

Draft Cambridge East Area Action Plan

Public Participation Report

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Chapter A INTRODUCTION</i>				
<i>A.1</i>				
10063 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The three Action Area Plans are acceptable as far as they go. None, however, is strong on implementation and delivery. There should be clear implementation plans, including phasing, realistic timescales for housing provision and associated infrastructure. We would expect to see strengthened implementation sections in the deposit LDF.	This is one of the requirements of the new plan-making system.	Add a new section to Chapter E: "Delivering Cambridge East" to show the proposed housing trajectory for Cambridge East which will include annual housebuilding targets and proposed milestone timing of service, facility and infrastructure provision.
<i>A.7</i>				
8255 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshalls is unconvinced of the need for a formal infrastructure plan to be part of the Proposals Map.	The appropriate means of dealing with infrastructure in future reviews of the AAP will depend on the nature of the use and certainty over location and alignment. Where there is certainty it may be most appropriate for it to be included on the Proposals Map. However, there may be circumstances where certainty can only be determined through masterplanning and planning application processes, and the Concept Diagram may be the more appropriate mechanism in such cases.	Revise 2nd sentence of paragraph A.7 to read: "They MAY be augmented...."
8188 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports future reviews of the Area Action Plan.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>A.8</i>				
8189 - The Marshall Group	Support	A8 Marshall is supportive of the hierarchy of plan preparation together with the reference to timing of specific requirements.	Support noted.	
<i>A.9</i>				
9399 - GO-East	Object	This paragraph refers to a number of strategies that are required as part of the implementation of the development of Cambridge East. The submission AAP should make clear what these are and the dependencies between these and effective implementation of the development. It is unclear for example whether these are strategies referred to elsewhere in the document or are other strategies which will have a bearing on the successful implementation of the development. [Soundness tests iv, v, vi, vii and viii]	This refers to the strategies identified in the main body of the AAP. The reason for each strategy is set out in the plan.	Add new sentence to paragraph A.9 to read: "Those strategies, and the need for them, are identified in the Area Action Plan."
<i>A.10</i>				
8192 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall is concerned about the absence of any guidance on future governance of Cambridge East. More and positive indication ought to be given, to inform public discussion.	The planning system is not the appropriate mechanism for consideration of governance. The Councils agree that governance is a very important issue for the major developments and will be considered in a parallel but separate process to the AAP.	

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Councils' Assessment****Change to Draft DPD****Chapter B VISION AND DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES****CE/1 The Vision for Cambridge East**

10104 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	<p>Not much reliance should be placed on the Airport producing housing before 2016 as there is uncertainty about the feasibility of relocating the airport. Moreover infrastructure planning is at a very early stage. There may well be delay in development of the Marshall's North Works site because the relocation of various existing uses has to be achieved. The majority of the housing site north of Newmarket road is also in the Green Belt and it will take several years before any amendment of Green Belt boundaries can be secured. By contrast the Bayer CropScience Ltd site is a brownfield opportunity and the main site is outside the Green Belt so can come forward for redevelopment at an early date.</p>	<p>The AAP plans for the whole of Cambridge East, whilst recognising that an early review of the plan will be undertaken before the main Airport site comes forward. Neither Council is relying on Cambridge Airport yielding dwellings by 2016. The only parts of Cambridge East that are assumed by the South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy DPD to come forward by 2016 are Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road and land north of Cherry Hinton, which can come forward whilst the Airport is still operating. Only part of the North Works site is proposed to be redeveloped and this is a relatively small part of Phase 1. Notwithstanding, Marshall's is in pre-application discussions with the District Council on an alternative site for some of the North Works operations and has advised that it currently anticipates submitting a planning application in spring 2006 with some relocated operations commencing on site in 2007. The City Local Plan assumes that only land north of Cherry Hinton that is not constrained by the Airport will come forward by 2016. There is no need to identify alternative locations for development. The case for development at Bayer Crop Science is addressed in response to separate representations to the South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy DPD.</p>
-------------------------------	--------	---	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11328	Object	I am very concerned about the apparent lack of consultation and working together with other departments when large plans are being proposed, such as the recent A14 consultation where representatives indicated that traffic problems existing and being effected by their proposals, on Ditton Lane were not their concern. I do hope that Addenbrook's and the Rosie have been brought into the consultation process.	The Councils are working in partnership with other organisations as far as possible. The Highways Agency's current proposals for the A14 do not extend beyond the Fen Ditton interchange and are focused on the needs of the A14 and not the new development at Cambridge East. However, the Highways Agency sits on a Transport Topic Group for Cambridge East which is considering the transport needs of the new urban quarter, including access to the A14. The Primary Care Trust and Addenbrooke's are formal consultees on the AAP.	
9544 9536	Object	Object to the proposed development of Cambridge East on the Cambridge Airport site. Recently purchased a property in Caribou Way and a large part of the reason behind choosing this property was the location, in that it is a quiet suburb but also allows easy access to the city centre and A14. A number of concerns about the proposed development and one of these includes: It is likely to result in a decrease in the value of the property, which could cause problems for us if we wish to move house in the future.	The Airport is identified in the Structure Plan 2003 as a location for major development on the edge of Cambridge. This takes forward the policy of RPG6 2000 which set the principle of new housing on the edge of Cambridge subject to a review of the Green Belt. The AAP includes policies to ensure that the new urban quarter is "integrated and linked sensitively into the urban fabric of eastern Cambridge to preserve existing residential amenity" (Policy CE/7(17)). The aim is to enhance Cambridge not detract from it both in terms of its physical character and the services and facilities it provides.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9497	Object	Observation of Cambridge over the past 25 years shows a mediaeval city which does not have the infrastructure or layout (road pattern, street widths etc.) to absorb such a huge extension. The city is already being throttled by existing population pressures. Genuine and realistic pre-planning of all the necessary facilities and services must be fully made (e.g. for water, drainage, electricity, gas, public transport, work places). Just building thousands of extra homes without full provision of social needs will be a disaster. Provision must be made for local shops, amenities, places of worship etc. otherwise Cambridge will sink under its own weight.	The proper planning of such a major new urban quarter of Cambridge will require the full and timely provision of all the physical and social infrastructure necessary to make a successful and sustainable new community. The policies of the AAP seek to achieve this. This version of the AAP deals with the development as a whole at a high level and focuses on the specific requirements for Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road which can take place at an early phase whilst the Airport is operational. A review of the AAP will work up the high level policies for the main part of the development as plans progress and the timetable for relocation is firmed up.	
8193 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports the vision for Cambridge East set out in this policy.	Support noted. Unlike all other chapters, this key chapter does not have any objectives. For consistency and to provide an overarching objective against which to develop indicators for monitoring, a new objective is proposed.	Insert new section at the top of Part B: OBJECTIVES B/a: To create a new and distinctive sustainable community on the eastern edge of Cambridge which will enhance the special character of the City and its setting and is connected to the rest of the City by high quality public transport and other non-car modes of transport .

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE/2 Development Principles</i>				
8485 - English Heritage	Object	The policy should state under Character and Design that the development should 'respect the underlying historic character of the site established by reference to the Historic Landscape Character database and archaeological evaluation'.	It is not considered that the landscape character of Cambridge East represents an historic landscape character that it would be appropriate, or indeed practicable, to seek to protect through the development. A major new urban quarter will inevitably change the open character of the Airport and the open character largely devoid of landscaping would not be appropriate for the development. Policies elsewhere in the AAP address archaeology (CE/22) and built heritage (CE/23) and the retention of any existing landscape features that are appropriate to the local landscape character (CE/16).	
7924 - Cambridgeshire Police	Object	Care should be taken that there is not excessive permeability both into and through the development, particularly with reference to "green fingers". Routes should be designed to be safe, attractive, well used and with the benefit of high levels of natural surveillance from their surroundings. Where home zone principles are applied there should be appropriate application of crime prevention through environmental design.	A high level of permeability at Cambridge East will be an important principle to encourage as much movement by foot and cycle as possible. It is also highlighted in criterion 13 that there should be a safe environment. It is agreed that routes should be designed to be "safe, attractive, well used and with the benefit of high levels of natural surveillance from their surroundings". A new criterion could helpfully be added to clarify this requirement. The detailed approach to design of routes will be a matter for the strategic masterplan and design guide required by the AAP.	Add new criterion following 12, to read: "FOOTPATHS, BRIDLEWAYS AND CYCLEWAYS SHOULD BE SAFE, ATTRACTIVE, WELL USED AND WITH THE BENEFIT OF HIGH LEVELS OF NATURAL SURVEILLANCE FROM THEIR SURROUNDINGS."
11475 - GO-East	Object	We welcome the fact that you have produced a monitoring strategy in respect of the LDF as a whole. We consider, however, that each DPD should include its own monitoring strategy as part of the overall implementation framework and that, accordingly, the submission DPDs will need to incorporate and develop the relevant parts of the current separate monitoring document.	Agreed. The submission DPD will include the Cambridge East table from the Monitoring Strategy with brief introductory text to set it in context.	Include a new chapter F: Monitoring Cambridge East which includes the table of indicators from the Monitoring Strategy and a brief introduction drawn from the strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8194 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall generally supports the 35 development principle points and in particular point 10, which refers to an emphasis on housing.	Support noted.	
9499 - East of England Regional Assembly 10183 - East of England Regional Assembly	Support	The Assembly supports the development of a new urban quarter of Cambridge, and the development principles set out in this Policy.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
2 8676 - RAVE	Object	This range of proposed new dwellings appears excessive in comparison with the Panel Report of the 2002 Structure Plan Review and the LDA Cambridge Green Belt Study.	The assumptions on dwelling capacity at the time of the Structure Plan were based on notional capacities and involved limited assessment of individual sites or taking account of existing local character and the potential character of the development. Work in the preparation of the AAP has involved further consideration such that a greater potential capacity has been identified, within the context of a high density development as required by Policy P9/2 of the Structure Plan. However, in identifying a potential dwelling range of 10-12,000 dwellings, the AAP makes clear that the development will follow a design-led approach within a range of potential densities (Policy CE/10(3)), and the actual densities resulting from this approach will influence the final number of dwellings built. The AAP must be read as a whole and it is not necessary or appropriate to repeat that point at Policy CE/2.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9286 - Defence Land Agent - East (Waterbeach Barracks)	Object	<p>Land at Waterbeach Barracks. On behalf of Defence Estates (DE), this development proposal is supported in principle, however, it is recommended that the plan be more realistic in terms of potential yield. It is considered that the proposed densities on the site (70 per hectare) are potentially unrealistic and inappropriate for this rural setting of the city. Land at Waterbeach Barracks should be identified to ensure that should the Cambridge East site fail to come forward in the densities proposed, and there is a shortfall of housing within the plan period, the Barracks site has the potential to sustainably accommodate up to 6,000 units.</p>	<p>The AAP plans for the whole of the Cambridge East development but recognises that development on the Airport site is dependent on the relocation of the Airport and that this may not take place until towards the end of the plan period. The main purpose of this first AAP is to bring forward Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road which can take place with the Airport still operating. It also recognises that there is further development north of Cherry Hinton that could take place before the Airport relocates, although anticipates that there would be an early review of the AAP to facilitate this. The Core Strategy makes clear that South Cambridgeshire District Council is not relying on any of the Airport site itself to yield dwellings by 2016. The City Local Plan makes the same assumption. There is no need to identify further land for development at the top two stages of the development sequence (ie in or on the edge of Cambridge) and there is no strategic context for a new settlement at Waterbeach.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
3 8682 - RAVE	Support	RAVE supports this policy because it implies that only land not required to maintain the Green Belt should be available for release. Since all of the land is presently within the Green Belt it must be incumbent on the LPA to justify the areas to be released, in Green Belt terms, which has not so far been done.	Support noted. However, the representor is concerned that the AAP does not justify the changes to the Green Belt boundaries. The principle of Green Belt release at Cambridge East and broad scale of development was confirmed through the Structure Plan process. The role of the AAP is therefore not to question whether a major new urban quarter should be development, but to ensure that the site identified is consistent with the broad areas of land established in the Structure Plan whilst ensuring that the principles underpinning the Cambridge Green Belt are respected and that land important to protecting the historic setting of Cambridge is retained in the Green Belt. The Councils consider that the approach to Green Belt review is consistent with those principles with the boundaries proposed which contain the development within the line of Airport Way, and also retain a substantial green corridor through the development and maintain separation from villages.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9283 - Defence Land Agent - East	Support	It is considered that the vision for Cambridge East should remain, however, the AAP should include within the Development Principles that: 'Due to the possibility that this site may not come forward within this plan period, the availability of alternative sites such as Waterbeach Barracks within the Sub-Region, outside of Cambridge City boundaries, has been recognised.'	The AAP plans for the whole of the Cambridge East development but recognises that development on the Airport site is dependent on the relocation of the Airport and that this may not take place until towards the end of the plan period. The main purpose of this first AAP is to bring forward Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road which can take place with the Airport still operating. It also recognises that there is further development north of Cherry Hinton that could take place before the Airport relocates, although anticipates that there would be an early review of the AAP to facilitate this. The Core Strategy makes clear that South Cambridgeshire District Council is not relying on any of the Airport site itself to yield dwellings by 2016. The City Local Plan makes the same assumption. There is no need to identify further land for development at the top two stages of the development sequence (ie in or on the edge of Cambridge) and there is no strategic context for a new settlement at Waterbeach.	
<hr/>				
4 8689 - RAVE	Object	The meaning of "physical separation" is not defined. The suggestion, elsewhere, that 200m meets this requirement would seem to be totally inadequate. The criteria for establishing adequate physical separation require to be agreed and explained in this policy.	The Development Principles policy properly identifies the requirement in principle that there will be physical separation between the new urban quarter and nearby villages. How this should be achieved is addressed in the more detailed policy in Section C4 which deals with mitigating the impact on existing villages. The adequacy of the proposed 200m separation with Teversham is addressed under a separate representation to Policy CE/6(1).	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>6</i>				
8028 - The National Trust	Object	Add reference to linking edge treatments to Wicken Fen Vision Area to north of development	It is not appropriate to go to this level of detail in the Development Principles policy.	
<i>12</i>				
11237 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Welcome inclusion of climate change mitigation and adaptation in this policy. The word "gas" appears to have been omitted between "greenhouse" and "emissions".	Support noted. Agree correction regarding greenhouse gases.	Revise criterion 12 to read "...greenhouse GAS emissions".
<i>13</i>				
8074 - The National Trust	Object	With high density development there is a need for attractive open space, easily accessible on foot or cycle, providing circular routes and longer distant trails. To make these facilities attractive there is a benefit in having 'desire points' at the end. The Trust's property at Anglesey Abbey offers one such opportunity with the added benefit of providing education opportunities.	Agree benefits of footpath and cycle routes having "desire points" at the end, or indeed, on a circular route. This would be more appropriate added to criterion 21 which deals with such networks and links with areas outside the development.	Revise criterion 21 to read: "...and an improved network connecting it to the rest of Cambridge, neighbouring villages, OTHER DESIRABLE DESTINATIONS SUCH AS TOURIST AND LEISURE FACILITIES, the open countryside and the wider network."
<i>14</i>				
8023 - The National Trust	Object	Add reference to the proposed Bridge of Reeds, the Landmark East project, which will provide a new landmark and piece of public art in close proximity to the Cambridge East Area.	It is not appropriate to refer to specific projects in the development principles section, particularly where they are outside the scope of the development and not yet firmly agreed schemes. The Bridge of Reeds and its relationship with the new urban quarter is addressed at paragraph D11.26 and its role in linking with the Wicken Fen vision in Policy CE/25 .	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>16</i>				
8024 - The National Trust	Object	Add reference to the fact that the green links to the greater countryside will also offer opportunities for the enhancement of biodiversity and landscape.	Agree.	Revise criterion 16 to read: "...provide a recreational resource, enhance biodiversity AND LANDSCAPE AND PROVIDE GREEN LINKS TO THE WIDER COUNTRYSIDE."
<i>19</i>				
8025 - The National Trust	Object	Add reference to the fact that the green links to the greater countryside will also offer opportunities for the enhancement of biodiversity and landscape.	This point has been included at criterion 16 in response to a similar representation. It is not necessary to repeat it here.	
<i>21</i>				
9153 - Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	Support	Policy CE/2 - 21. Welcome inclusion of reference to high quality footpaths, bridleways and cycleways.	Support noted.	
<i>24</i>				
8026 - The National Trust	Object	An explanatory reference to the proposed Bridge of Reeds could be added as this proposed structure, whilst situated to the north of the development area, will be sufficiently close to register as a significant item of public art that will serve a legible 'sense of place'.	If the Bridge of Reeds is successfully implemented it would come under the scope of this development principle. It is not necessary or appropriate to include it here.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>27</i>				
9103 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Object	The Trust objects to the fact that the services listed in this section do not include healthcare facilities. These services are included in the CE/12 where a similar list of examples of community services is set out. CE/12 states that 'Cambridge East will provide a full range of publicly provided services and facilities, e.g. schools, community uses, health facilities, funded.' In the interests of consistency 'health facilities' should be included in the list of services set out in Item 27 of CE/2.	Agree.	Revise criterion 27 to read: ...services and facilities to meet the needs of its residents, including community uses, education, HEALTH FACILITIES, sport and recreation."
<i>28</i>				
8196 - The Marshall Group	Object	Point 28 states that the developers will provide the necessary services, infrastructure and facilities, including long-term management and maintenance. The intention is that Cambridge East should be a partnership between the authorities and the landowner/developer. Local authorities will provide services in the normal way, with funding contributions, in whole or part, from the developer/landowner. The wording of point 28 should be altered better to reflect the likely reality without prejudice to the requirement of substantial funding from the developer/landowner.	The over-riding principle in the planning obligations circular is that the developers will find the services, facilities and infrastructure required by their developments. The private and public sector bodies that will be involved will only be asked to contribute if there is a shortfall in the value of the development. The necessary services, infrastructure and facilities required to support Cambridge East will be provided in a variety of ways, including directly by the developer or by way of financial contributions consistent with the provisions of Circular 05/2005. An amendment to the policy would help clarify this.	Amend Policy CE/2 criterion 28 to read: "With the developers of the urban quarter providing necessary services, infrastructure and facilities, EITHER DIRECTLY OR VIA FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS, including APPROPRIATE provision for management and maintenance."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>30</i>				
8027 - The National Trust	Object	Parts of the Wicken Fen Vision Area to the north of the proposed development could also offer the opportunity to provide areas for water storage.	This policy sets the principle that there be appropriate measures to address flood risk. Any specific proposals would be addressed in the drainage section.	
7800 - The camToo Project	Support	The site will drain onto the Cam flood plain downstream of Cambridge - The camToo flood relief channel will assist in the removal of waters that could otherwise back up into Cambridge.	This policy sets the principle that there be appropriate measures to address flood risk. Any specific proposals would be addressed in the drainage section.	
<i>32</i>				
11094 - Environment Agency	Object	A strategic surface water drainage scheme will be required for the Cambridge East area. This should be stipulated in within the policy for a 'Strategic Masterplan', to inform developers of its requirement at an early stage. This could be required as part of CE/2, No. 32.	This requirement is agreed, although it would be better included in the Drainage chapter D12, in Policy CE/26 which deals with surface water drainage. As a consequence, it should also be included in the schedule of planning obligations in chapter E2. Changes are proposed in response to a separate representation on the Drainage chapter.	
<i>34</i>				
11238 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Suggest adding "and the environment" at the end.	Agree.	Add "...and to the environment" to the end of criterion 34.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------

CAMBRIDGE EAST CONCEPT DIAGRAM

8197 - The Marshall Group	Object	The principal focus of the urban area should be as a town centre as opposed to a district centre. Access at the northern end of Airport Way, in the vicinity of the country park, should be widened to include road or vehicular access, as well as pedestrian and cycle access. The relocated car showrooms should be shown to the east of the urban park, on the north side of Newmarket Road.	The Concept Diagram reflects policies contained in the plan in a spatial form but where there is not sufficient certainty on boundaries to include them on the Proposals Map at this stage. It does not itself identify the policy approaches or terminology. Issues of name of the main centre, access to Cambridge East at the northern end of Airport Way and any relocation of the car showrooms are dealt with at their parent policies in respect to separate representations. If any changes are proposed in response to those representations they would also identify the need for a revision to the Concept Diagram.	
11391 - The Marshall Group (Cambridge East, Marshalls Site)	Object	Marshall objects to the north-east boundary north of Newmarket Road where it is shown following the hedge / ditch line from High Ditch Road to Newmarket Road to the west of Airport Way roundabout. Marshall also objects to the proposed 'minimum 300m wide' Green Corridor being designated as Green Belt at this stage. Defining a minimum width now, which is not based on design, is premature, unnecessary and restrictive to the masterplan. The Green Belt boundary should be defined as shown on LDA Design drawing number 1741/40/1 now and the Green Corridor designated when the built edge is defined.	The Concept Diagram reflects policies contained in the plan in a spatial form but where there is not sufficient certainty on boundaries to include them on the Proposals Map at this stage. It does not itself identify the policy approaches or terminology. Issues of Green Belt boundaries and width of Green Corridor are dealt with at their parent policies in respect to separate representations. If any changes are proposed in response to those representations they would also identify the need for a revision to the Concept Diagram.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Chapter C THE SITE AND ITS SETTING</i>				
<i>Objectives</i>				
7812	Object	Objection to the development of the land which currently occupies the Cambridge Airport. Objection to extra traffic that the houses will cause, and ruin of the lovely green landscape.	The principle of development at Cambridge Airport is established in the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan prepared by the County Council, as part of an overall development strategy to meet the needs of the Cambridge Sub-Region. The role of the AAP is to define detailed site boundaries and provide a planning policy framework for development.	
11392 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports objectives C1/a to C3/d and all of these are met by the proposed masterplan.	Support noted.	
<i>C1/a</i>				
8693 - RAVE	Object	It is not clear whether the reference is to Structure Plan Policy P9/2 or P9/3c	Objective C1/a specifically refers to Structure Plan P9/2c entitled Location and Phasing of Development Land to be Released from the Green Belt, which identifies the three areas which together make up Cambridge East: north of Newmarket Road, north of Cherry Hinton and Cambridge Airport.	
<i>C2/a</i>				
8733 - RAVE	Support	This policy seems to imply that Cambridge East, as conceived in this Area Action Plan, can, at best, only be neutral with regard to the setting of Cambridge.	Support noted. In terms of Green Belt, the objective is to ensure that the development does not "detract" from the setting of Cambridge. In terms of the development itself, the aim as set out in Policy CE/1, the vision for Cambridge East is for it to "complement and enhance the character of the City and protect and enhance the environmental qualities of the surrounding area".	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>C2/b</i>				
8236	Support	Support, but a separation of 200 metres between Cambridge East and Teversham will not meet this objective. Teversham would then be part of the Cambridge urban area. A separation of at least 500 metres is required.	Support for the objective noted. The issue of the extent of separation necessary to deliver the objective is addressed under separate representations.	
<i>C3/a</i>				
8487 - English Heritage	Object	Reference should be made to the need to protect and accommodate historic landscape features, and archaeology. Proper assessment of the site is required to help inform the layout and ensure that development benefits from, and responds to, underlying distinctiveness. The plan should make clear that the site will not be treated as a blank canvas.	It is not considered that the landscape character of Cambridge East represents an historic landscape character that it would be appropriate, or indeed practicable, to seek to protect through the development. A major new urban quarter will inevitably change the open character of the Airport and the open character largely devoid of landscaping would not be appropriate for the development. Policies elsewhere in the AAP address archaeology (CE/22) and built heritage (CE/23) and the retention of any existing landscape features that are appropriate to the local landscape character (CE/16).	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE/3 The Site For Cambridge East</i>				
9594	Object	The undersigned residents of Eland Way wish to make known their concerns about the major development of housing on Cambridge Airport: Dr A J Maguire, Dr M Gaskarth, Mr E Gaskarth. The proposed development site is too close to existing developments, namely Teversham and Cherry Hinton.	The principle of a major new urban quarter to Cambridge based on Cambridge Airport, land north of Teversham and land north of Newmarket Road is established in the Structure Plan. The role of the AAP is to provide a policy framework for that development, including site boundaries and separation from villages. Policy CE/6 states that a minimum of 200m Green Separation will be maintained between Cambridge East and Teversham to maintain village character. This also lies at the bell mouth of the Green Corridor and this will offer a much more open character close to much of the village, with those areas closer to the built parts of Cambridge East having views filtered by careful landscaping (Policy CE/6). Development on the sensitive outer edges of Cambridge East, particularly close to villages, will also be at lower densities and building heights will be restricted (Policy CE/10).	
11393 - The Marshall Group (Cambridge East, Marshalls Site)	Object	Marshall objects to the north-east boundary north of Newmarket Road where it is shown following the hedge / ditch line from High Ditch Road to Newmarket Road to the west of Airport Way roundabout. Marshall also objects to the proposed 'minimum 300m wide' Green Corridor being designated as Green Belt at this stage. Defining a minimum width now, which is not based on design, is premature, unnecessary and restrictive to the masterplan. The Green Belt boundary should be defined as shown on LDA Design drawing number 1741/40/1 now and the Green Corridor designated when the built edge is defined.	The site boundary reflects the land that can be removed from the Green Belt whilst protecting the historic and compact character of Cambridge and it's setting. To extend the Cambridge East development further east than Airport Way would undermine the purposes of the Green Belt. The AAP states in paragraph C1.5 that the Green Belt boundary may need to be reviewed if there is to be a new access road linking to the A14. That would be for the early review of the AAP.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10438 - Harcourt Developments Ltd. 10437 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd	Object	Our clients have concerns regarding the achievable housing delivery rates from this strategic allocation. The draft Area Action Plan should be amended to provide a more realistic assessment of housing land supply from Cambridge East. The Area Action Plan makes over optimistic assumptions concerning the likely housing delivery rate from this capacity source. Our assessment identifies a more realistic supply of 400 dwellings from this allocation (relating to land north of the Marshall's Works site). The remainder of the allocation should be deleted, as it is unlikely to come forward for development in the period to 2016.	The Area Action Plan relates to the development of Cambridge East as a whole. It does not assume that the whole development will come forward by 2016. It is realistic to assume that development on land north of Newmarket Road can be delivered during the period to 2016, and likewise land north of Cherry Hinton, which can come forward before relocation of Cambridge Airport. The objector's assessment that only 400 dwellings are likely to come forward by 2016 is not accepted. The majority of the unconstrained phases are on undeveloped land. Only the northern part of the North Works needs to be relocated for development of Phase 1 to be completed and good progress is being made on pre-application discussions relating to a proposed relocation site at Swavesey.	
10648 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports the policy for the site at Cambridge East as it provides a logical relationship between two parts of the Cambridge East development north and south of Newmarket Road.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>I</i>				
9318 - Defence Land Agent - East	Object	Furthermore, as the extent of the proposed extension, and therefore the loss of Green Belt land, is yet to be finalised, it is considered on behalf of DE, that the AAP should include within the Development Principles that: 'Due to the possibility that this site may not come forward within this plan period, the availability of alternative sites within the Sub-Region, such as Waterbeach Barracks, has been recognised.'	The AAP proposes the extent of land to be released from the Green Belt for development. The Councils are not relying on land at Cambridge Airport to come forward for development by 2016. Early phases of development on land north of Newmarket Road and north of Cherry Hinton can come forward while the Airport is operational. Notwithstanding any specific issues relating to development at Waterbeach Barracks, there is no justification for identifying other land for residential development. If there were, this would be an issue for the Cambridge City Local Plan or South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy and not for the Cambridge East Area Action Plan.	
8803 - RAVE	Object	The estimated capacity of Cambridge East seems very high and would appear to be based on the number of houses the LPA's would like to place on it rather than a capacity derived from a principled review of the site's Green Belt function and a more realistic density of development after due allowance for open space .	Work in the preparation of the AAP has involved consideration of potential dwelling numbers, within the context of a high density development as required by Policy P9/2 of the Structure Plan. However, in identifying a potential dwelling range of 10-12,000 dwellings, the AAP makes clear that the development will follow a design-led approach within a range of potential densities (Policy CE/10(3)) to ensure a high quality development, and the actual densities resulting from this approach will influence the final number of dwellings built.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>b</i> 8199 - The Marshall Group (Cambridge East, Marshalls Site)	Object	Marshalls Site, Cambridge East. Marshall objects to the hedge/ditch line from High Ditch Road to Newmarket Road forming the eastern boundary. The boundary would be better formed by the hedge line further to the east, as illustrated in the LDA Design report, particularly if a link road to the A14 is not required. If one is required, that might appropriately form the green belt boundary.	The site boundary reflects the land that can be removed from the Green Belt whilst protecting the historic and compact character of Cambridge and its setting. To extend the Cambridge East development further east than Airport Way would undermine the purposes of the Green Belt. The AAP states in paragraph C1.5 that the Green Belt boundary may need to be reviewed if there is to be a new access road linking to the A14. That would be for the early review of the AAP.	
8237	Object	No, no, no. The boundary must not be Airport Way. If you don't want to build closer to Airport Way than 200 metres then make that the boundary. I think it should be no closer than 500 metres. The land in between must remain in the Green Belt.	The site, as stated in the policy and shown on the Proposals Map, does not include the Green Corridor which widens out at Teversham to include the 200m Green Separation. Therefore the 200m Green Separation is not in the site and does remain in the Green Belt. The extent of Green Separation is dealt with under separate representations on Policy CE/6.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
2				
8200 - The Marshall Group	Object	The Concept Plan should be altered to show an appropriate notation for the long-term relocation of the car showrooms' complex, to the north side of Newmarket Road, along a length of that road immediately inside either the link road or the green belt boundary. Upon that relocation, proposals would be submitted for the relocation of the petrol filling station.	The Preferred Options report considered whether to include a policy proposing the relocation of the car showrooms to help provide a suitable environment for the Phase 1 development. In response to a representation from Marshall indicating that it did not intend relocating, the draft AAP does not require the car showrooms to be relocated but does indicate that there is potential for redevelopment at the end of their useful life with a more appropriate form of development, which could involve retaining the existing car showroom use but in a building form that makes better use of land. In view of Marshall's representation to the draft AAP that it is now considering relocating the car showroom use, the text could be revised to make clear that the uses could remain on their existing site in any redevelopment but that they could also be relocated elsewhere in the Cambridge East development. Whilst Marshall suggests a potential relocation site, it is not considered appropriate or necessary to be prescriptive in the AAP, or include any location on the Concept Diagram. Any suitable relocation site should be considered as part of the wider masterplanning of the development.	Add to the end of paragraph C1.9: "... or their relocation elsewhere within the Cambridge East development."
11394 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports the proposed extent and boundaries for Phase 1 North of Newmarket Road (Policies CE/3(2, 3).	Support noted.	
3				
11395 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports the proposed extent and boundaries for Phase 1 North of Newmarket Road (Policies CE/3(2, 3).	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>4</i>				
11396 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports Policies CE/3(4, 5, 6) which also relate to Phase 1 North of Newmarket Road.	Support noted.	
<i>5</i>				
11397 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports Policies CE/3(4, 5, 6) which also relate to Phase 1 North of Newmarket Road.	Support noted.	
<i>6</i>				
9304 - Defence Land Agent - East	Object	The non-delivery of the Cambridge extensions could have implications on delivery of housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region, as set out in CPSP Policy 9/1. Should this urban extension fail to come forward, leaving a subsequent shortfall of housing provision, the land at Cambridge East should be safeguarded to meet longer-term needs after 2016, to be consistent with CPSP Policy 9/2c. There would then be a need to look at sites within South Cambridgeshire District, such as Waterbeach Barracks.	The AAP plans for the whole of the Cambridge East development but recognises that development on the Airport site is dependent on the relocation of the Airport and that this may not take place until towards the end of the plan period. The main purpose of this first AAP is to bring forward Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road which can take place with the Airport still operating. It also recognises that there is further development north of Cherry Hinton that could take place before the Airport relocates, although anticipates that there would be an early review of the AAP to facilitate this. The Core Strategy makes clear that South Cambridgeshire District Council is not relying on any of the Airport site itself to yield dwellings by 2016. The City Local Plan makes the same assumption. There is no need to identify further land for development at the top two stages of the development sequence (ie in or on the edge of Cambridge) and there is no strategic context for a new settlement at Waterbeach.	
11398 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports Policies CE/3(4, 5, 6) which also relate to Phase 1 North of Newmarket Road.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>C1.5</i>				
11399 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall supports the principle of revisiting the precise boundaries of the site and the Green Belt in the first review of the Area Action Plan but consider that the eastern extent referred to North of Newmarket Road should be removed from the Green Belt now and not at a future review. Marshall proposes that the last sentence of Paragraph C1.5 is deleted.	The site boundary reflects the land that can be removed from the Green Belt whilst protecting the historic and compact character of Cambridge and it's setting. To extend the Cambridge East development further east than Airport Way would undermine the purposes of the Green Belt. The reference to the early review of the AAP in respect to the Green Belt boundary north of Newmarket Road relates specifically to the eventuality that a new link road to the A14 is required. If no new link is necessary, the Green Belt boundary would not need to be reviewed again.	
<i>C1.11</i>				
7801 - The camToo Project	Object	The camToo Project will provide a superior cycle route to the City centre that is off-road, dedicated, with only one road crossing (Ditton Lane).	Paragraph C1.11 relates to one specific cycle route specifically to serve those living to the north of the North Works on Phase 1 of the development which should be secured through the development but which would form part of a wider network of cycle paths linking in with various existing and proposed routes and serve a variety of destinations both within the City and outside.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>C1.12</i>				
8201 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall recognises the need to ensure the relationship between the new neighbourhood North of Newmarket Road and the frontage on Newmarket Road is attractive, pleasant, functional and obvious. Proposals will be made in the short-term for another car showroom at the western end of the undeveloped frontage and the demolition of the industrial complex adjacent to the park and ride site.	Support noted. The Preferred Options report considered whether to include a policy proposing the relocation of the car showrooms to help provide a suitable environment for the Phase 1 development. In response to a representation from Marshall indicating that it did not intend relocating, the draft AAP does not require the car showrooms to be relocated but does indicate that there is potential for redevelopment at the end of their useful life with a more appropriate form of development, which could involve retaining the existing car showroom use but in a building form that makes better use of land. In view of Marshall's representation to the draft AAP that it is now considering relocating the car showroom use, the text could be revised to make clear that the uses could remain on their existing site in any redevelopment but that they could also be relocated elsewhere in the Cambridge East development. Whilst Marshall suggests a potential relocation site, it is not considered appropriate or necessary to be prescriptive in the AAP, or include any location on the Concept Diagram. Any suitable relocation site should be considered as part of the wider masterplanning of the development.	Add to the end of paragraph C1.9: "... or their relocation elsewhere within the Cambridge East development."
<i>C1.15</i>				
8029 - The National Trust	Object	As the area to the north of Newmarket Road will be Phase 1 of the development, its inhabitants will not have the benefit of the proposed open space corridors planned for the areas to the south. Links to the Wicken Fen Vision area will, therefore, be important to provide opportunities access to open space/countryside.	This can be considered as part of masterplanning along with access to other countryside areas as required by Policy CE/25. It is not necessary to specifically identify such a link in relation to the policy on the site boundary.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE/4 The Setting of Cambridge East</i>				
9331 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	The extent of the incursion into the Green Belt will impact upon the purpose of including land within the Green Belt as established in PPG2. There will be an impact upon wider Green Belt objectives resulting from the manner in which the development form is proposed. Taylor Woodrow Developments believe that the housing provision can be achieved elsewhere, for example at Netherhall Farm, in a manner which will not have such sweeping impacts upon green belt functions.	The principle of removing land from the Green Belt was established in the Structure Plan which looked at the suitability of land around the fringes of Cambridge for urban extensions. The principle of development at Cambridge East is therefore established. The AAP takes forward the Structure Plan policies to provide a more detailed policy framework for a major new urban quarter to Cambridge. The Green Belt releases proposed at considered appropriate without causing significant harm to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt.	
9732 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Object	We do not agree that the Green Belt should be modified in this area for the provision of housing. There has been a Green Belt around Cambridge since the 1960's to prevent communities from merging into one another and with the City. The necessity for the Green Belt is still as vital as ever, and any erosion of it should be resisted. If however the plan is adopted then separation of villages is paramount.	The Airport is identified in the Structure Plan 2003 as a location for major development on the edge of Cambridge. This takes forward the policy of RPG6 2000 which set the principle of new housing on the edge of Cambridge subject to a review of the Green Belt. The principle of development is therefore established. The role of the AAP is to ensure that the new urban quarter is developed in such a way that it does not undermine the fundamental purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt and that it maintains separation from nearby villages and maintains their character.	
<i>1</i>				
11400 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports the creation of a Green Corridor linking from Coldham's Common to Teversham and the provision of land as Green Separation between Cambridge East and the villages of Fen Ditton and Teversham (CE/4(1)).	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------

a

9891 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	The Society considers the suggested Green Corridor to too narrow considering the density of development proposed. In relation to page 21-para 3 / and page 23 para C2.7 -the width illustrated on the Concept diagram and width stated in text do not seem to correlate i.e. the buffer landscape/green corridor surrounding Teversham is shown too narrow on the Concept Diagram.	The width of the Green Corridor is proposed to be at least 300 metres as it runs through the new urban quarter. This width is compatible with other green corridors into Cambridge, notably the nearby Stourbridge Common and is considered an appropriate extent to ensure that the character of Cambridge with its radial green corridors is maintained. The separation from Teversham is a separate issue and the alignment of the corridor is proposed specifically to maximise the benefit to the village of the Green Corridor. However, separation from villages is a distinct issue and work in relation to the new town of Northstowe has demonstrated that a minimum width of 200m is necessary for maintaining village character. The same separation is proposed at Cambridge East for Teversham.	
---------------------------------------	--------	--	---	--

b

8238	Object	No, this land must remain in the Green Belt.	The principle of releasing land from the Green Belt for an urban extension to Cambridge is established in the Structure Plan. The role of the AAP is to provide more detailed planning framework for that development.	
------	--------	--	--	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>2</i>				
11401 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall also has no objection to the purposes of the Green Belt in the vicinity of Cambridge East (CE/4(2)), although notes that these are different from Green Belt purposes given in paragraph 1.6 PPG2, policy P9/2b of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, and paragraph 4.2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies.	Support noted. However, the AAP purposes are consistent with Structure Plan Policy P9/2b and interpreted to relate specifically to Cambridge East.	
<i>d</i>				
8239	Support	A 200 metre separation is inadequate for this. At least 500 metres is required to prevent Cambridge merging with Teversham.	Support noted. However, extending the separation between Cambridge East and Teversham from 200m to 500m is not considered appropriate or necessary in order to protect village character and identity, or to ensure that Cambridge will not merge with any of the surrounding villages, in the light of detailed work undertaken in relation to Northstowe. This demonstrated that it is the form of landscape treatment within the areas of separation that is particularly important to protect village character, rather than its physical extent, other than to ensure that there is physically space to create an appropriate form of landscape treatment.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>f</i> 8254 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall urges that outdoor recreation should include the provision of formal playing fields, which is seen as appropriate development within green belts, as set out in PPG2.	Whilst sports pitches are uses normally acceptable in the Green Belt, in the context of a Green Corridor of limited width through a major urban extension, the emphasis should be on an open character, informal recreation, landscape treatment and on biodiversity and wildlife. Furthermore, it would not be appropriate for the Green Corridor to include buildings such as changing accommodation which would undermine its open character.	
8203 - The Marshall Group 8204 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports the policy provision indicating one of the purposes of the green belt in the vicinity of Cambridge East to be 'Provide opportunities for outdoor recreation and public access to the open countryside adjoining Cambridge East.'	Support noted.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Councils' Assessment

Change to Draft DPD

3

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8205 - The Marshall Group 11403 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the requirement that the Green Corridor will have a minimum width of 300m (CE/4(3)). Stipulating such a minimum width is not based on design, is premature, unnecessary and restrictive to the masterplanning process. The width, shape and content of the Green Corridor should be led by good design and be based on analysis of the existing Green Corridors running through Cambridge. Existing spaces within the Green Corridors running through Cambridge are varied in width and articulated, ranging from 40m to more than 400m. Width will be determined by a variety of factors and precise definition should rely upon a subsequent review of the Area Action Plan, when the strategic Master Plan will become a local master plan, to inform the relevant planning application.	The Structure Plan requires that a green corridor is retained through from Teversham to Coldhams Common (Policy P9/2c) and that it is retained as Green Belt (Policy P9/2b). The AAP defines the new Green Belt boundaries around Cambridge East, following advice from GO-East at the Preferred Options stage that this is the appropriate approach. It is therefore necessary for the AAP to establish the boundaries of the Green Corridor at this stage. Para C2.5 recognises that there are no clear features on the ground to assist with the definition of the boundaries of the green Corridor and they are therefore policy led based on principles for the development as set out in the AAP. The Councils have set out their approach to the definition of the Green Corridor in the AAP (paras C2.6-C2.10), and remain of the view that the Corridor must have a substantial width if it is properly to fulfil its role of bringing the countryside into the heart of the city. There is certainly variation in the width of corridors in the rest of Cambridge, both wider and narrower than 300m, particularly as they get close to the heart of the city, much of which is historic accident rather than planned. The Councils consider that at Cambridge East, which is the outer part of the Green Corridor on the eastern side of the city, it is reasonable to set a minimum width of 300m for the corridor to reflect similar corridors in this part of the city eg Stourbridge Common and ensure that the purpose of the corridor is not undermined by encroachment from development on either side, including potential for pinch points which could undermine its purpose. The AAP acknowledges that it may be appropriate to review the detailed boundaries of the Green Corridor when the AAP is reviewed and the	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
			proposals for the development as a whole are further worked up (paras C1.5 and C2.5).	
4				
11404 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall supports the principle that the Green Corridor will have landscaping and biodiversity value and also perform a recreational function for both informal recreation and children's play, as stated in Policy CE/4(4), but considers that it should also contain playing fields, courts and equipped children's play areas. Marshall objects to part of Policy CE/4(5) which states that it will not contain any associated urban uses such as playing fields.	Support for the landscape, biodiversity and informal recreation role of the Green Corridor is noted. Whilst sports pitches are uses normally acceptable in the Green Belt, in the context of a Green Corridor of limited width through a major urban extension, the emphasis should be on an open character, informal recreation, landscape treatment and on biodiversity and wildlife. Furthermore, it would not be appropriate for the Green Corridor to include buildings such as changing accommodation which would undermine its open character.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
5				
10675 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The policy is generally supported, however, it is not considered that playing fields are necessarily inappropriate within the green corridor where they can be accommodated without detracting from the landscape, biodiversity and informal recreation value of the corridor.	Support for the landscape, biodiversity and informal recreation role of the Green Corridor is noted. Whilst sports pitches are uses normally acceptable in the Green Belt, in the context of a Green Corridor of limited width through a major urban extension, the emphasis should be on an open character, informal recreation, landscape treatment and on biodiversity and wildlife. Furthermore, it would not be appropriate for the Green Corridor to include buildings such as changing accommodation which would undermine its open character.	
8206 - The Marshall Group 11405 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall supports the principle that the Green Corridor will have landscaping and biodiversity value and also perform a recreational function for both informal recreation and children's play, as stated in Policy CE/4(4), but considers that it should also contain playing fields, courts and equipped children's play areas. Marshall objects to part of Policy CE/4(5) which states that it will not contain any associated urban uses such as playing fields, allotments and cemeteries. Such uses have been regarded as appropriate uses within green belts since the mid-1950's.	Support for the landscape, biodiversity and informal recreation role of the Green Corridor is noted. Whilst sports pitches are uses normally acceptable in the Green Belt, in the context of a Green Corridor of limited width through a major urban extension, the emphasis should be on an open character, informal recreation, landscape treatment and on biodiversity and wildlife. Furthermore, it would not be appropriate for the Green Corridor to include buildings such as changing accommodation which would undermine its open character.	
6				
9155 - Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	Support	Policy CE/4 - 6. Welcome reference to footpath, cycleway and bridleway crossings.	Support noted.	
11402 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports Policy CE/4(6) which describes the design approach for road, public transport, footpath, cycleway and bridleway crossings across the Green Corridor, although Marshall questions the practicality of tunnelling.	Support noted. Tunnelling is identified as an option that may merit investigation in sensitive locations, but is not specified as a requirement at this stage.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Councils' Assessment

Change to Draft DPD

C2.3

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11406 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the north-east boundary north of Newmarket Road, where it is shown on the Concept Diagram and Proposals Map, following the hedge / ditch line from High Ditch Road to Newmarket Road to the west of Airport Way roundabout. In this part of the site the boundary should cross Newmarket Road west of Airport Way roundabout and then run eastwards, following the south side of Newmarket Road. It should then run northwards following the eastern edge of a private garden at Quy Waters and a hedgerow running north to High Ditch Road, before turning west along the south side of High Ditch Road to meet the north-east corner of the proposed Cambridge East site shown on the Proposals Map.	<p>The proposed eastern boundary of the Green Belt running roughly north south between Newmarket Road and High Ditch Road follows a clear hedge and ditch line. The policy objective is to ensure that land is retained within the Green Belt which provides an appropriate setting for Cambridge as a compact historic city. When viewed from the east, Airport Way to the south of Newmarket Road provides a clear boundary to the edge of the development. This was recognised by the Panel at the Structure Plan EIP. In the AAP, the boundaries for the site of Cambridge East do not extend as far as Airport Way for much of its length in order to provide protection to Teversham village and also a transitional area between the Green Corridor and the wider countryside. It is not appropriate for the Green Belt boundary north of Newmarket Road to extend any further east than Airport Way, which would result in a small area of development protruding into the countryside to the detriment of the Green Belt and the setting of Cambridge.</p> <p>That said, the need for and alignment of any new link to the A14 is not determined, but it is envisaged that it is likely to link from the A14 to the Airport Way roundabout. The AAP acknowledges that if such a link is provided as part of the main Airport site coming forward, then the extent of the site and the Green Belt boundary may need to be reviewed and the road may provide an alternative clear boundary for the Green Belt. However, for this AAP, it is appropriate to define the boundary as in the draft AAP which follows a clearly defined feature on the ground close to, but not extending beyond, Airport Way.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>C2.5</i>				
8030 - The National Trust	Object	The opportunity to plan for compensatory areas of Green Belt should be taken now. This would help to provide an earlier opportunity to define landscape and biodiversity enhancement, and improvements to access, in the wider countryside.	The Councils are not convinced that there is a justification for compensatory extensions to the Green Belt in relation to Cambridge East and indeed the outer boundary of the Green Belt to the east of Cambridge lies outside of the administrative areas of both the City and South Cambs. However, the AAP does identify the importance of landscape and biodiversity improvements both within the site and in adjoining Green Belt areas and the need to provide access into the wider countryside as part of the development of Cambridge East.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11407 - The Marshall Group	Object	<p>Marshall objects to the requirement that the Green Corridor will have a minimum extent defined at this early stage. Stipulating such a minimum width is not based on design, is premature, unnecessary and restrictive to the masterplanning process. The width, shape and content of the Green Corridor should be led by good design and be based on analysis of the existing Green Corridors running through Cambridge. Existing spaces within the Green Corridors running through Cambridge are varied in width and articulated, ranging from 40m to more than 400m.</p> <p>Paragraph C2.5 should be deleted.</p>	<p>The Structure Plan requires that a green corridor is retained through from Teversham to Coldhams Common (Policy P9/2c) and that it is retained as Green Belt (Policy P9/2b). The AAP defines the new Green Belt boundaries around Cambridge East, following advice from GO-East at the Preferred Options stage that this is the appropriate approach. It is therefore necessary for the AAP to establish the boundaries of the Green Corridor at this stage. Para C2.5 recognises that there are no clear features on the ground to assist with the definition of the boundaries of the green Corridor and they are therefore policy led based on principles for the development as set out in the AAP.</p> <p>The Councils have set out their approach to the definition of the Green Corridor in the AAP (paras C2.6-C2.10), and remain of the view that the Corridor must have a substantial width if it is properly to fulfil its role of bringing the countryside into the heart of the city. There is certainly variation in the width of corridors in the rest of Cambridge, both wider and narrower than 300m, particularly as they get close to the heart of the city, much of which is historic accident rather than planned. The Councils consider that at Cambridge East, which is the outer part of the Green Corridor on the eastern side of the city, it is reasonable to set a minimum width of 300m for the corridor to reflect similar corridors in this part of the city eg Stourbridge Common and ensure that the purpose of the corridor is not undermined by encroachment from development on either side, including potential for pinch points which could undermine its purpose. The AAP acknowledges that it may be</p>	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Councils' Assessment

Change to Draft DPD

appropriate to review the detailed boundaries of the Green Corridor when the AAP is reviewed and the proposals for the development as a whole are further worked up (paras C1.5 and C2.5).

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Councils' Assessment

Change to Draft DPD

C2.7

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11408 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the requirement that the Green Corridor will have a minimum width of 300m. Stipulating such a minimum width is not based on design, is premature, unnecessary and restrictive to the masterplanning process. Paragraph C2.7 should be revised to say: 'It will be a significant area of land. Its shape will be defined by masterplanning. It will have an average width of approximately 300m increasing significantly as it opens up into a bell shape around Teversham end of the corridor to maintain the setting and individual identity of the village.'	<p>The Structure Plan requires that a green corridor is retained through from Teversham to Coldhams Common (Policy P9/2c) and that it is retained as Green Belt (Policy P9/2b). The AAP defines the new Green Belt boundaries around Cambridge East, following advice from GO-East at the Preferred Options stage that this is the appropriate approach. It is therefore necessary for the AAP to establish the boundaries of the Green Corridor at this stage. Para C2.5 recognises that there are no clear features on the ground to assist with the definition of the boundaries of the green Corridor and they are therefore policy led based on principles for the development as set out in the AAP.</p> <p>The Councils have set out their approach to the definition of the Green Corridor in the AAP (paras C2.6-C2.10), and remain of the view that the Corridor must have a substantial width if it is properly to fulfil its role of bringing the countryside into the heart of the city. There is certainly variation in the width of corridors in the rest of Cambridge, both wider and narrower than 300m, particularly as they get close to the heart of the city, much of which is historic accident rather than planned. The Councils consider that at Cambridge East, which is the outer part of the Green Corridor on the eastern side of the city, it is reasonable to set a minimum width of 300m for the corridor to reflect similar corridors in this part of the city eg Stourbridge Common and ensure that the purpose of the corridor is not undermined by encroachment from development on either side, including potential for pinch points which could undermine its purpose. The AAP acknowledges that it may be</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
			appropriate to review the detailed boundaries of the Green Corridor when the AAP is reviewed and the proposals for the development as a whole are further worked up (paras C1.5 and C2.5).	
<i>C2.8</i>				
11409 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall supports the principle that the Green Corridor will provide for informal recreation, but objects to the omission of playing fields, courts and equipped children's play areas.	Whilst sports pitches are uses normally acceptable in the Green Belt, in the context of a Green Corridor of limited width through a major urban extension, the emphasis should be on an open character, informal recreation, landscape treatment and on biodiversity and wildlife. Furthermore, it would not be appropriate for the Green Corridor to include buildings such as changing accommodation which would undermine its open character.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE/5 Landscaping the Setting of Cambridge East</i>				
8488 - English Heritage	Object	The importance of the evolution of the landscape, and any archaeological potential, should be highlighted in this policy. As stated above, a full appraisal of the historic character of the site is necessary, and this should be a requirement in this policy.	It is not considered that the landscape character of Cambridge East represents an historic landscape character that it would be appropriate, or indeed practicable, to seek to protect through the development. A major new urban quarter will inevitably change the open character of the Airport and the open character largely devoid of landscaping would not be appropriate for the development. Policies elsewhere in the AAP address archaeology (CE/22) and built heritage (CE/23) and the retention of any existing landscape features that are appropriate to the local landscape character (CE/16).	
8207 - The Marshall Group 11411 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is generally supportive of the policy, including points (a)(i). Marshall agrees that a Landscape Strategy for the countryside adjoining the built parts of Cambridge East should be submitted, approved and implemented to help deliver a quality landscape setting for Cambridge East. Marshall has already embarked on the preparation of such a strategy (see the Cambridge East Living Spaces report) and this strategy supports all of the requirements of Policy CE/5.	Support noted. The Living Spaces report will provide a useful context for discussion as Marshall develops its masterplan for the development.	
<i>e</i>				
8073 - The National Trust	Object	CE/5 e, f, g: Whilst supporting this policy, there is a need to include provision within the Strategy for linking to the Wicken Fen Vision area and defining landscape and biodiversity enhancements associated with the linkages.	Criterion e requires links between the urban quarter and the wider countryside, which will include the Wicken Fen vision. Connection of the green spaces of Cambridge East with the Wicken Fen Vision is specifically identified in the Development Principles policy CE/5(5) and it is not necessary to be referred to repeatedly.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>h</i> 10842 - Cambridgeshire County Council 10677 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The policy is generally supported, however, it is not considered that more formal provision such as playing fields is necessarily inappropriate within the green corridor where they can be accommodated without detracting from the landscape, biodiversity and informal recreation value of the corridor.	Support for landscape areas to contribute to informal recreation needs is noted. Whilst sports pitches are uses normally acceptable in the Green Belt, in the context of a Green Corridor of limited width through a major urban extension, the emphasis should be on an open character, informal recreation, landscape treatment and on biodiversity and wildlife. Furthermore, it would not be appropriate for the Green Corridor to include buildings such as changing accommodation which would undermine its open character.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE/6 Green Separation from Fen Ditton and Teversham</i>				
10844 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The policy is generally supported, however, it is not considered that more formal provision such as playing fields is necessarily inappropriate within the green corridor where they can be accommodated without detracting from the landscape, biodiversity and informal recreation value of the corridor.	Whilst sports pitches are uses normally acceptable in the Green Belt, in the context of an area of Green Separation between a major urban extension and an existing village of limited width, the emphasis should be on an open character, informal recreation, landscape treatment and on biodiversity and wildlife.	
11347 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd (Netherhall Farm)	Object	In order to ensure sufficient land is genuinely available in the Plan period, we propose that land at Netherhall Farm, Worts Causeway, be acknowledged as a housing land allocation in support of the major urban extensions.	The AAP proposes the extent of land to be released from the Green Belt for development. The Councils are not relying on land at Cambridge Airport to come forward for development by 2016. Early phases of development on land north of Newmarket Road and north of Cherry Hinton can come forward while the Airport is operational. Notwithstanding any specific issues relating to development at Netherhall Farm, there is no justification for identifying other land for residential development. If there were, this would be an issue for the Cambridge City Local Plan or South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy and not for the Cambridge East Area Action Plan.	
9802 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Support	Good to see understand the importance of separating Cambridge East from Teversham, Fen Ditton and Cherry Hinton and are considering the landscaping.	Support noted. Separation is proposed between Cambridge East and the villages of Fen Ditton and Teversham. Cherry Hinton forms part of the urban area of Cambridge and the AAP proposes that the new urban quarter is "integrated and linked sensitively into the urban fabric of eastern Cambridge to preserve existing residential amenity".	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11412 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports the proposed green separation between the villages of Teversham and Fen Ditton, and the built up area of Cambridge East. This separation is provided in the Preliminary Landscape Masterplan in the Living Spaces report. The 200m separation shown does not contain any 'urban uses such as playing fields, allotments or cemeteries' as it is recognised that the Green Separation should be rural in character to ensure that the villages remain in rural settings. The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages is one of the special qualities of Cambridge, as defined by LDA Design in the Cambridge Green Belt Study 2002, and in paragraph 4.3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy pre-submission public participation draft June 2002.	Support noted.	
9734 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Support	It is vital that the separation of Fen Ditton village from the development is maintained and the tree lines are enhanced to ensure this separation.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>I</i> 8209 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the reference to a minimum requirement of 200 metres of green separation for reasons similar to those which it made in relation to the width of the green corridor.	The principle of Green Separation from villages is established in the Structure Plan (Policy P9/2b) and must be defined in the AAP. There are no clear features on the ground to assist with the definition of Green Separation at Teversham and the proposed boundaries are defined having regard to the work that has been undertaken at Northstowe where a minimum of 200m was found to be required in order to provide an appropriate landscape treatment between the town and adjacent villages. This work is utilised at Cambridge East for the purposes of this AAP and identifying the land proposed to be released from the Green Belt. However the AAP makes clear that the final extent and treatment of Green Separation can be considered in more detail when the AAP is reviewed once detailed assessment of this part of the site and masterplanning of the site as a whole is further advanced but before any development commences.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9337 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	Taylor Woodrow Developments do not consider that the proposals provide sufficient separation. If this were to arise, a smaller net developable area would be available.	The principle of Green Separation from villages is established in the Structure Plan (Policy P9/2b) and must be defined in the AAP. There are no clear features on the ground to assist with the definition of Green Separation at Teversham and the proposed boundaries are defined having regard to the work that has been undertaken at Northstowe where a minimum of 200m was found to be required in order to provide an appropriate landscape treatment between the town and adjacent villages. This work is utilised at Cambridge East for the purposes of this AAP and identifying the land proposed to be released from the Green Belt. However the AAP makes clear that the final extent and treatment of Green Separation can be considered in more detail when the AAP is reviewed once detailed assessment of this part of the site and masterplanning of the site as a whole is further advanced but before any development commences.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8811 - RAVE	Object	A minimum separation of 200m is wholly inadequate to achieve the Green Belt function of prevention of coalescence.	The principle of Green Separation from villages is established in the Structure Plan (Policy P9/2b) and must be defined in the AAP. There are no clear features on the ground to assist with the definition of Green Separation at Teversham and the proposed boundaries are defined having regard to the work that has been undertaken at Northstowe where a minimum of 200m was found to be required in order to provide an appropriate landscape treatment between the town and adjacent villages. This work is utilised at Cambridge East for the purposes of this AAP and identifying the land proposed to be released from the Green Belt. However the AAP makes clear that the final extent and treatment of Green Separation can be considered in more detail when the AAP is reviewed once detailed assessment of this part of the site and masterplanning of the site as a whole is further advanced but before any development commences.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10360 - Teversham Parish Council	Object	Teversham Parish Council object to the stated minimum of 200m Green Separation between the village framework of Teversham and the built up area of Cambridge East. The Parish Council does not believe that this is adequate and it will not provide an effective and appropriate separation between the countryside and the new urban quarter of Cambridge City.	The principle of Green Separation from villages is established in the Structure Plan (Policy P9/2b) and must be defined in the AAP. There are no clear features on the ground to assist with the definition of Green Separation at Teversham and the proposed boundaries are defined having regard to the work that has been undertaken at Northstowe where is minimum of 200m was found to be required in order to provide an appropriate landscape treatment between the town and adjacent villages. This work is utilised at Cambridge East for the purposes of this AAP and identifying the land proposed to be released from the Green Belt. However the AAP makes clear that the final extent and treatment of Green Separation can be considered in more detail when the AAP is reviewed once detailed assessment of this part of the site and masterplanning of the site as a whole is further advanced but before any development commences.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8242 8240	Object	A 200 metre separation is inadequate. At least 500 metres is required. And it must not be 'Green Separation', it must remain in the Green Belt.	The principle of Green Separation from villages is established in the Structure Plan (Policy P9/2b) and must be defined in the AAP. There are no clear features on the ground to assist with the definition of Green Separation at Teversham and the proposed boundaries are defined having regard to the work that has been undertaken at Northstowe where a minimum of 200m was found to be required in order to provide an appropriate landscape treatment between the town and adjacent villages. This work is utilised at Cambridge East for the purposes of this AAP and identifying the land proposed to be released from the Green Belt. However the AAP makes clear that the final extent and treatment of Green Separation can be considered in more detail when the AAP is reviewed once masterplanning on the site as a whole is further advanced but before any development commences.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
2 8210 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the exclusion of playing fields, allotments or cemeteries, but particularly playing fields, from the green separation zones. Such uses will not compromise the perception of separation.	Whilst sports pitches, allotments and cemeteries are uses normally acceptable in the countryside, including the Green Belt, this is normally in the context of land immediately adjoining an urban area or village, where it forms an area of transition between built development and informal open countryside. In that context it is usually possible for an open but nonetheless semi urban character to be accommodated without harm to the character of the wider countryside or the setting of the built up area. In the context of an area of Green Separation of limited width between a major new urban extension and existing village communities, it is important to ensure that the Green Separation is able to provide an area of separation between two built up areas, which would be compromised by allowing open uses of a semi urban character. In the Green Separation an informal countryside character should be provided with an emphasis on landscape, biodiversity, wildlife and informal recreation.	
9184 - Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	Object	This should make it clear that the high degree of public access will include new public footpaths and bridleways.	The principle of a high degree of public access is established in this policy. Policy CE/14 requires a dedicated network of rights of way including cycle, pedestrian and horse riding routes connecting with various destinations, including surrounding villages. It is not necessary to duplicate this in Policy CE/6.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10365 - Teversham Parish Council	Support	Teversham Parish Council support a Green Separation which does not contain any associated urban uses such as playing fields, allotments or cemeteries. The Green Separation should form an effective and appropriate separation between Teversham village and the Cambridge East development.	Support noted.	
<i>C4.3</i>				
8241	Object	A 200 metre separation is inadequate. At least 500 metres is required.	Extending the separation between Cambridge East and Teversham from 200m to 500m is not considered appropriate or necessary in order to protect village character and identity, or to ensure that Cambridge will not merge with any of the surrounding villages, in the light of detailed work undertaken in relation to Northstowe. This demonstrated that it is the form of landscape treatment within the areas of separation that is particularly important to protect village character, rather than its physical extent, other than to ensure that there is physically space to create an appropriate form of landscape treatment.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>C4.4</i>				
11413 - The Marshall Group	Object	The first sentence of Paragraph C4.4 of the Draft Area Action Plan says 'The landscape character of the Green Separation (from Teversham) will be informal countryside as for the remainder of the Green Corridor...'. Marshall agrees that the landscape character of the Green Separation from Teversham should be informal countryside, but disagree that the character of the Green Corridor should be informal countryside. The sentence should be revised to say 'The landscape character of the Green Separation will be informal countryside because it is at the meeting of the City and the Countryside'.	The Councils consider that the appropriate character for the Green Corridor through the new urban quarter is that of informal countryside, recognising that it is at the outer part of the city and a key role is to bring the countryside into the city. The proposed rewording is therefore not consistent with the Councils' position.	
<i>C4.8</i>				
8055 - The National Trust	Object	Make reference to extending the tree belt to provide a link to the Wicken Fen Vision area. This would provide an opportunity to improve the landscape and biodiversity whilst enhancing access to an important strategic open space at the same time.	The AAP requires a landscape strategy to be prepared which will need to include consideration of appropriate landscaping both on and off site to integrate the development in to the wider countryside. The issue of links with the Wicken Fen Vision is established in the Development Principles policy and does not need to be repeated throughout the document. It is not the only important link beyond the site.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------

Chapter D THE URBAN QUARTER AT CAMBRIDGE EAST

CE/7 The Structure of Cambridge East

11096 - Environment Agency	Object	As with our objection to policy CE/2, any flood management or surface water drainage infrastructure must be considered on a strategic scale.	This requirement is agreed, although it would be better included in the Drainage chapter D12, in Policy CE/26 which deals with surface water drainage. As a consequence, it should also be included in the schedule of planning obligations in chapter E2.	Add the following to Policy CE/26 para 1: "... A strategic surface water drainage scheme will be required at an early stage for the Cambridge East area." Add to the table under para E2.7, at the row on Surface Water Drainage, as a new first point in the columns on Phase 1 and Cambridge East as a whole: "A strategic surface water drainage scheme will be required."
8202 - Prudential Assurance Company Limited	Support	The Prudential supports Policy CE/7 on the basis that the Prudential wishes to ensure that the proposed shops, services, cultural, leisure and community facilities that are to be provided within the new District Centre serve the needs of Cambridge East and the immediately surrounding area only, and that they will complement and not undermine the vitality and viability of, or compete with, Cambridge City Centre. However, such an interpretation of Policy CE/7 potentially conflicts with paragraphs D1.5 and D2.5.	Support noted. The primary role of the District Centre will be to serve Cambridge East and the immediately surrounding area. It is intended that uses would not be permitted which could compete with the City Centre. However, the constrained City Centre has limited opportunities for some new uses to locate and, subject to the sequential test, there may be a case for them to locate at Cambridge East as the next largest centre in Cambridge so long as this complements the City Centre and does not compete with it. This would have the benefit both of enabling new facilities to locate in Cambridge for the benefit of all residents and also to help support a vibrant district centre in the new urban quarter.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>12</i>				
9159 - Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum 7946	Support	Support the provision of a high quality, highly accessible network of footpaths, bridleways and cycleways.	Support noted.	
<i>13</i>				
10859 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Cambridgeshire County Council strongly supports improved access to the A14 for both the developments at Northstowe and Cambridge East. The County Structure Plan requires that there should be a new access to the A14 as part of the infrastructure requirements to support Cambridge East. Initial assessment has suggested that this should be provided through a new interchange in the vicinity of Honey Hill. The Highways Agency would not welcome additional junctions on the A14, a new junction at Honey Hill would therefore require closure of Fen Ditton interchange. Given the proximity of the Quy junction the replacement junction would only be able to accommodate west-facing slip roads. Measures would be required to prevent 'rat running' through Fen Ditton using High Ditch Road.	Support noted. Work is currently in progress on the preparation of a Long Term Transport Strategy for Cambridgeshire which will look at the issue of whether a new/replacement link to the A14 is required to serve this development. The LTTS is due to report towards the end of November. If a clear position on this key infrastructure issue is available before the Councils meet in December to approve the plan for submission, an amendment could be made to the AAP. If not, the AAP includes an appropriate policy context to ensure that a new link is provided if more detailed transport strategy work on Cambridge East determines it is needed.	
<i>14</i>				
10850 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The policy is generally supported, however, it is not considered that more formal provision such as playing fields is necessarily inappropriate within the green corridor where they can be accommodated without detracting from the landscape, biodiversity and informal recreation value of the corridor.	General support is noted. Whilst sports pitches are uses normally acceptable in the Green Belt, in the context of a Green Corridor of limited width through a major urban extension, the emphasis should be on an open character, informal recreation, landscape treatment and on biodiversity and wildlife.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>18</i>				
8489 - English Heritage	Support	Policy CE/7 We welcome point 18.	Support noted.	
<i>D1.5</i>				
8208 - Prudential Assurance Company Limited	Object	The Prudential objects to the wording contained within Paragraphs D1.5 and D2.5 on the basis that there are alternative and suitable City Centre sites available for the development of City Centre uses. Any development at the District Centre should be restricted to development which serves the needs of the Centre and its immediate catchment only.	The AAP recognises the constrained nature of the historic centre of Cambridge which means there are limited opportunities for some larger new facilities to locate in Cambridge, and seeks to maximise the potential at Cambridge East to facilitate those facilities to come to Cambridge, and at the same time help to create a vibrant district centre. It is crucial to ensure that any proposed higher order uses can be accommodated at Cambridge East in a way that would complement and not detract from the City Centre. As such, any proposals would need to demonstrate that they meet the sequential test. Cambridge East will be a major new urban quarter to Cambridge and will have the second largest centre in the city. The challenge is to provide for a vibrant district centre to serve the needs of the local community without undermining the city centre. It would help to clarify the purpose behind the policy if the AAP included a requirement for uses to demonstrate their suitability having regard to the sequential tests set out in PPS6.	Add the following to the end of Policy CE/8 paragraph 2: "...having regard to the sequential test."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D2/c</i>				
8212 - Prudential Assurance Company Limited	Support	The Prudential supports Policy CE/7 and Objectives D2/c and D2/d on the basis that the Prudential wishes to ensure that the proposed shops, services, cultural, leisure and community facilities that are to be provided within the new District Centre serve the needs of Cambridge East and the immediately surrounding area only, and that they will complement and not undermine the vitality and viability of, or compete with, Cambridge City Centre.	Support noted.	
<i>D2/d</i>				
8216 - Prudential Assurance Company Limited	Support	The Prudential supports Policy CE/7 and Objectives D2/c and D2/d on the basis that the Prudential wishes to ensure that the proposed shops, services, cultural, leisure and community facilities that are to be provided within the new District Centre serve the needs of Cambridge East and the immediately surrounding area only, and that they will complement and not undermine the vitality and viability of, or compete with, Cambridge City Centre. The Prudential supports D2/d subject to the provisions outlined in paragraph D2.6.	Support noted.	
<i>D2/e</i>				
8213 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to this constraint. Retailing is a dynamic function, being notable for its ability to change to deliver its service by new means. Development of the centre is some years away and to seek to impose this restriction is unnecessarily prescriptive.	It is appropriate and reasonable that the AAP includes the objective that individual uses should not come forward that could threaten the development of a vibrant district centre overall. This is an objective and the AAP does not set any specific tests or thresholds for such uses, which would not be appropriate at this stage.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE/8 The District Centre</i>				
8211 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the designation of the principal focus of the urban quarter as a district centre, as opposed to a town centre. The centre which will be planned and emerge for Cambridge East will be more akin to a town centre as opposed to a district centre.	The centre at Cambridge East will be a significant retail and service provider for the new urban quarter at Cambridge East. It will serve a population greater than that at the new town of Northstowe. However, it will be the second centre in the hierarchy within the urban area of Cambridge and should not be of such a scale or include uses which would compete with the City Centre in terms of that hierarchy. In practice it is likely to fall somewhere between a town and district centre as defined in PPS6. It is agreed that the term district centre should be qualified in order to make this clear. The Cambridge Local Plan Redeposit Draft 2004 uses the term "large district centre" for Cambridge East and this term should be used in the AAP for consistency. It does not need to be used in every case where the term district centre is currently used, but would be helpful in certain key circumstances to make clear the scale of centre envisaged.	Replace the term "district centre" with "large district centre" in the following cases: Policy CE/2(22) Policy CE/7(2) Para D1.2, 1st sentence Objectives D2/a and D2/c Policy CE/8(1) and (2) Para D2.1, 1st sentence

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9398 - GO-East	Object	The use of the term 'district centre' should be qualified as this may be misleading in relation to the generally understood nature of such a centre as described in PPS6 and what may actually be required to serve as the main centre for Cambridge East.	The centre at Cambridge East will be a significant retail and service provider for the new urban quarter at Cambridge East. It will serve a population greater than that at the new town of Northstowe. However, it will be the second centre in the hierarchy within the urban area of Cambridge and should not be of such a scale or include uses which would compete with the City Centre in terms of that hierarchy. In practice it is likely to fall somewhere between a town and district centre as defined in PPS6. It is agreed that the term district centre should be qualified in order to make this clear. The Cambridge Local Plan Redeposit Draft 2004 uses the term "large district centre" for Cambridge East and this term should be used in the AAP for consistency. It does not need to be used in every case where the term district centre is currently used, but would be helpful in certain key circumstances to make clear the scale of centre envisaged.	Replace the term "district centre" with "large district centre" in the following cases: Policy CE/2(22) Policy CE/7(2) Para D1.2, 1st sentence. Objectives D2/a and D2/c Policy CE/8(1) and (2) Para D2.1, 1st sentence
2				
9689 - Sainsbury's Supermarkets Limited	Object	An objection is submitted to the reference to a food supermarket being provided as part of the proposed district centre, as the existing Sainsbury's store at Coldham Lane is well located to service the area and currently fulfills a district centre function and will serve as a district centre for the residents of the East area. The Council should encourage Sainsbury's to extend their existing store. The proposed district centre within the East area is not required and should be deleted.	A development of the scale of Cambridge East will require its own large District Centre which will include a wide range of convenience and comparison shopping along with other supporting uses such as pubs, restaurants and cafis and supporting services and facilities, including community and leisure facilities. It needs to be conveniently located to serve the new urban quarter by car, public transport, cycle and foot. It is not considered that the existing Sainsbury store is well located to serve that function and it is unlikely that it could physically extend in a satisfactory way to serve a new population of 24,000 to 29,000 people.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D2.5</i> 8217 - Prudential Assurance Company Limited	Object	The Prudential objects to the wording contained within Paragraphs D1.5 and D2.5 on the basis that there are alternative and suitable City Centre sites available for the development of City Centre uses. Any development at the District Centre should be restricted to development which serves the needs of the Centre and its immediate catchment only.	The AAP recognises the constrained nature of the historic centre of Cambridge which means there are limited opportunities for some larger new facilities to locate in Cambridge, and seeks to maximise the potential at Cambridge East to facilitate those facilities to come to Cambridge, and at the same time help to create a vibrant district centre. It is crucial to ensure that any proposed higher order uses can be accommodated at Cambridge East in a way that would complement and not detract from the City Centre. As such, any proposals would need to demonstrate that they meet the sequential test. Cambridge East will be a major new urban quarter to Cambridge and will have the second largest centre in the city. The challenge is to provide for a vibrant district centre to serve the needs of the local community without undermining the city centre. It would help to clarify the purpose behind the policy if the AAP included a requirement for uses to demonstrate their suitability having regard to the sequential tests set out in PPS6.	Add the following to the end of Policy CE/8 paragraph 2: "...having regard to the sequential test."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D2.6</i>				
8218 - Prudential Assurance Company Limited	Support	Paragraph D2.6 makes provision for assessments to be carried out to establish how much shopping floor area should be located in the District Centre and the types and mix of uses which will help to secure a successful and vibrant centre. The Prudential supports this approach as it is essential to ensure that the retail provision in the District Centre is appropriate to the scale of the Centre and does not undermine opportunities for the development of uses which are more appropriately located within the City Centre itself.	Support noted.	
<i>D2.8</i>				
11239 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	In order to make the most effective use of the land the Area Action Plan should indicate the expectation that car parking areas should be shared between uses, particularly those where demand is focussed in relatively short time periods.	<p>(a) The Core Strategy encourages the exploration of opportunities for reduced levels of car parking in locations close to facilities and services, and for car pooling and shared use of parking, for example, on mixed-use sites, particularly where mix of day / night uses. (para D7.29).</p> <p>(b) This representation relates to the district centre which will be a mixed-use site. For mixed-use sites it is possible that reduced levels of parking which could be then be shared would be feasible, especially if certain uses will be open at different times / demand is likely to be phased rather than concentrated.</p>	Amend paragraph D2.8 by inserting a new second sentence to read: "Opportunities for shared use of car parking in the District Centre should be explored with applicants for planning permission for buildings and uses which include proposals for car parking."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D2.10</i>				
8059 - The National Trust	Object	Include reference to the provision already being made by Sustrans for improved cycle access to Fen Ditton. This provision could be utilised to extend the cycle and footpath network as proposed.	It is not necessary to refer to specific existing routes in this context, which is establishing the principle of ensuring links are available. The transport chapter looks specifically at cycle routes that exist or may be required.	
<i>D2.11</i>				
8220 - Prudential Assurance Company Limited	Support	Paragraph D2.11 recognises that the District Centre should not be so large that it threatens the viability of other centres, including the City Centre. However the Prudential objects to that part of paragraph D2.11 which states that '...it is inevitable that some changes elsewhere will occur...' The paragraph should be amended to make it absolutely clear that any such changes should not undermine the vitality and viability of the City Centre and in particular that the District Centre should not result in adverse changes, to the retail offer within the City Centre.	Support noted. In relation to the comment that some changes will occur elsewhere, it would help to clarify that this is most likely to be in the smaller centres, rather than the City Centre where the key objective is to ensure its vitality and viability is not undermined by the large district centre at Cambridge East.	Add the following to the end of the 1st sentence in para D2.11: "..., particularly in smaller centres."
<i>3</i>				
11240 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recognition that the secondary school should be located at a local centre rather than the District centre is welcomed.	Support noted.	
<i>D3.5</i>				
8214 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall does not accept that the location of the secondary school in the highest order centre would lead to increased truancy. In such a location, the school would enhance the functional focus of the centre.	The County Council as education authority has confirmed its position that it wishes the secondary school to be located at a local centre rather than the district centre which it considers will provide a more appropriate environment for pupils at lunchtimes and before and after school.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D3.11</i>				
7960 - Care and Education Partnership	Object	While welcoming the provision for pre- and post-school activities and a nursery, I think there is not enough provision for community facilities for childcare, eg after-school clubs, community playgroups, childminding networks, community day nursery, parent/toddler groups. There should be adequate buildings available for these groups in every Local Centre. It is usually lack of premises which deters the creation of such groups. The Sure Start document Building for Sure Start - integrated provision for under-fives is an excellent reference.	<p>It is anticipated that each local centre will include a primary school, along with community space to allow for uses such as pre-school, breakfast clubs, after school clubs and holiday clubs as well as facilities for children's services and health care. In addition, the co-location of facilities with other service providers will also be explored.</p> <p>Further to the provision of services and facilities provision will be required for professional community development workers in order to help establish a vibrant and sustainable community. Early and ongoing development work can help establish a strong feeling of community ownership of facilities and community space.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D4/a</i>				
10919 - House Builders Federation	Object	The objective refers to the need to meet the requirements of Policy P9/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan. It would seem more appropriate to now refer to the dwelling requirement between 2001-2021 in the East of England Plan, which may be adopted by the time the Development Plan Enquiry ends. Furthermore, the Government's proposed changes to PPG3 (July 2005) now advocate provision for 15 years housing land supply in Development Plans.	(a) The Government is still considering the proposed changes to PPG3 "Housing" extending plan horizons from 10 years to 15 years with a proposed requirement that the first 5 years is allocated and developable. However, at the present time the requirement in PPG3 "Housing" is for a plan horizon of 10 years. (b) RSS14 is still in the course of preparation and is not forecast to be adopted until some considerable time after the submission of the LDF to the Secretary of State. (c) The Core Strategy and Area Action Plans, together with a continuation of historic windfall rates of development are sufficient to meet the housing requirements of Draft RSS14 up to 2021. (d) Given that RSS14 could still be changed, casing the LDF on the Draft could result in delaying adoption of the LDF. (e) Any changes to the strategy that are required once RSS14 has been finalised and adopted can best be accommodated by a review of the Core Strategy once it has been adopted.	No Change.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE/10 Cambridge East Housing</i>				
9502 - Fairview New Homes	Object	The AAP states that the Council will seek affordable housing on all sites. This is unjustified as guidance in Circular 6/98 states that the threshold for developments on which affordable housing can be sought should be housing developments of 25 or more dwellings or residential sites of 1 hectare or more (unless the specific area is in inner London or in settlements in rural areas with a population of 3,000 or fewer) (Paragraph 10a). The Circular goes on to state that it may be appropriate for local authorities to seek to adopt a lower threshold, but that exceptional local constraints on the provision of affordable housing must be demonstrated. It has not however been demonstrated that affordable housing should be provided on all sites. As such, Fairview object to this requirement and consider that a site threshold should be set on which affordable housing will be sought on individual sites within the Cambridge East area, which accords with Circular 6/98.	The AAP deals specifically with affordable housing provision as part of the Cambridge East development. This major development will make a key contribution to meeting the housing needs of the Cambridge area. The development as a whole, including individual phases, will be required to provide affordable housing.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10930 - House Builders Federation	Object	<p>The suggested threshold exceeds the requirements of the Structure Plan and the East of England Plan. It is not evident if the Council has considered the viability of individual developments as required by Government guidance and whether developers will be able to provide the affordable housing without recourse to public subsidy. There appears to be no sound reason why the Council should not assess the affordable housing requirement at the outline application stage. The HBF considers that the affordable housing requirements set out in policy CE/10 seriously undermines the soundness of the Plan as it threatens the deliverability of the Council's overall housing requirement.</p>	<p>Whilst there is no threshold specifically identified in the AAP, the site will accommodate 10-12,000 homes and is clearly well in excess of any threshold. The issue of development viability is extremely complex, particularly at the early stages in planning a development, especially one as large as Cambridge East. There are many calls on the development, many of which are not fully identified at this stage, although the schedule in the planning obligations section seeks to be as comprehensive as possible. Even if all the costs of all the other obligations were known, within the area of affordable housing much depends on the mix of tenures and methods of provision. With so many variables and unknowns, it is not reasonable to expect the local planning authority to be able to provide evidence of the viability at this stage of any particular level of affordable housing provision at Cambridge East, be it 50% or any other target higher or lower. The appropriate approach is for the AAP to identify a policy target, based on demonstrated levels of need and having regard to the character of the area and the nature of the urban quarter to be created. The actual level of affordable housing secured as part of planning permissions will be determined at the time of an application having regard to detailed assessments of all the calls on the development and in negotiation with the developer who will have the opportunity to demonstrate in the light of their own detailed financial assessments of their proposals whether the policy target is achievable or not. The wording of Policy CE/10(5) specifically says that the amount of affordable housing that will be "sought" (and not required) will be "approximately 50%" in order to provide some flexibility. It also</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
			includes provision to take account of costs associated with the development and whether any other planning objectives should be given priority in determining the final S106 package. The AAP seeks to strike a balance between need and what is reasonable and realistic to seek in policy terms. It is important to provide a guide to developers of the approximate target that the LPA's will seek as part of any planning permissions. However, the policy also provides flexibility for the actual level of provision to be determined at the application stage when the issue of viability can be properly assessed.	
9388 - GO-East	Object	The AAP should include a housing trajectory to demonstrate how the plan's housing requirements will be delivered, in accordance with PPS12 (paragraph 4.25).	Agreed. This will be included in a new chapter in Part E on Delivering Cambridge East.	Include new chapter in Part E: Delivering Cambridge East to include a housing trajectory for the development.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9387 - GO-East	Object	Clear evidence should be provided of the viability of seeking this amount of affordable housing proposed to demonstrate that what is sought is realistic and achievable.	The issue of development viability is extremely complex, particularly at the early stages in planning a development, especially one as large as Cambridge East. There are many calls on the development, many of which are not fully identified at this stage, although the schedule in the planning obligations section seeks to be as comprehensive as possible. Even if all the costs of all the other obligations were known, within the area of affordable housing much depends on the mix of tenures and methods of provision. With so many variables and unknowns, it is not reasonable to expect the local planning authority to be able to provide evidence of the viability at this stage of any particular level of affordable housing provision at Cambridge East, be it 50% or any other target higher or lower. The appropriate approach is for the AAP to identify a policy target, based on demonstrated levels of need and having regard to the character of the area and the nature of the urban quarter to be created. The actual level of affordable housing secured as part of planning permissions will be determined at the time of an application having regard to detailed assessments of all the calls on the development and in negotiation with the developer who will have the opportunity to demonstrate in the light of their own detailed financial assessments of their proposals whether the policy target is achievable or not. The wording of Policy CE/10(5) specifically says that the amount of affordable housing that will be "sought" (and not required) will be "approximately 50%" in order to provide some flexibility. It also includes provision to take account of costs associated with the development and whether any other planning objectives should be given priority in	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10921 - House Builders Federation	Object	The policy relates to housing supply up to 2016. It would seem more appropriate to now refer to the dwelling requirement between 2001-2021 in the East of England Plan, which may be adopted by the time the Development Plan Enquiry ends. Furthermore, the Government's proposed changes to PPG3 (July 2005) now advocate provision for 15 years housing land supply in Development Plans.	<p>determining the final S106 package. This is a practical policy approach to a difficult issue. In the Cambridge area, both Cambridge City and South Cambs, house prices are such in relation to income that many people are not able to access the housing market. Both Councils' Housing Needs Surveys demonstrated that a target well above 50% could be sought in needs terms. The AAP seeks to strike a balance between need and what is reasonable and realistic to seek in policy terms and provide flexibility for the actual level of provision to be determined at the application stage when the issue of viability can be properly assessed.</p> <p>(a) The Government is still considering the proposed changes to PPG3 "Housing" extending plan horizons from 10 years to 15 years with a proposed requirement that the first 5 years is allocated and developable. However, at the present time the requirement in PPG3 "Housing" is for a plan horizon of 10 years. (b) RSS14 is still in the course of preparation and is not forecast to be adopted until some considerable time after the submission of the LDF to the Secretary of State. (c) The Core Strategy and Area Action Plans, together with a continuation of historic windfall rates of development are sufficient to meet the housing requirements of Draft RSS14 up to 2021. (d) Given that RSS14 could still be changed, casing the LDF on the Draft could result in delaying adoption of the LDF. (e) Any changes to the strategy that are required once RSS14 has been finalised and adopted can best be accommodated by a review of the Core Strategy once it has been adopted.</p>	No change.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>I</i> 8815 - RAVE	Object	As already noted, this projected yield for Cambridge East appears to reflect the desired number which the LPA wish to place on the site rather than being the result of a principled review of the Green Belt function of the site determining the land which may be available for development	The principle of a major new urban extension is established in the Structure Plan. However, the AAP has approached the definition of the site and the Green Belt boundary based on ensuring that land is retained in the Green Belt which is necessary to perform the functions of the Cambridge Green Belt as set out in Structure Plan Policy P9/2b. The Structure Plan also sets the framework for a high density development. The AAP has considered what appropriate densities would be and sets both a minimum density and an aspirational density, subject to a design led approach. It is having regard to these factors that the indicative dwelling range has been identified.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
3 8215 - The Marshall Group	Object	There is a need to specify the lowest acceptable density as a guide to inform further thinking on urban form. Marshall suggests that the average density across the urban quarter should be 75 dwellings per hectare, with no phase achieving less than 50 dwellings per hectare.	The AAP provides guidance on minimum density but expresses this as applying across the development as a whole, rather than to each phase as suggested. It is reasonable on this basis to take 50dph as a starting point for each phase of development, but in view of the range in character areas there will be across the new urban quarter, including more sensitive locations on the edge of the development, and the uncertainty at this time on the nature, size and position of possible smaller phases of development, it is not considered appropriate to tie this down to the degree suggested and a design led approach should be followed. There is no reason why Marshall as landowner could not take a minimum density approach for its own project development if it feels it appropriate.	
10925 - House Builders Federation	Object	The HBF would question how realistically achievable such densities are.	The Structure Plan gives a clear steer that Cambridge East will be a high density development. The AAP includes an aspirational target for density but also a minimum average density in order to provide flexibility and a design led approach is required. The landowner is supporting the higher aspirational densities which is informed by emerging masterplanning.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8821 - RAVE	Object	It is very hard to see how such a high average density can be reconciled with the requirement to deliver a "high quality development".	There is no reason why high densities and high quality development should not be compatible. Many well loved areas of very high design quality are at a high density, e.g. parts of central Cambridge. It is important that the development follows a design led approach to ensure high quality is integral to design and function. The AAP requires a Strategic Design Guide for the whole development and local Design Guides and Design Codes for individual phases to ensure this is achieved.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
5 8219 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the imposition of the District-wide policy of 50% of affordable housing at Cambridge East, where a major element will be socially rented, because - (1) It will produce a social structure unlike that in any other similar development. (2) There is no certainty over the long-term source of funding available for such affordable housing. (3) As well as funding a wide range of functions and facilities to serve Cambridge East, e.g. schools, recreation, etc. Marshall will also have to fund the relocation of Marshall Aerospace. Affordable housing should therefore be 30%.	Cambridge East is a key part of the development strategy for the Cambridge area and the delivery of affordable homes is also a fundamental part of the strategy. It is appropriate for affordable housing provision to be at the district wide level unless there are clear reasons why this should not be the case. Cambridge Policy CE/10(5) includes a target of approximately 50% affordable housing which will be sought through any planning permission. It is not a fixed requirement. The policy states that account will be taken of costs associated with the development and whether there are other planning objectives which should be given priority. This will enable viability of the development as a whole to be taken into account in the planning application process, at which time all requirements of the development and costs will be better understood. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that 50% affordable housing is not achievable at Cambridge East, or indeed that 30% would be an appropriate alternative. The AAP policy provides a reasonable, robust and yet flexible policy approach. The objective is to secure maximum affordable housing provision that is consistent with securing a balanced and sustainable community. The danger is that in an area of high house prices, if there is not a significant level of affordable housing, including intermediate tenures, that the social structure created would be much more polarised than in other urban areas of this scale, with a significant proportion of the community effectively excluded from it. This includes a development that can be efficiently and effectively delivered.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8830 - RAVE	Object	Although the proportion of affordable housing of 50% may be socially desirable, the heavy levels of planning obligations which will need to be carried by the market priced proportion will result in severe difficulties in creating an integrated development.	Policy CE/10(5) states that account will be taken of costs associated with the development and whether there are other planning objectives which should be given priority. This will enable viability of the development as a whole to be taken into account in the planning application process, at which time all requirements of the development and costs will be better understood. The objective is to secure maximum affordable housing provision that is consistent with securing a balanced and sustainable community. This includes a development that can be efficiently and effectively delivered.	
9504 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Fairview object to the requirement for the provision of approximately 50% affordable housing on the grounds that the percentage of affordable housing is too high. This would make the development of sites potentially unviable and therefore such an approach could reduce the level of housing being developed. Policy P9/2 of the Structure Plan states that 40% or more of the new housing in the Sub-Region should be affordable. Given the large level of infrastructure necessary to enable the delivery of development in the Cambridge East area, the level of affordable housing should be set at approximately 40% so that development is not stifled due to the high proportion of affordable housing affecting the viability of new development. There should also be scope included in the policy to consider the particular merits of each case.	Policy CE/10(5) includes a target of approximately 50% affordable housing which will be sought through any planning permission. It is not a fixed requirement. The policy states that account will be taken of costs associated with the development and whether there are other planning objectives which should be given priority. This will enable viability of the development as a whole to be taken into account in the planning application process, at which time all requirements of the development and costs will be better understood. The objective is to secure maximum affordable housing provision that is consistent with securing a balanced and sustainable community. This includes a development that can be efficiently and effectively delivered.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>6</i>				
8245 - The Marshall Group	Object	It is not possible to ensure that 'adequate housing will be limited to people in housing need and must be available in the long-term'. Changes in legislation are extending the right to buy, which may prevent achieving the housing's long-term availability.	The principle is to secure affordable housing that will be available in the long term through the type of tenancy to be offered for rented accommodation and the period of the lease on any shared ownership/shared equity housing. The fact that social housing tenants and leaseholders could subsequently acquire their homes does not conflict with the policy objective and in any case the proceeds from the disposal of any affordable housing units would need to be reinvested in affordable housing so the long term benefit is not lost.	
<i>7</i>				
8246 - The Marshall Group	Object	At the level of 50% provision, it is not possible to pepper-pot affordable housing in small groups or clusters.	The phrase "pepper potting" has deliberately not been used in the context of a development of the scale of Cambridge East or given the 50% target for affordable housing. However, it is appropriate to seek a distribution of different types and tenures of affordable housing through the development as a whole in small groups or clusters.	
<i>10</i>				
8247 - The Marshall Group	Object	The last sentence should be omitted to keep open the possibility of contributing to off-site provision.	It is not appropriate to provide for off-site provision of affordable housing in the context of a major new urban quarter. There is no reason why provision should not be made on site in full where it will help to provide a balanced community and meet local needs.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D4.2</i>				
8571	Object	The density is too high, and is unsuitable for families.	The Structure Plan gives a clear steer that Cambridge East will be a high density development. The AAP includes an aspirational target for density but also a minimum average density in order to provide flexibility and a designed approach is required. A mix in the type of housing provided at Cambridge East, to include family housing, is required by Policy CE/10(4).	
<i>D4.5</i>				
8576	Object	What defines high-quality housing? This statement is not sufficiently well-defined.	High quality housing will encompass many aspects which are addressed in various policies throughout the AAP from the physical appearance, to energy efficiency, to the surrounding environment and provision of open space, landscaping, pedestrian and cycle routes, etc. The strategic and local Design Guides required by the AAP to accompany any planning applications will need to pull together all these aspects of design to ensure that overall a high quality development is achieved. The importance of these Design Guides to achieving high quality housing could helpfully be highlighted in the reasoned justification.	Revise last sentence of paragraph D4.5 to read: "A high quality of design in both the buildings and the wider environment will be required, and the package of supplementary guidance that will be required, IN PARTICULAR THE STRATEGIC DESIGN GUIDE AND LOCAL DESIGN GUIDES AND DESIGN CODES, will be a key tool in ensuring that high quality is delivered on the ground."
9741 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Support	The highest level of design and construction should be achieved for the North Works development to set a standard for the rest of the Cambridge East proposed developments.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D4.7</i>				
8580	Object	There is no mention of homes for families, yet there is an expectation that there will be enough families in the development to warrant a new secondary school!	The provision of housing for families will be addressed through providing a variety of house types and is specifically required by Policy CE/10(4). It could be added to paragraph D4.6 for completeness. Paragraph D4.7 specifically identifies certain specific groups which can get overlooked by the market, to highlight the importance of taking account of their needs too.	Add the following to the end of the 3rd sentence of paragraph D4.6: ".... suitable for families."
<i>D4.8</i>				
8248 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the proposal to provide a site for travellers at Cambridge East. Widespread experience indicates that such sites are incapable of being absorbed in a high density urban quarter.	The AAP includes no specific proposal for travellers. It includes a cross reference to the proposed South Cambridgeshire Travellers DPD which will develop a strategy for provision in the district, including proposing specific sites as appropriate. This will be separate from, but take account of, all the other documents within the South Cambs LDF, including the Cambridge East AAP.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D4.11</i>				
8583	Object	This statement makes no requirement on the number of homes with more than two bedrooms. Merely requiring a "balanced mix" leaves too much scope for convenient interpretation at a later date.	The high density nature of the development as set out in the policy will influence the level of provision of smaller homes. Whilst the market has not made significant provision for smaller homes in South Cambs, leading to specific targets being included in the Development Control Policies DPD, this trend has not been seen in Cambridge City where the proportion of smaller homes in new development over the last 10-15 years has been quite high. In the context of an urban extension to Cambridge it is not considered necessary to prescribe any particular dwelling mix beyond the requirement for a range of house types in Policy CE/10(4).	
<i>D4.20</i>				
8249 - The Marshall Group	Object	The mix of affordable housing should take account of the volume of affordable housing in the adjacent wards of Abbey and Romsey. This would suggest a lowering of the percentage of social rented housing.	The AAP gives an indicative tenure mix for Cambridge East as a whole to assist developers in the proposition of proposals. The appropriate tenure mix in different phases of development is likely to vary depending on adjoining development, particularly where it adjoins existing parts of Cambridge and is a matter for more detailed consideration in the context of individual planning applications.	
11241 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support policy CE/10 for affordable housing but subject to the requirement that the overall viability of the development is taken into account.	Support noted. The policy ensures that viability will be taken into account in determining planning applications.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D4.22</i>				
9189 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Object	This paragraph describes the pressure that new employment development creates for additional affordable housing. The document should recognise that healthcare developments are responding to increases in the population, not generating population increases.	Structure Plan Policy P9/1 requires employment uses to contribute towards affordable housing through developer contributions and no exceptions are provided for health care facilities. Addenbrooke's is the chief generator of key worker housing demand within Cambridge and it is essential that it continues to play its part in facilitating housing provision for its own staff. Policy CE/10(9) specifically provides that where key worker employers are providing or contributing towards the provision of key worker housing that this will satisfy the affordable housing requirement of the policy. This approach is consistent with the Redeposit Draft Cambridge Local Plan.	
<i>D4.25</i>				
8250 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall welcomes this policy, which introduces flexibility in the actual delivery of built affordable homes.	Support noted.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Councils' Assessment

Change to Draft DPD

D5/a

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10909 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>The adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan (Policy WLP18) identifies all major development areas as preferred sites for a major waste management facility. There is an urgent need to find sites for the proposed provision in WLP; the ODPM has made clear that where site specific allocations are not made in the WLP it would be appropriate to provide sites by securing allocations of employment land within new development areas. Phase 1 is a preferred location for a major waste management facility e.g. a materials recovery facility. There is also provision in the WLP for a Household Waste Recycling Centre to be accommodated within Cambridge East. It would be sensible for this to be co-located with the major waste management facility and provision for employment land should take this into account.</p>	<p>The adopted Waste Local Plan identifies all major developments as preferred locations for major waste management facilities but does not identify specific sites. The County Council has begun the preparation of a Waste and Minerals LDF and the issues and options report raised fundamental questions about whether the major development were appropriate locations for waste facilities. It is not know at this time what approach will be proposed in the emerging Waste LDF.</p> <p>There may be some major developments where it is appropriate to propose general employment areas as part of the proper planning of an area, eg. Northstowe, where such an area is proposed in order to provide a local range of employment for this entirely new settlement. In appropriate circumstances, this approach may provide an opportunity for waste facilities to secure a suitable site in open competition with other employment uses, but it is not an allocation for a waste facility, which ODPM has confirmed cannot be made in a District LDF document.</p> <p>In the case of Cambridge East, which is an urban extension to Cambridge, there are no proposals for a general employment area. Policy CE/11 provides for small scale industries in use classes B1(c), B2 and B8 (up to 1,850m) which contribute to a greater range of local employment opportunities, particularly if they contribute to the development of locally-based skills or expertise. It is not considered that a major waste management facility falls into this definition. The policy also requires that the nature and form of employment provision reflects the high density character of the urban</p>	

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******Councils' Assessment******Change to Draft DPD***

quarter and that it is located at the district centre as part of mixed use development or at local centres comprising small-scale employment. None of these requirements, which are consistent with the Structure Plan, would encompass a major waste management facility. Whilst it is recognised that modern waste management facilities are very different from older operations, they nonetheless involve significant levels of heavy traffic and have some issues of noise, dust, and odours and in principle are not good neighbours to be placed in close proximity to residential uses.

Looking specifically at Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road, the AAP identifies the considerable challenge that exists in creating a satisfactory residential neighbourhood ahead of the wider development and specifically adjoining the North Works site, and the relocation of some existing employment uses will be important to help provide a suitable residential environment. It is not appropriate to propose a general employment area in Phase 1. Turning specifically to a waste facility in this location. It would not be appropriate to locate a major waste management facility or a household waste recycling centre in Phase 1. It would significantly undermine the ability to create a successful residential area. This relates both to the nature and scale of the use and the type and level of traffic generation that would be created into an area with a single traffic access.

It appears that this objection is very much opportunity led in view of the County Council's concern that there is an urgent need for a facility, rather than the good planning of this major new

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
			urban quarter. There is no suggestion that Cambridge East requires a general employment area and it appears that the proposal to include one is specifically in order to bring forward a waste facility: in effect a waste allocation by another name. This is not appropriate. Achieving a high quality neighbourhood will be crucial to achieving a successful new development in the longer term and this proposal would seriously damage the ability for this to be achieved. The appropriate mechanism to explore whether there may be potential in Cambridge East as a whole for a major waste management facility is through the emerging Minerals and Waste LDF, which would need to identify a specific site allocation, and which could be considered in the context of the Cambridge East Area Action Plan.	
8251 - The Marshall Group	Object	Objective D5(a) This should be altered to refer to "some" people.	The objective could be amended to clarify that not all people living in Cambridge East will be likely to find jobs locally.	Amend Objective D5/a to read: "TO PROVIDE A PART OF THE LABOUR FORCE FOR CAMBRIDGE AND ITS LOCALITY AS WELL AS PROVIDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR SOME PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN CAMBRIDGE EAST TO WORK LOCALLY"
<i>CE/11 Cambridge East Employment</i>				
8252 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the general principles set out. Marshall itself will retain employment at Cambridge East, estimated to be of the order of 1,000 jobs.	Support noted.	
<i>Objectives</i>				
8253 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is generally supportive of the objectives and policy.	Support noted.	
<i>CE Member Reference Group 4.11.05</i>				
<i>Cambridge City Council Environment Scrutiny 8.11.05</i>				
<i>South Cambs Special Council 22.11.05</i>				

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Councils' Assessment

Change to Draft DPD

CE/12 Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Arts and Culture

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9541	Object	<p>Object to the proposed development of Cambridge East on the Cambridge Airport site. Recently purchased a property in Caribou Way and a large part of the reason behind choosing this property was the location, in that it is a quiet suburb but also allows easy access to the city centre and A14. A number of concerns about the proposed development and one of these includes: A lack of local services, such as schools, supermarkets and doctors surgeries. If up to 12,000 new homes are to be built, the residents of these new properties will obviously need to send their children to school and it is very unlikely the existing schools would be able to cope with the number of additional pupils wishing to attend. We also feel that a new supermarket would need to be built, as current stores in the area would not be able to cope with the increased consumer demand. We are concerned that it will become increasingly difficult to receive treatment at Addenbrooke's Hospital due to the increase in number of people in the catchment area requiring treatment. We are always hearing in the news about hospital waiting lists, and for that matter the difficulty in arranging a doctor's appointment, so the increased demand will surely only make these waiting lists longer.</p>	<p>The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 identifies land at Cambridge Airport, north of Newmarket Road and north of Cherry Hinton for development. The main purpose of this first AAP is to bring forward the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road, which can take place before the Airport relocates. However, it is important that this AAP plans holistically for the whole of the Cambridge East development at a broad level and although it is not possible at this stage in this AAP to include a comprehensive list of all the services, facilities and infrastructure which will need to be provided for the whole of the development, it does provide an indicative list of the requirements for the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road, and as many of the other facilities that can be determined at this time for Cambridge East as a whole.</p> <p>In terms of education, the principle underpinning education provision for the new urban quarter is that the development will serve its own needs and it will not be planned to use existing school provision in either the adjoining parts of the City (e.g. Cherry Hinton) or the nearby villages of Fen Ditton and Teversham. However, capacity in those schools will be a factor taken into account in the overall planning of school places.</p> <p>In terms of supermarket provision there is no immediate need for a large supermarket in the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road. However, there maybe potential in the future when the remainder of the site comes forward for development to locate a food supermarket in the district centre.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------

Finally, the provision of health care is taken into account in this AAP and in terms of Addenbrooke's, the NHS Trust's 2020 vision outlines plans to develop the site as a biomedical and health care cluster providing a range of healthcare activities.

9512 - Fairview New Homes	Object	<p>Fairview object to the requirements for contributions towards arts and cultural provision, public art, the funding of community development workers and youth workers and any other level of provision that is unreasonable and is not necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms. Fairview require that the use of planning obligations as referred to in Policy CE/40 and throughout the document, should conform to the guidance issued in ODPM Circular 05/2005.</p>	<p>The Councils consider that these uses are directly related to the development and necessary to help engender community identity in such a large new community. Community development is a key part of helping involve the community in their area at an early stage.</p>	
---------------------------	--------	--	---	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9389 - GO-East	Object	<p>We welcome the indication in Table D6 of the range of facilities likely to be needed in respect of the development overall and Phase 1 in particular. However, we consider that the submission AAP should be clearer in respect of the mechanisms and timescales to determine what will be required specifically in respect of Phase 1 and that this should be linked to an overall delivery framework for this early phase of the development (see the related representation in respect of Section E on delivery).</p> <p>[Soundness text viii]</p>	<p>(a) Section (viii) of the 'soundness' tests set out in PPS12 requires that 'there are clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring'. (b) The AAP will provide a framework for negotiations on the planning application(s) for the development of Cambridge East which will identify the full range of services, facilities and infrastructure which will be required for/by this development. Those requirements will be incorporated into the planning obligation attached to any planning permission(s) and will include funding provisions, the timing of delivery in relation to the progress of development. Cambridgeshire Horizons has a key role in helping the District Council and the service, facility and infrastructure providers to identify, plan, secure funding and project manage delivery. The final list of services, facilities and infrastructure, and the timetable for delivery has not been determined and cannot therefore be included in the AAP. The AAP can and already does provide mechanisms for identifying what will be needed including a number of strategies which must be prepared. Whilst these matters could be included in a Supplementary Planning Document for Cambridge East, preparation of such a document would be likely to delay development and therefore a framework of negotiations on the content of a planning obligation is the best way forward at this time. The planning obligation will include timetable for delivery of services, facilities and infrastructure tied to number of dwellings completed and housing completions will be included in the District Council's Annual Monitoring Report.</p>	<p>Add an additional section to policy CE/12 to read: "(14) The delivery of development and its associated services, facilities and infrastructure will be monitored on an annual basis as part of the District Council's Annual Monitoring Report."</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9551	Object	A number of concerns about the proposed development and one of these includes: The lack of local services, such as schools, supermarkets and doctors surgeries.	<p>The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 identifies land at Cambridge Airport, north of Newmarket Road and north of Cherry Hinton for development. The main purpose of this first AAP is to bring forward the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road, which can take place before the Airport relocates. However, it is important that this AAP plans holistically for the whole of the Cambridge East development at a broad level and although it is not possible at this stage in this AAP to include a comprehensive list of all the services, facilities and infrastructure which will need to be provided for the whole of the development, it does provide an indicative list of the requirements for the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road, and as many of the other facilities that can be determined at this time for Cambridge East as a whole.</p> <p>In terms of education, the principle underpinning education provision for the new urban quarter is that the development will serve its own needs and it will not be planned to use existing school provision in either the adjoining parts of the City (e.g. Cherry Hinton) or the nearby villages of Fen Ditton and Teversham. However, capacity in those schools will be a factor taken into account in the overall planning of school places.</p> <p>In terms of supermarket provision there is no immediate need for a large supermarket in the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road. However, there maybe potential in the future when the remainder of the site comes forward for development to locate a food supermarket in the district centre.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11292 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Given the level of basic infrastructure provision necessary to enable the development to take place, the plan should acknowledge the potential role of a range of service providers who typically contribute to the delivery of sustainable community living, namely the public, voluntary and commercial sectors. As such Fairview object to Policy CE/12 - that planning obligations should be sought for a full range of publicly and community provided services and facilities and services and facilitates that are to be provided by the community and voluntary sector.	<p>Finally, the provision of health care is taken into account in this AAP and in terms of Addenbrooke's, the NHS Trust's 2020 vision outlines plans to develop the site as a biomedical and health care cluster providing a range of healthcare activities.</p> <p>The AAP acknowledges that not all services and facilities will be provided by the public or commercial sectors. Some facilities at Cambridge East will be best provided through the direct involvement of community or voluntary sector e.g. facilities for faith and social and sporting clubs.</p> <p>The service providers are collaborating to establish what services and facilities should be provided as well as how they should best be provided and the AAP includes an indicative but not exclusive list of services and facilities to be explored for the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road and Cambridge East as a whole in order to establish a vibrant and sustainable community from the outset of development.</p>	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Councils' Assessment

Change to Draft DPD

1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9809 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Object	Plans for shops, schools, health centres - will they be in place when new residents move in. (I think there is still only one shop - Morrisons, at Cambourne. Church is still not there.) Because of proximity to Tesco Fulbourn and Newmarket Road and Asda, will there be supermarket-type provision or will the residents need to drive?	<p>The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 identifies land at Cambridge Airport, north of Newmarket Road and north of Cherry Hinton for development. The main purpose of this first AAP is to bring forward the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road, which can take place before the Airport relocates. However, it is important that this AAP plans holistically for the whole of the Cambridge East development at a broad level and although it is not possible at this stage in this AAP to include a comprehensive list of all the services, facilities and infrastructure which will need to be provided for the whole of the development, it does provide an indicative list of the requirements for the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road, and as many of the other facilities that can be determined at this time for Cambridge East as a whole.</p> <p>In terms of education, the principle underpinning education provision for the new urban quarter is that the development will serve its own needs and it will not be planned to use existing school provision in either the adjoining parts of the City (e.g. Cherry Hinton) or the nearby villages of Fen Ditton and Teversham. However, capacity in those schools will be a factor taken into account in the overall planning of school places.</p> <p>In terms of supermarket provision there is no immediate need for a large supermarket in the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road. However, there maybe potential in the future when the remainder of the site comes forward for development to locate a food supermarket in the district centre.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
			Finally, the provision of health care is taken into account in this AAP and in terms of Addenbrooke's, the NHS Trust's 2020 vision outlines plans to develop the site as a biomedical and health care cluster providing a range of healthcare activities.	
9811 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Object	In new communities with many one parent families, provision must be made for 8 am to 6 pm care and holiday activities.	Paragraph D6.21 of the AAP acknowledges the appropriateness of primary schools having a community wing in order to provide for uses such as pre-school, breakfast clubs, after school clubs, holiday clubs.	
8256 - The Marshall Group	Object	Any contribution (in cash or kind) to be made by Marshall must be reasonably related to the development. Should the development have to accommodate uses which do not arise from or are not reasonably related to Cambridge East, such transactions will have to be on an appropriate commercial basis.	Planning obligations are legal agreements which are available to local planning authorities which can make development acceptable which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms. The tests for planning obligations are set out in Circular 05/05 being: (1) relevant to planning, (2) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, (3) directly related to the proposed development, (4) fairly and reasonable related in scale and kind to the proposed development, and (5) reasonable in all other respects. It is therefore reasonable for developers to pay for or contribute to the cost of all of a service or facility which would not have been necessary but for their development even where this would confer some wider benefit on the community. Only if extra provision is made because it is desirable to serve the wider community would it be appropriate that funding on an appropriate commercial basis would be justified. This clarification could be added to the end of paragraph D6.1.	Add the following to the end of paragraph D6.1: "The development will pay for or contribute to the cost of all of services or facilities which would not have been necessary but for their development even where this would confer some wider benefit on the community. Only if extra provision is made because it is desirable to serve the wider community would it be appropriate that funding from other sources would be required."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>5</i>				
8257 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall expresses reservations to the requirement pointing to the provision of facilities in early phases and to the reference to funding community development workers. Marshall will willingly consider emerging evidence to enable it to revisit those concerns.	For the creation of a successful development from the outset it will be crucial for the infrastructure, service and community needs of residents to be met in early phases. The safeguard for the landowners/developers will be the application of the five planning obligation tests of "relevance to planning", "necessary to make the development acceptable", "directly related to the development", "being related in scale and kind", and "reasonableness". Community development workers in particular will be needed from the very early stages of development to provide support for people moving into Cambridge East for all the reasons set out at paragraphs D6.10 and D6.11 of the Area Action Plan.	No Change.
<i>11</i>				
8072 - The National Trust	Object	See representation made re: CE/2 - 4. Works of public art should be provided along the link to the Bridge of Reeds. The bridge will represent a significant item of public art and a landmark structure.	The AAP does not identify specific locations for the provision of public art which will emerge through more detailed masterplanning and design work. However, the focus will be on enhancing the public realm within the development and the direct requirements of it.	
8258 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall remains to be convinced of the necessity to appoint a lead artist to inform a strategy for public art.	The intention is for a strategy for public art to be developed early in the process in partnership with the developer and key arts agencies. The appointment of a lead artist would be expected as part of the design team which would implement the strategy.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>13</i>				
8259 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall repeats its concerns about the need for the planning application to include the early provision of community development and youth workers. It is a matter which it will revisit in the light of emerging evidence.	For the creation of a successful development from the outset it will be crucial for the infrastructure, service and community needs of residents to be met in early phases. The safeguard for the landowners/developers will be the application of the five planning obligation tests of "relevance to planning", "necessary to make the development acceptable", "directly related to the development", "being related in scale and kind", and "reasonableness". Community development workers in particular will be needed from the very early stages of development to provide support for people moving into Cambridge East for all the reasons set out at paragraphs D6.10 and D6.11 of the Area Action Plan.	No Change.
<i>D6.1</i>				
8260 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall has seen no evidence to support the suggestion that Cambridge East is an appropriate location at which to relocate sports stadia.	The draft Area Action Plan includes the following reference "It could also provide the opportunity for existing facilities in Cambridge such as sports stadia to relocate and develop improved facilities." This is not a proposal but in the knowledge that a number of Cambridge based sports stadia are on constrained sites and that an expanded Cambridge will increasingly be the focus for those stadia that such a large site such as Cambridge East which provides an opportunity to explore whether provision can be made for relocation as part of the planned development.	No change.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D6.4</i>				
8061 - The National Trust	Object	The service providers should be aware of the facilities, particularly for lifelong learning, that are available outside the public sector. For instance, the National Trust's property at Anglesey Abbey already provides educational and leisure opportunities.	Policy CE/12(4) requires detailed assessments and strategies to be prepared which have regard to capacity at existing facilities which could serve the needs of the development.	
<i>2nd Bullet</i>				
8261 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of combining services and facilities which will be mutually supportive and convenient to the public. In particular, it sees a compelling and important role for both primary and secondary schools, which must be developed as community schools, following the model of other primary and secondary schools in Cambridgeshire. The Village College legacy in Cambridgeshire remains a significant innovation both at a national and regional level.	Support noted.	
<i>D6.6</i>				
8060 - The National Trust	Object	The service providers should be aware of the facilities, particularly for lifelong learning, that are available outside the public sector. For instance, the National Trust's property at Anglesey Abbey already provides educational and leisure opportunities.	Policy CE/12(4) requires detailed assessments and strategies to be prepared which have regard to capacity at existing facilities which could serve the needs of the development.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D6.9</i>				
8262 - The Marshall Group	Support	The audit and assessment of existing facilities within Barnwell and Abbey Wards is clearly important, with the authorities probably being better placed than Marshall to inform that process.	Support noted. There is clearly a role for the local authorities and other key public service providers in undertaking an audit and assessment of existing facilities in the area adjoining Phase 1 and identifying the requirements to serve the new development. However, there may be further work required for other services and facilities and there is clearly a role for Marshall in this work. The recently formed Cambridge East Community Services Topic Group will be a useful forum for such partnership working.	
<i>D6.14</i>				
8263 - The Marshall Group	Object	On a non-prescriptive basis, Marshall is supportive of the facilities and services to be explored in relation to Cambridge East. However, only those arising in relation to the development can anticipate substantial funding from the landowner/developer. Transactions in relation to other uses generated by the absence of provision in the City will be subject to normal commercial considerations. Governance should be accorded a much higher priority.	It is agreed that the development will be expected to provide or fund all the infrastructure required to serve the development of Cambridge East, in accordance with circular 05/2005. This could include provision where the required level for Cambridge East also exceeds that requirement eg where provision is made on the basis of a threshold range and the development falls within it. The Councils recognise that governance is an important issue, particularly for the parishes within South Cambridgeshire. It is not a matter that is appropriately addressed through the planning process but needs to be considered in parallel with it.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Table D6</i>				
10941 - House Builders Federation	Object	The Planning Obligation requirements will need to be in conformity with the tests of reasonableness set out in Circular 5/05. The HBF doubts whether some of the entries in the Table would do so.	It is agreed that the development will be expected to provide or fund all the infrastructure required to serve the development of Cambridge East, in accordance with circular 05/2005, subject to financial viability. This could include provision where the required level for Cambridge East also exceeds that requirement eg where provision is made on the basis of a threshold range and the development falls within it. There may be certain commercially provided facilities that are required early in order to create a viable and sustainable community and that can only come forward with initial subsidy. This would be a reasonable call on the development. The Councils recognise that governance is an important issue, particularly for the parishes within South Cambridgeshire. It is not a matter that is appropriately addressed through the planning process but needs to be considered in parallel with it.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Education</i>				
9835 - Care and Education Partnership	Object	We urge you to consider the provision of childcare facilities in Cambridge East. Whilst welcoming the provision for pre and post school activiteis and a commercial nursery, we would ask you to ensure provision for community facilities for childcare, e.g. after school clubs, community playgroups, childminding networkds, community day nursery, parent/toddler groups - with adequate buildings provided as it is usually lack of premises which deters the creation of such groups.	The AAP can ensure the provision of certain key facilities such as schools and associated facilities and that buildings are provided that can provide a location for other community provided facilities, eg. schools and community centres. The community developer worker will work with the new community to help establish these types of support groups. It is expected that the commercial sector is likely to bring forward all-day nursery care,particularly in mixed use locations.	
9834 - Care and Education Partnership	Object	We urge you to consider the provision of childcare facilities in Cambridge East. Whilst welcoming the provision for pre and post school activiteis and a commercial nursery, we would ask you to ensure provision for community facilities for childcare, e.g. after school clubs, community playgroups, childminding networkds, community day nursery, parent/toddler groups - with adequate buildings provided as it is usually lack of premises which deters the creation of such groups.	The AAP can ensure the provision of certain key facilities such as schools and associated facilities and that buildings are provided that can provide a location for other community provided facilities, eg. schools and community centres. The community developer worker will work with the new community to help establish these types of support groups. It is expected that the commercial sector is likely to bring forward all-day nursery care,particularly in mixed use locations.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11243 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	In Table D6 it states that, as a whole Cambridge East would need 6-7 primary schools. This should be amended to read 5-6 primary schools.	The AAP should be revised to reflect the County Council's latest assessment of primary school requirements for the development as a whole to 5 to 6 primary schools.	<p>Revise 3rd sentence of paragraph D3.1 to read:</p> <p>"However, it is not certain at this stage that the urban quarter will require, or be able to support, 5 to 6 Local Centres, which is the anticipated number of primary schools required to serve the development..."</p> <p>Revise Table D6, Education, Cambridge East as a whole, to read:</p> <p>"5-6 primary schools"</p> <p>Revise 1st sentence of paragraph D6.16 to read:</p> <p>If the whole new urban quarter has in the order of 10,000 to 12,000 dwellings, this would suggest a need for 5 to 6 primary schools."</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D6.16</i>				
11244 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	In paragraph D6.16 it states that, as a whole Cambridge East would need 6-7 primary schools. This should be amended to read 5-6 primary schools.	The AAP should be revised to reflect the County Council's latest assessment of primary school requirements for the development a a whole to 5-6 primary schools.	<p>Revise 3rd sentence of paragraph D3.1 to read:</p> <p>"However, it is not certain at this stage that the urban quarter will require, or be able to support, 5 to 6 Local Centres, which is the number of primary schools required to serve the development..."</p> <p>Revise Table D6, Education, Cambridge East as a whole, to read:</p> <p>"5-6 primary schools"</p> <p>Revise 1st sentence of paragraph D6.16 to read:</p> <p>"If the whole new urban quarter has in the order of 10,000 to 12,000 dwellings, this would suggest a need for 5 to 6 primary schools."</p>
8264 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall welcomes the emphasis given to the use of schools as community schools fulfilling a wider community role.	Support noted.	
<i>D6.17</i>				
8265 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall welcomes the emphasis given here to the use of schools as community schools fulfilling a wider community role.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Objectives</i>				
8838 - RAVE	Object	This AAP does not set out a credible Transport Strategy which will be critical to the success of this hugely ambitious project. The Cambridge Labour Group have submitted a detailed critique of the present approach and we agree with it's approach.	The objectives are necessary in the interest of sustainability and to enable impacts on surrounding communities to be minimised. They form a broad commitment to be addressed during the development of the masterplan and in the assessment of planning applications.	
<i>D7/a</i>				
11245 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Welcome explicit support for improvements to Rights of Way network and recognition of the relationship to recreation, transport and health.	Support noted.	
<i>D7/b</i>				
8062 - The National Trust	Object	Add reference to the wider countryside.	The proposed change is unnecessary as this aspiration is adequately covered by objective D7/a.	
<i>D7/c</i>				
9221	Object	Cycleways should be convenient and follow desire lines. Segregation should be clarified as physical.	Objectives are not the place for the inclusion of detailed policy text as proposed by the objector.	
<i>D7/d</i>				
8120 - Cambridge City Council Labour Group	Object	To demonstrate this is an achievable objective requires an independent assessment as soon as possible, and before the AAP can become policy.	This objective will be implemented through future masterplanning for Cambridge East and the assessment of planning applications. It is an objective not a policy and is not in need of independent assessment.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D7/e</i>				
8122 - Cambridge City Council Labour Group	Object	The AAP does not refer to any test of adequacy or of evidence that this objective is achievable.	This objective will be implemented through future masterplanning for Cambridge East and the assessment of planning applications. Policy CE/14 provides further details. A definition of HQPT is given in the Structure Plan.	
<i>D7/g</i>				
8123 - Cambridge City Council Labour Group 9228	Object	AAP needs to provide some evidence that the plans will result in a viable transport system within the development and on the existing network.	The objective is achievable, it requires new road links to minimise their impact on surrounding communities. It does not require there to be no such impact.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D7/i</i>				
11247 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Modal shift targets are welcomed, but there are no timescales for the targets or baseline data. There is no indication of what action will be taken if the targets are not met, who will monitor and how this will be achieved.	The objective is necessary in the interest of sustainability and to enable impacts on surrounding communities to be minimised. The Councils will work with the County Council as local transport authority on the implementation of Cambridge East from masterplanning to the assessment of planning applications. Agreements will be reached on future monitoring arrangements, the outcome of which can be fed back into the design and assessment of future phases of Cambridge East. It is not necessary or correct to include such statements into a plan objective.	
8124 - Cambridge City Council Labour Group	Object	The AAP has not demonstrated the evidence on which such objectives can be justifiably aimed for.	The objective is necessary in the interest of sustainability and to enable impacts on surrounding communities to be minimised. The objective forms a broad commitment to be addressed during the development of the masterplan and in the assessment of planning applications.	
9247	Object	25% foot/cycle use goal is both too low and a challenge with the current AAP proposals. Cycle/foot use goals should be separated. DfT LTN1/04 and LTN2/04 should be followed as an objective, as they represent good practice. Transport development should have a cycle audit, to comply with Local Transport Plan. Is there a basis and justification for 35% public transport use with existing similar developments? This needs to be demonstrated.	The objective is necessary in the interest of sustainability and to enable impacts on surrounding communities to be minimised. The objective does not preclude achieving a higher modal share for cycling and walking as it refers to achieving 'at least 25%' by these modes. Objectives are not the place for the inclusion of detailed policy text as proposed by the objector.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8266 - The Marshall Group	Object	This sets the objective for modal shift. In doing so, insufficient weight has been given to the proportion of trips which will be internal to Cambridge East. A reasonable estimate would be 10%. In that circumstance, modal shift externally should be: -By car: no more than 40% -By public transport: by at least 30% -By foot and cycle: by at least 30%	The objective is necessary in the interest of sustainability and to enable impacts on surrounding communities to be minimised. The objective does not preclude achieving a higher modal share for cycling and walking as it refers to achieving 'at least 25%' by these modes.	
<i>D7.2</i>				
8125 - Cambridge City Council Labour Group	Object	There is no means of demonstrating this independently before the submission of a planning application appears in the AAP	The objector is correct insofar that a planning application for the AAP development will have to be accompanied by a transport assessment which will allow its impacts to be assessed by the decision maker. However the objector is incorrect that there will be no assessment of these impacts before that time. The County's Long Term Transport Study will provide information on transport impacts as a whole for all of the urban extensions and for the new settlement. In addition a separate more detailed study of Cambridge East has recently commenced by independent consultants.	
<i>D7.4</i>				
9747 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Support	The planners of the Cambridge East development should be liaising with the Highways Authorities about the proposed improvement to the A14 to discourage increased traffic levels through Fen Ditton.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE/13 Road Infrastructure</i>				
10335 - Highways Agency	Object	The Highways Agency wishes, therefore, to maintain its 'in-principle' objection to the provision of an additional junction on the A14 to service a new Cambridge East urban expansion.	Objection noted. The AAP position on an additional junction to the A14 is that this is not currently a requirement. The outcome of the Long Term Transport Strategy and the Cambridge East Transport Strategy will reveal how best to provide for access to the A14. This may necessitate a new junction.	
11249 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Do we want to limit this to public transport capacity?	Whilst it is essential to make provision for public transport it will also be important to ensure that adequate capacity exists for all vehicles including the private car. In this regard Cambridge East is similar to any other urban extension or new settlement. Car ownership will not be prevented and provision will be made for car parking so it follows that cars will be used. The aim will be to minimise this useage through the provision of High Quality Public Transport and by providing for good quality cycle and pedestrian links.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9538	Object	Object to the proposed development of Cambridge East on the Cambridge Airport site. Recently purchased a property in Caribou Way and a large part of the reason behind choosing this property was the location, in that it is a quiet suburb but also allows easy access to the city centre and A14. A number of concerns about the proposed development and one of these includes: The additional traffic that the proposed development will cause. The extra traffic generated on Airport Way and Gazelle Way will make it difficult for us to access our property. Both myself and my partner are professional people and drive to work. The extra traffic will create even more congestion around the Newmarket Road area, causing our journeys to and from work to take longer and therefore causing us an inconvenience.	Cambridge Airport was chosen as a location for development by the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Structure Plan which was adopted in 2003. The Area Action Plan has to be consistent with the Structure Plan.	
11325	Object	Increased traffic is inevitable. I was pleased to note that vehicular access would be solely from Newmarket road. However, if the slip roads onto the A14 at Fen Ditton remain open, the traffic along Ditton Lane- Horningsea Road will increase. Recent traffic surveys show that it has reached saturation point. This narrow road was never suitable as an "arterial road" into Cambridge having a Primary School, Old People's Home and Health Centre along it. As a resident of Fen Ditton I realise that closing of the slips roads will be an inconvenience to residents of this village and Horningsea but an additional couple of miles to access A14 in both directions at Quy Roundabout is a price worth paying.	The policy precludes any improvements to the A14 slip roads at Fen Ditton to improve junction capacity. If a new junction is shown to be necessary this would be accompanied by the closure of the Fen Ditton junction. Furthermore the policy requires the submission of Transport Assessments to ensure that transport impacts are assessed and to allow adequate mitigation which can include traffic management measures where these are justified.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9550	Object	A number of concerns about the proposed development and one of these includes: The additional traffic that the proposed development will cause. The extra traffic generated on Airport Way and Gazelle Way will make it difficult for us to access our property. Both myself and my partner are professional people and drive to work. The extra traffic will create even more congestion around the Newmarket Road area, causing our journeys to and from work to take longer and therefore causing us an inconvenience.	Cambridge Airport is identified for major development in the adopted 2003 Structure Plan. The AAP must be in general conformity with the Structure Plan. It would be unrealistic to expect that the development would have no impact on existing patterns of travel in the area. Nevertheless the objective of the AAP is to ensure that the plan and its implementation minimise the impact of traffic generation on surrounding communities.	
8365	Object	I don't know what subheading to put this comment against. The proposed development of Cambridge East will swamp the transport system in eastern Cambridge. The existing roads into Cambridge from this area are Newmarket Road, Coldhams Lane and Mill Road. These are already at or beyond their capacity. If Cambridge East does go ahead then we must have improved transport facilities first, not a promise that we might perhaps get them later.	The Councils intend Cambridge East to be a sustainable development where alternative modes of travel are possible and encouraged at the earliest possible stage. This will include measures aimed at facilitating public transport patronage and accessibility, cycling and walking.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>I</i>				
10328 - Highways Agency	Object	With regard to the Site Specific Policies, the Highways Agency has concerns about proposed development at Cambridge Northern Fringe, Cambridge Northern fringe East (Chesterton Sidings), Papworth Everard, Cambridge Airport, and Cambourne all of which could have implications for the trunk road network. We would wish to see evidence that the scale of development proposed could be accommodated without having a detrimental impact on the operation of the adjacent trunk roads.	Concerns noted. The proposed development at Cambridge East is a requirement of the adopted Structure Plan. Its impacts on local roads including trunk roads are being assessed through a Long Term Transport Strategy for the County and a more detailed and focussed Cambridge East Transport Strategy. Policy CE/13 requires adequate highway capacity to serve all stages of the development.	
9588	Object	The undersigned residents of Eland Way wish to make known their concerns about the major development of housing on Cambridge Airport: Dr A J Maguire, Dr M Gaskarth, Mr E Gaskarth. Already there is excessive traffic in the area of Newmarket Road, and the proposed development will create significantly more traffic congestion.	Concerns noted. The proposed development at Cambridge East is a requirement of the adopted Structure Plan. Its impacts on local roads including trunk roads are being assessed through a Long Term Transport Strategy for the County and a more detailed and focussed Cambridge East Transport Strategy. Policy CE/13 requires adequate highway capacity to serve all stages of the development.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
2				
8090	Object	The impact of a new A14 junction and resulting traffic should be planned very carefully with sensitivity to the impact on Fen Ditton Village and its approach.	Agree that any new junction will need careful planning with regard to Fen Ditton and its approach.	
9256	Object	The sentence beginning "Such improvements and satisfactory access arrangements...." is a duplicate of point 3.	Accepted.	Delete last sentence of Policy CE/13 part 2, which duplicates part 3.
8268 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is generally supportive of this element of policy. It allows for the possibility of Fen Ditton junction fulfilling a slightly different role, perhaps by increased use for public transport, although that is not said expressly. Facilitating public transport may require alteration or management of the junction, both to favour public transport use.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
4 10865 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The possibility of additional access points to serve portions of the development or a change in their location should not be ruled out at this stage in the process. For example we would not wish to rule out at this stage the possibility of a second access to Airport Way to serve the part of the development north of the green corridor and south of Newmarket Road. The detailed Transport Assessment may conclude upon a different access strategy. Therefore, a degree of flexibility should be incorporated into the wording of both the policy and the supporting text in paragraph D7.10.	The outcome of the Long Term Transport Strategy and the Cambridge East Transport Strategy are not yet available to support an alternative arrangement of primary road access points, no alternative wording is proposed. The Councils cannot support the proposal that another road access point north of the green corridor is included in the plan without proper justification. Such an arrangement could lead to increased traffic levels through Teversham on Fulbourn Road, degrade the green separation to that village and increase the separation between the airport site and the new Country Park to the north of Teversham. Road access arrangements will be considered at the Examination in Public which will have the benefit of current transport studies. Furthermore the AAP will be subject to review before the airport site proper is likely to come forward for development.	
8130 - Cambridge City Council Labour Group	Object	Since these roads are all at or near capacity, the AAP needs, but fails, to demonstrate that this road network can respond to the additional burdens proposed by the East Cambridge proposals	Paragraph 4 is a factual statement of where the road access points to Cambridge East will be. The capacity of the local road network is being assessed through the Long Term Transport Study and a more detailed study of Cambridge East. This data will influence subsequent stages of the AAP and its examination in public.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>a</i>				
8639	Object	Following the confusing change of lane usage on the eastbound approach to the Newmarket Road / Barnwell Road roundabout, there has been heavy outbound congestion along Newmarket Road, and increased danger to cyclists due to cars having to cut in front of them in order to get to Ditton Lane. This roundabout must be returned to its original configuration in this direction if it is to have any chance of coping with the increased traffic flow.	The requirement in policy CE/13(4a) sets out broad requirements for vehicular access onto Newmarket Road. It would not be appropriate for the AAP to seek to detail the design of those junctions or to require knock-on changes to the carriageway elsewhere along Newmarket Road. These are matters for consideration at a later date when planning applications are being considered alongside a detailed Transport Assessment and when the necessary planning obligations are being negotiated.	
9839	Object	Newmarket Road is currently well over capacity, largely due to the disastrous introduction the closely spaced junctions with the Cambridge Retail Park, which when combined with the junction with B&Q provide a very low net capacity. No additional developments can be permitted to connect to this road until the area around the Cambridge Retail Park has been redesigned to provide improved capacity.	The requirement in policy CE/13(4a) sets out broad requirements for vehicular access onto Newmarket Road. It would not be appropriate for the AAP to seek to detail the design of those junctions or to require knock-on changes to the carriageway elsewhere along Newmarket Road. These are matters for consideration at a later date when planning applications are being considered alongside a detailed Transport Assessment and when the necessary planning obligations are being negotiated.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9838	Object	Regarding the new connections to Newmarket Road itself, an analysis must be performed to show that these will not cause congestion in this area for through traffic. The choice of junction and layout must be specified -- closely spaced junctions controlled by traffic lights are obviously not an acceptable due to the retail park experience, whereas roundabouts of the type successfully used in South Cambridge may work. Until the analysis of traffic movements and expected congestion levels has been performed, it must be assumed that the congestion will be unacceptable.	The requirement in policy CE/13(4a) sets out broad requirements for vehicular access onto Newmarket Road. It would not be appropriate for the AAP to seek to detail the design of those junctions or to require knock-on changes to the carriageway elsewhere along Newmarket Road. These are matters for consideration at a later date when planning applications are being considered alongside a detailed Transport Assessment and when the necessary planning obligations are being negotiated.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>b</i>				
8269 - The Marshall Group	Object	In dealing with primary road access, access to Airport Way is confined to the Gazelle Way roundabout. Marshall objects to that, being advised that an appropriate vehicular access can be achieved further north on Airport Way, between Airport Way roundabout and the junction with Church Road. By allowing a vehicular link there, a much more logical system of access to existing primary roads can be achieved to avoid forcing traffic onto Newmarket Road and creating longer journeys.	Given the location of the green corridor adjoining Teversham and the need to minimise rat-running through that village it is not thought appropriate to include a vehicular access onto Airport Way north of Teversham.	
10358 - Teversham Parish Council	Object	Teversham Parish Council have severe concerns about the proposal to create a primary road access to Cambridge East at the Gazelle Way roundabout. The existing highways and associated infrastructure will not have the capacity to meet the increased demands arising from the proposed road link, and the significant increase in vehicle movements will have a serious and adverse impact on both the local environment and the residential amenities of existing residents within the Parish of Teversham (Teversham village and Foxgloves estate).	It is essential that Cambridge East is served by road access points to the north, east, south and west to provide for traffic movements and to dilute the impacts on each of the receiving roads. The policy requires that roads be located and designed to avoid impacts on the landscape, nature reserves and existing residential properties. The policy also requires planning applications to be accompanied by Transport Assessments to allow impacts to be assessed and mitigated and for traffic management measures to be funded to minimise traffic impacts on nearby residents.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9261	Object	There should be an additional exit onto Airport Way further up closer to Newmarket Road to allow for access to/from the A14 without overloading either the full length of Airport Way, or the already busy and congested Newmarket Road. Especially when the North of Newmarket Road development will have its sole access via that Newmarket Road junction. Bear in mind that there will be people wishing to travel into the development, as well as away from it.	The outcome of the Long Term Transport Strategy and the Cambridge East Transport Strategy are not yet available to support an alternative arrangement of primary road access points, no alternative wording is proposed. The Councils cannot support the proposal that another road access point north of the green corridor is included in the plan without proper justification. Such an arrangement could lead to increased traffic levels through Teversham on Fulbourn Road, degrade the green separation to that village and increase the separation between the airport site and the new Country Park to the north of Teversham. Road access arrangements will be considered at the Examination in Public which will have the benefit of current transport studies. Furthermore the AAP will be subject to review before the airport site proper is likely to come forward for development.	
<hr/>				
<i>c</i> 8650	Object	Improve junction between Coldham's Lane and Newmarket Road for traffic entering Newmarket Road.	Policy CE/13(4c) states that Cambridge East be accessible from Coldham's Lane. It is not concerned with the junction of Coldham's Lane with Newmarket Road. This junction may need to be improved as part of the development of the Airport site. The Transport Assessment which will accompany the planning application for the development of that site will reveal where transport impacts need to be mitigated.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
6				
8132 - Cambridge City Council Labour Group	Object	The proposed Transport Assessment needs to be independent of, and precede, any planning application, to avoid the strong possibility that 'no adverse impact on the city's transport network' (D7.2), which is a requirement, is not attainable.	The transport assessments will be undertaken by the developer and assessed by the Councils and the County as local transport authority, which is standard practice.	
9265	Object	It is widely accepted that Transport is one of the key challenges facing Cambridge East, and the viability of the whole development rests on solving the issues. It is therefore imperative that a Transport Assessment has been made *in advance* of the submission of the AAP to the Secretary of State. Making one afterwards is too late as a lot of the design principles will by then have been set.	The transport assessments will be undertaken by the developer regarding a particular planning application and assessed by the Councils and the County as local transport authority, which is standard practice. They cannot be done in advance of an application. However the Councils are undertaking two transport studies to inform the AAP, the Long Term Transport Strategy and a more detailed and focussed Cambridge East Transport Strategy.	
9804 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Object	This is high density building which will inevitably add to the traffic congestion which is already there due to proximity to A14.	The purpose of the required Transport Assessment is to reveal the transport impacts of the development and so allow them to be properly mitigated. This will include traffic management measures, support for public transport and other measures including contributions towards improving the capacity of existing orbital routes.	
7921	Support	I agree a detailed report is required, but it does not state as to how far this report must extend. If one looks at current traffic levels on the Barwell road past Sainsbury's going south, there is continual traffic build up at rush hour and weekends. The same can be said for Coldman's lane past the roundabout with Barwell road heading towards the railway and Asda. Is the report going to extend this far?	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7 9746 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Support	It is essential that the greatly increased traffic flow is prevented from transiting into High Ditch Road and any public transport should be routed elsewhere.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8				
8270 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to this policy but its objection would be tempered if the absolute requirement to contribute to orbital capacity could be lessened to a provisional requirement, subject to evidence.	The policy requirement only requires contributions based on forecast evidence of impact and is necessary and reasonable.	
8654	Object	This statement must be strengthened, not only to require that the developers contribute to improvements in orbital road capacity, but also to state what those improvements will be and how the development, in combination with the road improvements, will affect congestion in the city. One key route that is likely to be required is a bridge to connect Wadloes Road to Chesterton. A large number of additional car journeys to the Science Park is inevitable, and this road will help to alleviate this.	The policy text in paragraph 8 is considered to be sufficient at this stage. Insufficient evidence exists to state how orbital links should be improved. Current transport studies will reveal what impacts can be expected. When planning applications are submitted they will be accompanied by Transport Assessments. Taken together these documents will enable the impacts of the development on orbital routes to be determined and for the authorities to consider how best to mitigate them.	
10333 - Highways Agency	Object	The Agency would wish to see the M11, A11 and A14 identified within the Action Plan as these roads currently function as an informal 'outer Cambridge' orbital ring road.	This part of the policy primarily concerns orbital routes within Cambridge connecting Cambridge East to other major destinations in the City including Addenbrooke's to the south and the Science Parks to the north. If significant impacts on the M11, A14 and A11 are revealed by transport studies and future Transport Assessments these can be addressed at the time through negotiations on the planning application and associated planning obligation package.	
11248 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council could support limited improvements to capacity on the assumption that generation of vehicular traffic is kept to a minimum by excellent provision being made for other modes of travel.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>9</i>				
8271 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is supportive of the proposal to relocate the park and ride site to south of Newmarket Road and east of Airport Way. Again, the policy might usefully be worded in a provisional way, to leave open the possibility of a more distant relocation of the park and ride site, should that prove more attractive on the basis of further experience and scrutiny.	Support noted.	
<i>D7.5</i>				
10861 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Cambridgeshire County Council strongly supports improved access to the A14 for both the developments at Northstowe and Cambridge East. The County Structure Plan requires that there should be a new access to the A14 as part of the infrastructure requirements to support Cambridge East. Initial assessment has suggested that this should be provided through a new interchange in the vicinity of Honey Hill. The Highways Agency would not welcome additional junctions on the A14, a new junction at Honey Hill would therefore require closure of Fen Ditton interchange. Given the proximity of the Quy junction the replacement junction would only be able to accommodate west-facing slip roads. Measures would be required to prevent 'rat running' through Fen Ditton using High Ditch Road.	The AAP takes a pragmatic approach towards the A14 access issue. Whilst it is clear that access will need to be provided it is not currently clear whether this could best be done via a new junction or through improvements to the existing Quy junction. The outcome of the Long Term Transport Strategy will provide evidence in this regard insofar as it has tested the Structure Plan requirement for a new junction. However this is not yet available to support or not a change to the policy.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D7.6</i>				
9276	Object	AAP should not be submitted without clarity on A14 access after discussion with Highways Agency.	The Cambridge East site is included in the Structure Plan as a major development area and so the AAP is correct to bring it forward for development. The plan is not definitive about how best to provide for access to the A14 because transport studies have not yet reported. It is believed that the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road would not require improved access. Future revision of the AAP will address the A14 access issue in further detail.	
10862 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Cambridgeshire County Council strongly supports improved access to the A14 for both the developments at Northstowe and Cambridge East. The County Structure Plan requires that there should be a new access to the A14 as part of the infrastructure requirements to support Cambridge East. Initial assessment has suggested that this should be provided through a new interchange in the vicinity of Honey Hill. The Highways Agency would not welcome additional junctions on the A14, a new junction at Honey Hill would therefore require closure of Fen Ditton interchange. Given the proximity of the Quay junction the replacement junction would only be able to accommodate west-facing slip roads. Measures would be required to prevent 'rat running' through Fen Ditton using High Ditch Road.	The AAP takes a pragmatic approach towards the A14 access issue. Whilst it is clear that access will need to be provided it is not currently clear whether this could best be done via a new junction or through improvements to the existing Quay junction. The outcome of the Long Term Transport Strategy will provide evidence in this regard insofar as it has tested the Structure Plan requirement for a new junction. However this is not yet available to support or not a change to the policy.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D7.7</i>				
8273 - The Marshall Group	Object	The A14 should be the subject of further research to help inform the long-term transport strategy. This should include examination of the Quy Interchange to determine whether, by alteration and improvement, it could provide a link to the A14.	Paragraph D7.7 does not rule this option out.	
8591	Object	The analysis regarding additional traffic movements generated versus the ability of the various proposals to cope with the must be carried out before the plan is approved. Upgrading the junction at Quy is only an acceptable solution if the additional number of movements through Ditton Lane can be shown to be minimal, otherwise a new junction is necessary as discussed. These issues are far too major to leave until later.	Before the AAP is approved the results of the Long Term Transport Study and more detailed transport work focussing on Cambridge East will be known. The outcome of those studies is not available now to allow the plan to be more definitive about future A14 access arrangements.	
8066 - The National Trust	Object	The National Trust would prefer the option for improving the existing junction off the A14 at Quy rather than constructing a new junction. The improvement option would be better suited for the visitors to Anglesey Abbey, more sustainable and would not affect the position and setting of the proposed Bridge of Reeds.	The preference of the National Trust has been noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9845	Object	However I do not support mere tinkering at Quy as it would not be able to cope with the large extra demands made at peak times (which includes people wishing to access the P&R sites), and so would lead to an increase of traffic on Ditton Lane which must not be permitted.	<p>The AAP takes a pragmatic approach towards the A14 access issue. Whilst it is clear that access will need to be provided it is not currently clear whether this could best be done via a new junction or through improvements to the existing Quy junction. The outcome of the Long Term Transport Strategy will provide evidence in this regard insofar as it has tested the Structure Plan requirement for a new junction. However this is not yet available to support or not a change to the policy.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to the impact of proposed access arrangements on Ditton Lane and High Ditch Road in accordance with the provisions of policy CE/13.</p>	
9281	Support	I strongly support the proposal to replace the Ditton Lane junction with a new junction located elsewhere.	Support noted.	
10863 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Cambridgeshire County Council strongly supports improved access to the A14 for both the developments at Northstowe and Cambridge East. The County Structure Plan requires that there should be a new access to the A14 as part of the infrastructure requirements to support Cambridge East. Initial assessment has suggested that this should be provided through a new interchange in the vicinity of Honey Hill. The Highways Agency would not welcome additional junctions on the A14, a new junction at Honey Hill would therefore require closure of Fen Ditton interchange. Given the proximity of the Quy junction the replacement junction would only be able to accommodate west-facing slip roads. Measures would be required to prevent 'rat running' through Fen Ditton using High Ditch Road.	<p>The AAP takes a pragmatic approach towards the A14 access issue. Whilst it is clear that access will need to be provided it is not currently clear whether this could best be done via a new junction or through improvements to the existing Quy junction. The outcome of the Long Term Transport Strategy will provide evidence in this regard insofar as it has tested the Structure Plan requirement for a new junction. However this is not yet available to support or not a change to the policy.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to the impact of proposed access arrangements on Ditton Lane and High Ditch Road in accordance with the provisions of policy CE/13.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D7.8</i>				
8274 - The Marshall Group	Object	The A14 should be the subject of further research to help inform the long-term transport strategy. This should include examination of the Quy Interchange to determine whether, by alteration and improvement, it could provide a link to the A14.	Providing for adequate access to the A14 will be the subject of further investigation in both the Long Term Transport Strategy and in the more detailed Cambridge East Transport Strategy.	
<i>D7.10</i>				
10866 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The possibility of additional access points to serve portions of the development or a change in their location should not be ruled out at this stage in the process. For example we would not wish to rule out at this stage the possibility of a second access to Airport Way to serve the part of the development north of the green corridor and south of Newmarket Road. The detailed Transport Assessment may conclude upon a different access strategy. Therefore, a degree of flexibility should be incorporated into the wording of both the policy and the supporting text in paragraph D7.10.	The outcome of the Long Term Transport Strategy and the Cambridge East Transport Strategy are not yet available to support an alternative arrangement of primary road access points, no alternative wording is proposed. The Councils cannot support the proposal that another road access point north of the green corridor is included in the plan without proper justification. Such an arrangement could lead to increased traffic levels through Teversham on Fulbourn Road, degrade the green separation to that village and increase the separation between the airport site and the new Country Park to the north of Teversham. Road access arrangements will be considered at the Examination in Public which will have the benefit of current transport studies. Furthermore the AAP will be subject to review before the airport site proper is likely to come forward for development.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D7.13</i>				
11250 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	This section should also state that the developer will fund any highway mitigation measures as a result of the residual increase in vehicular traffic as a result of the development.	The proposed change is unnecessary and too detailed for the AAP. It is implicit that if a development causes an impact that the developer pay for the it be appropriately mitigated if this is necessary and possible.	
7920	Object	These areas are current areas of congestion for rush hour and weekend traffic. The report does not seem to have any information on this. Therefore without detailed analysis, as a local resident I can say it does not seem possible to sustain growth in these areas. So I am concerned that the traffic will build up where people are required to use existing supermarkets. The council must analyze traffic at these areas at current rates and then state what future traffic is expected due to this build.	The results of the County Long Term Transport Study will provide much additional information concerning traffic levels as will a more detailed study focussing on Cambridge East that has recently commenced. This will inform the subsequent stage of the AAP and its public examination. Future transport modelling will inform the development of the masterplan. Each planning application will be subject to a transport assessment as required by paragraph D7.12.	
<i>D7.14</i>				
11251 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The dual use of the Park & Ride to serve as car parking for the Country Park needs to be investigated as part of the emerging Transport Strategy. This investigation should focus on the degree of capacity required to ensure that parking for the Country Park will not diminish the ability of the P&R to intercept car trips into the City.	Concern noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
2				
9807 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Object	Promises of extra public transport to different areas of the city are hard to believe, in view of cut backs which have already occurred. No guarantee that new residents will be working in the centre - provision for transport to Science Park, etc?	Policy CE/14 (2) identifies four routes for High Quality Public Transport to connect the new urban extension to the major centres of attraction, including to the Science Park. Policy CE/40 requires developer contributions towards the provision of High Quality Public Transport, which could include subsidies towards services in the early stages of development if they would not be commercially viable.	
8695	Object	The price for the services must be specified and be kept permanently low. Average journey times must be calculated and specified, and steps made to minimise them, including more doors on buses and off-bus ticket pre-purchase schemes.	Bus services are provided by commercial operators and they are responsible for setting the level of fares. Policy CE/40 requires developer contributions towards the provision of High Quality Public Transport, which could include subsidies towards services if they would not be commercially viable. Paragraphs D7.16 and D7.19 set out the series of bus priority improvement measures which may assist in delivering bus routes where they use existing highways. These measures should ensure buses are not held up in congestion, and journey times are reduced and more reliable. In addition, a guided bus link to the city centre is proposed (Policy CE/14 (2d)), which will provide a direct link to the city centre. High Quality Public Transport is defined in Structure Plan Policy P8/6 and includes infrastructure such as prepaid / electronic ticketing, real time bus information and a higher quality of buses, as well as improved bus frequencies. As a package of measures, this should improve boarding times and journey times.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9895 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	High Quality Public Transport routes are not shown (i.e. integrating/linking existing and all new urban extensions areas) as well landscape and general road transport improvements to existing major routes.	Policy CE/14 (2) identifies four routes for High Quality Public Transport to connect the new urban extension to the major centres of attraction. Paragraphs D7.15-D7.20 provide more detail, and paragraph D7.16 and D7.19 set out the series of bus priority improvement measures which may assist in delivering these routes. These routes will minimise and mitigate any environmental impacts, including through appropriate additional landscaping.	
8133 - Cambridge City Council Labour Group	Object	Assumptions about capacity within this section are included without evidence of engineering capacity or need.	In order to achieve a high quality urban quarter it is necessary to provide high quality alternatives to the use of the car. Policy CE/14 (2) identifies four routes for High Quality Public Transport to connect the new urban extension to the major centres of attraction. Paragraphs D7.16 and D7.19 set out the series of bus priority improvement measures which may assist in delivering these routes where they use existing highways and consultants have been appointed to undertake a Transport Strategy for Cambridge East, and as part of this more detailed work, will establish whether there is sufficient capacity.	
<i>a</i>				
8278 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is generally supportive although it questions the need to specify high quality links to Cambridge West and, to a lesser extent, the Science Park and Cambridge Northern Fringe.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>b</i>				
8301 - The Marshall Group 8283 - The Marshall Group	Object	It is premature to require a connection with Cambridgeshire Guided Bus, upon which a decision is still awaited. A guided bus link to the City centre may be appropriate but it is likely to involve both on and off-road running, as is the case with the current proposal.	A guided bus proposal to serve Cambridge East is separate from, and not in any way dependent upon, the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway proposal between Huntingdon and Trumpington, which is currently the subject of a TWA application.	
8279 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is generally supportive although it questions the need to specify high quality links to Cambridge West and, to a lesser extent, the Science Park and Cambridge Northern Fringe. A guided bus link to the City centre may be appropriate but it is likely to involve both on and off-road running, as is the case with the current proposal.	Support noted.	
<i>c</i>				
8296 - The Marshall Group	Object	It is premature to require a connection with Cambridgeshire Guided Bus, upon which a decision is still awaited.	A guided bus proposal to serve Cambridge East is separate from, and not dependent upon, the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway proposal between Huntingdon and Trumpington, which is currently the subject of a TWA application.	
8280 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is generally supportive although it questions the need to specify high quality links to Cambridge West and, to a lesser extent, the Science Park and Cambridge Northern Fringe. A guided bus link to the City centre may be appropriate but it is likely to involve both on and off-road running, as is the case with the current proposal.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>d</i>				
8286 - The Marshall Group	Object	It is premature to require a connection with Cambridgeshire Guided Bus, upon which a decision is still awaited.	A guided bus proposal to serve Cambridge East is separate from, and not dependent upon, the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway proposal between Huntingdon and Trumpington, which is currently the subject of a TWA application.	
8282 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is generally supportive although it questions the need to specify high quality links to Cambridge West and, to a lesser extent, the Science Park and Cambridge Northern Fringe. A guided bus link to the City centre may be appropriate but it is likely to involve both on and off-road running, as is the case with the current proposal.	Support noted.	
<i>4</i>				
8285 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the absolute requirement to provide an initial subsidy for a 12-month period, new residents to encourage bus usage. It is unjustifiable. Given the absolute and comparative popularity of cycling in Cambridge, any scheme of subsidy to encourage modal shift away from car use, should first look at cycling.	Each non-car mode has an important role in catering for the range of trips which will be made from the urban quarter into Cambridge city centre and other destinations. It is not appropriate to promote any one mode to the exclusion of any others, but instead provide a comprehensive package of measures to address the varying needs of the new community. As well as the provision of quality cycle infrastructure, ensuring High Quality Public Transport provision early on in the development is essential to provide travel choice, and in the early stages of the development bus provision will need subsidy to ensure its commercial viability.	
11252 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Provision of a subsidy to new residents for bus use is welcomed.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
5				
8743	Object	There is no mention made of the experience cyclists travelling along Coldham's Road will have. This is currently a fairly busy route, but is narrow and dangerous. As the amount of traffic on this road increases and the area is developed, it should be accompanied by a wide, off-road cycle path running between the Barnwell Road roundabout and Cherry Hinton.	Paragraph D7.24 provides a list of external rights of way routes to be provided. Although not exhaustive, this list already includes a couple of alternative routes to cycling along Coldham's Road, and other routes may be considered during the detailed masterplanning process.	
8291 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshalls question the reference to horse riding routes, which seems odd.	Policy CE/14(5) is concerned with the provision of infrastructure for non-motorised modes, including a network of routes for recreational purposes. As some public rights of way already cater for horse riders, it is appropriate that any new rights of way should also accommodate their use to complement the existing network.	
8067 - The National Trust	Object	This policy is supported but reference should be made to the opportunity offered for improving access to the rights of way network by the disused railway line shown on the Concept Diagram.	Support noted. Whilst paragraph D7.24 provides a list of external rights of way routes to be provided, this list is not exhaustive and other routes may be considered during the detailed masterplanning process.	
11253 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Welcome clear statement on developing inclusive and extended Rights of Way network.	Support noted.	
8287 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is generally supportive of achieving a high level of accessibility.	Support noted.	
9167 - Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	Support	Welcome specific reference to cycle, pedestrian and horse riding infrastructure.	Support noted.	
9808 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Support	Good to see that cycleways are being planned.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D7.15</i>				
8700	Object	This statement appears to imply that problems along Newmarket Road can be solved by giving greater priority to buses. There is already as much priority to buses as the road can possibly take. The problem here is one of capacity, mostly caused by badly thought-out lighted junctions. These capacity issues must be resolved first.	In order to achieve a high quality urban quarter it is necessary to provide high quality alternatives to the use of the car. Policy CE/14 (2) identifies four routes for High Quality Public Transport to connect the new urban extension to the major centres of attraction. Paragraph D7.16 sets out the series of bus priority improvement measures which may assist in delivering these routes where they use existing highways and consultants have been appointed to undertake a Transport Strategy for Cambridge East, and as part of this more detailed work, will establish whether there is sufficient capacity.	
8134 - Cambridge City Council Labour Group	Object	This paragraph contains untested assumptions about current transport capacity, and engineering capacity for alternatives which might achieve the 'enhancement' which would be needed.	In order to achieve a high quality urban quarter it is necessary to provide high quality alternatives to the use of the car. Policy CE/14 (2) identifies four routes for High Quality Public Transport to connect the new urban extension to the major centres of attraction. Paragraphs D7.16 and D7.19 set out the series of bus priority improvement measures which may assist in delivering these routes where they use existing highways and consultants have been appointed to undertake a Transport Strategy for Cambridge East, and as part of this more detailed work, will establish whether there is sufficient capacity.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7802 - The camToo Project	Support	The camToo Project opens up the opportunity for a high quality transport link from the northern section along the route of the old Mildenhall railway line to join the camToo cross river route just north of Barnwell Bridge thereby giving access to the dual carriageway section of Newmarket Road and the City centre.	Support noted. The AAP forms one strand of the development plan for the Cambridge area. It will need to be read alongside the Cambridge Local Plan. The area between Cambridge East and the City Centre lies within the City of Cambridge. Proposed changes to the Cambridge Local Plan paragraph 8.19 do include reference to the camToo project. The reference states that a full social, environmental and economic appraisal of camToo would be required before it could be considered for inclusion as a formal proposal in the Development Plan. As the camToo project would not be located within the area addressed by the AAP this reference is considered to adequately address the potential of the project to provide transport linkages between Cambridge East and the commuter destinations.	
8289 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall welcomes the recognition that Newmarket Road will be the principal route for access to the City centre, including the Grafton Centre. Marshall looks forward to helping the relevant authorities achieve a more coherent and complete system of bus priority along that route, perhaps to be strengthened by similar proposals on Parkside and East Road.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D7.16</i>				
8135 - Cambridge City Council Labour Group	Object	The 'improvements' proposed are likely to have minimal impact, and would have to be supplemented by much greater changes which remain unspecified, and may be unimaginable, to address the existing deficit and additional demand on the transport system.	In order to achieve a high quality, sustainable, urban quarter it is necessary to provide a package of high quality alternatives to reduce the number of trips made by car. Policy CE/14 identifies a series of measures for non-car modes to address travel needs and provide travel choice. This includes four routes for High Quality Public Transport (HQPT) to connect the new urban extension to the major centres of attraction. Paragraph D7.16 sets out the series of bus priority improvement measures which may assist in delivering these routes where they use existing highways. Consultants have been appointed to undertake a Transport Strategy for Cambridge East and will undertake more detailed work on delivering these, and other, routes.	
8290 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall welcomes and is supportive of the measures indicated for achieving better bus priority, based as they are, in large measure, upon the work of its advisers, WSP.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>1st Bullet</i>				
8711	Object	The guided busway to St. Ives, without which this is far less sensible, has not yet been approved, and remains of questionable effectiveness and value for money while the railway option is still cheaper, has far more public support, and is likely to be proven necessary over time in order to meet the increased capacity that the continued expansion of Cambridge will require. Any use of guided buses should therefore be tentative at most.	A decision on the Cambridgeshire Guided Bus Project should be available before the plan is subject to public examination. The Guided Bus proposal is included in the Structure Plan, and is being promoted by the Structure Plan authorities. It would be wrong to ignore this in this AAP. Should the CGB project not be supported this can be taken into account through a review of the AAP.	
8710	Object	Give more details about the Newmarket Road guided bus route: justify its choice over normal bus lanes, and estimate the impact on traffic congestion that it will have.	Paragraph D7.16 sets out the series of bus priority improvement measures and for Newmarket Road this includes widening the existing bus lanes to 7.5m, which could be in a guideway or other means of tracking. Consultants have been appointed to undertake a Transport Strategy for Cambridge East and will undertake more detailed work on delivering this, and other routes, to inform the detailed masterplanning process.	
9301	Object	Busways should not be installed if they negatively impact cycle provision, noting that shared use provision on Newmarket Road is poor, and alternative routes indirect. There is not clear justification for the benefits of busways over bus lanes, which needs to be demonstrated. Nor viability given property/retail access requirements. Green environment needs to be maintained. Bus priority measures should attempt to benefit cyclists.	Paragraph D7.16 sets out the series of bus priority improvement measures and for Newmarket Road this includes widening the existing bus lanes to 7.5m, which could be in a guideway or other means of tracking. Consultants have been appointed to undertake a Transport Strategy for Cambridge East and will undertake more detailed work on delivering the necessary transport infrastructure in a holistic manner, which will inform the detailed masterplanning process.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>2nd Bullet</i>				
9309	Object	Cyclist use of new Elizabeth Way junction has not been considered and needs to be, including giving cyclists use of a bypass and/or priority measures. It has not been shown that conversion to crossroads will not have a markedly deleterious effect on the transport network.	Consultants have been appointed to undertake a Transport Strategy for Cambridge East and will undertake more detailed work on delivering the necessary transport infrastructure in a holistic manner, including meeting the needs of cyclists and for public transport, which will inform the detailed masterplanning process.	
8723	Object	Please, please, no! This is the one remaining large junction in Cambridge which works. This cannot be supported without a full analysis of the effect on traffic flow that this would have, and a justification showing an improvement in traffic flow versus not making this change. It would also make U-turns impossible, which would make it much harder to restrict right-hand turns on junctions between Coldham's Lane and B&Q on Newmarket Road (see other representations), and would affect access to other side roads.	Consultants have been appointed to undertake a Transport Strategy for Cambridge East and will undertake more detailed work on delivering the necessary transport infrastructure in a holistic manner, including meeting the needs of cyclists and for public transport, which will inform the detailed masterplanning process.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>3rd Bullet</i>				
8725	Object	Insufficient detail -- what do bus priority measures here mean?	Bus priority measures are, by their name, measures which give buses priority over other road traffic. Measures can include bus lanes, priority traffic signals at junctions, and bus only routes / access controlled by bollards and will vary according to the local circumstances, taking account of factors such as road width. The bus priority along Maids Causeway will be a matter of detail for the masterplanning process.	
9311	Object	Consideration should be given to extending the benefits of priority to cyclists, for example using a separate cycle approach with an induction loop. Any implementation of bus priority must not worsen the situation for cyclists.	Noted. The bus priority along Maids Causeway will be a matter of detail for the masterplanning process and will consider the impact on cyclists.	
<i>5th Bullet</i>				
8726	Object	Insufficient detail -- what do bus priority measures here mean?	Bus priority measures are, by their name, measures which give buses priority over other road traffic. Measures can include bus lanes, priority traffic signals at junctions, and bus only routes / access controlled by bollards and will vary according to the local circumstances, taking account of factors such as road width. The bus priority along East Road will be a matter of detail for the masterplanning process.	
9315	Object	Cyclists should benefit from priority too, and should certainly not be negatively impacted, including waiting at junctions. Bus lane on short dual carriageway section seems rather pointless compared to harm to other road users given needs to turn left and right.	Noted. The bus priority along East Road will be a matter of detail for the masterplanning process and will consider the impact on cyclists.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D7.17</i>				
11326	Object	I note that High Ditch Road is thought suitable as a cycle route from the new housing scheme- not with the present flow of traffic along it.	Paragraph D7.17 proposes the use of High Ditch Road to provide a public transport link between Cambridge East and the Cambridge Northern Fringe. It is not proposed as a suitable cycle route; these are listed in paragraph D7.24.	
7798 - The camToo Project	Object	The plan does not state how the site will be connected to the Science Park. The camToo Project is the only practical and acceptable way of providing this link - it also forms the first part of the existing guided bus phase 2 project. We therefore request The camToo Project be referred to in this section	It is correct that the AAP does not specify how the site will be connected to the Science Park. However paragraph A.2 of the AAP acknowledges that an early review of the AAP will take place when the timing of the later stages of the development are more certain. The AAP itself will form only one strand of the development plan for the Cambridge area. It will need to be read alongside the Cambridge Local Plan. The area between Cambridge East and the Science Park lies primarily within the City of Cambridge. Proposed changes to the Cambridge Local Plan paragraph 8.19 do include reference to the camToo project. The reference states that a full social, environmental and economic appraisal of camToo would be required before it could be considered for inclusion as a formal proposal in the Development Plan. As the camToo project would not be located within the area addressed by the AAP this reference is considered to adequately address the potential of the project to provide transport linkages between Cambridge East and the Science Park.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8712 9317	Object	The Cambridge Guided Bus scheme has not yet been approved. Relying on its existence in a submission to the Secretary of State is a mistake.	A decision on the Cambridgeshire Guided Bus Project should be available before the plan is subject to public examination. The Guided Bus proposal is included in the Structure Plan, and is being promoted by the Structure Plan authorities. It would be wrong to ignore this in this AAP. Should the CGB project not be supported this can be taken into account through a review of the AAP.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D7.18</i>				
8728	Object	Insufficient detail -- what do bus priority measures here mean?	Bus priority measures are, by their name, measures which give buses priority over other road traffic. Measures can include bus lanes, priority traffic signals at junctions, and bus only routes / access controlled by bollards and will vary according to the local circumstances, taking account of factors such as road width. The bus priority measures will be a matter of detail for the masterplanning process.	
9320	Object	Consideration should be given to extending the benefits of priority to cyclists, for example using a separate cycle approach with an induction loop. Any implementation of bus priority must not worsen the situation for cyclists including junction wait times that would make cycling no faster than car use.	Consultants have been appointed to undertake a Transport Strategy for Cambridge East and will undertake more detailed work on delivering the necessary transport infrastructure in a holistic manner, including meeting the needs of cyclists and for public transport, which will inform the detailed masterplanning process.	
8136 - Cambridge City Council Labour Group	Object	The 'improvements' proposed are likely to have minimal impact, and would have to be supplemented by much greater changes which remain unspecified, and may be unimaginable, to address the existing deficit and additional demand on the transport system.	In order to achieve a high quality, sustainable, urban quarter it is necessary to provide a package of high quality alternatives to reduce the number of trips made by car. Policy CE/14 identifies a series of measures for non-car modes to address travel needs and provide travel choice. This includes four routes for High Quality Public Transport (HQPT) to connect the new urban extension to the major centres of attraction. Paragraph D7.16 sets out the series of bus priority improvement measures which may assist in delivering these routes where they use existing highways. Consultants have been appointed to undertake a Transport Strategy for Cambridge East and will undertake more detailed work on delivering these, and other, routes.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D7.20</i>				
9324	Object	Clarity is required on what section of Newmarket Road is to be met up with. Carving up Coldham's Common must not happen, but running alongside the railway may prevent the effects of this. The wording should permit consideration of meeting Coldham's Lane.	Paragraph D7.20 refers to investigating a guided bus link across Coldham's Common when the AAP is reviewed. Any future investigation would need to fully consider the environmental impact, including any loss of amenity, when assessing the suitability of such a link. If it is considered suitable, the route and treatment of it, will be a matter of detail for the masterplanning process.	
8138 - Cambridge City Council Labour Group	Object	We do not consider an additional transport route across Coldham's Common would be acceptable for amenity reasons	Paragraph D7.20 refers to investigating a guided bus link across Coldham's Common when the AAP is reviewed. Any future investigation would need to fully consider the environmental impact, including any loss of amenity, when assessing the suitability of such a link. If it is considered suitable, the route and treatment of it, will be a matter of detail for the masterplanning process.	
11254 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Options for the route of the direct bus based public transport link from the site towards the city centre should be investigated as part of the emerging Transport Strategy and can then be immediately incorporated into the review of the AAP.	Agree. Consultants undertaking the Transport Strategy for Cambridge East will carry out more detailed work on delivering the necessary transport infrastructure, including for public transport.	
<i>D7.23</i>				
9325	Object	While I generally support this option, this should say not merely segregated but "physically segregated".	Paragraph D7.25 already refers to "a network of cycleways and footpaths which are segregated from each other and from other road vehicles."	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D7.24</i>				
8063 - The National Trust	Object	This policy is supported but reference to the National Cycle Network - Route 11, should be expanded to include mention of the route linking with Wicken Fen and Anglesey Abbey, both important countryside recreation facilities to the north of Cambridge.	It is not possible, or desirable to list all conceivable links provided by the external rights of way. Therefore, paragraph D7.24 concerns itself with the routes within or close to Cambridge. Whilst National Cycle Network Route 11 links with other routes to Wicken Fen and Anglesey Abbey, this is already detailed in paragraph D11.26 in relation to access to the countryside, and to include it here would be unnecessary duplication.	
9329	Object	Dedicated cycle routes are complementary to on-road provision, not alternatives/replacements. The proposed routes do not directly follow desire lines and have disadvantages compared to on-road routes. They are useful for some cyclists and some destinations, but not all.	Noted. Paragraph D7.24 outlines a number of external rights of way routes, but does not detail whether they will be provided on or off-road. This is a matter for the detailed masterplanning process, which will also consider desire lines when creating new routes. The last bullet includes links into the existing network, including the on-road cycle network.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>2nd Bullet</i>				
7799 - The camToo Project	Object	<p>There is no reference to The camToo Project which has within it this route, route 63 according to the City Local Plans.</p> <p>The camToo Project will also provide a more useful alternative to the current Sustrans route which crosses Stourbridge Common twice by running alongside the Eastern Side of the Common. This will provide a practical alternative for commuters to Newmarket Road.</p>	<p>The AAP forms one strand of the development plan for the Cambridge area. It will need to be read alongside the Cambridge Local Plan. The area between Cambridge East and the City Centre lies within the City of Cambridge. Proposed changes to the Cambridge Local Plan paragraph 8.19 do include reference to the camToo project. The reference states that a full social, environmental and economic appraisal of camToo would be required before it could be considered for inclusion as a formal proposal in the Development Plan. As the camToo project would not be located within the area addressed by the AAP this reference is considered to adequately address the potential of the project to provide transport linkages between Cambridge East and the commuter destinations.</p>	
9330	Object	<p>Green End Road route poor. Plan should allow for improvement.</p>	<p>Note the concerns regarding existing cycle routes. Paragraph D7.24 identifies a series of external rights of way routes which incorporate existing routes if they follow similar desire lines. There is scope to secure planning obligations towards improving existing routes, in accordance with Circular 05/2005.</p>	
<i>3rd Bullet</i>				
9332	Object	<p>Shallow underpasses should be strongly considered, like already exist on Coldham's Common. The wording should allow this consideration.</p>	<p>Noted. This is a matter for consideration in the detailed masterplanning process.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>4th Bullet</i>				
9334	Object	Similarly to my comment on Coldham's Common bridges, the suggested route over Coldhams Lane at Rosemary Lane, over the railway, Brookfields, Burnside, over the railway again, is a poor idea because of the number of bridges involved. Crossing Coldham's Lane (unless by yet another bridge!) would also be difficult and inconvenient for such a busy road. A shallow underpass such as already on Coldham's Common would suffice.	Noted. This is a matter for consideration in the detailed masterplanning process.	
9841	Object	I would request that improvements are made to the Tins and Snakey Path as part of this proposal, both of which are currently too narrow.	Note the concerns regarding existing cycle routes. Paragraph D7.24 identifies a series of external rights of way routes which incorporate existing routes if they follow similar desire lines. There is scope to secure planning obligations towards improving existing routes, in accordance with Circular 05/2005.	
8736	Support	I fully support increased prominence being given to these routes, although this paragraph is a little confusing -- it implies that there is a route from Coldham's Lane to Brookfields (along the Tins) which then doubles back along Snakey Path.	Support noted.	
<i>5th Bullet</i>				
9340	Object	On-road cycle lanes the full length of Coldham's Lane would be better, either instead of or in addition to off-road links.	Noted. Provided there are no constraints to on-road provision, this can be considered during the detailed masterplanning process.	
<i>D7.25</i>				
9343	Object	Links should be physically segregated from other modes inc. pedestrians. Cyclists should not be losers at side roads and careful design allows this to work.	Paragraph D7.25 already refers to "a network of cycleways and footpaths which are segregated from each other and from other road vehicles."	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D7.27</i>				
9344	Object	While I agree with the sentiment, it is important to recognise that many of the tools that have been used in Cambridge to discourage car use can and have also negatively affected cycling. As such I believe this point should say " ... discourage internal and through movements by car without discouraging sustainable modes of transport".	The tools used in the centre of Cambridge have reacted to an existing transport problem and can often be constrained land uses and a lack of space. On the other hand, Cambridge East will be designed at the outset along Home Zone principles, which whilst permitting car use, is more favourable to movements by walking, cycling and public transport.	
<i>D7.29</i>				
11255 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Support the requirement for school travel plans which the Government wishes to see in place for all schools by 2010. Suggest the inclusion of the following text to expand on the requirements of workplace and school travel plans; "Travel Plans should have measurable outputs, related to targets or aims in the LTP and provide monitoring and enforcements arrangements." There may also be scope for consideration of an area-wide or site travel plan.	Agree.	Add the following text to the end of paragraph D7.29: "Travel Plans should have measurable outputs, related to targets or aims in the LTP and provide monitoring and enforcements arrangements."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE/15 Transport for North of Newmarket Road</i>				
8139 - Cambridge City Council Labour Group	Object	We are not aware of any transport capacity study that has demonstrated that the impact of this development on the transport network would be acceptable, whatever mitigating measures are planned.	In order to achieve a high quality, sustainable urban quarter it is necessary to provide high quality alternatives to the use of the car. Policy CE/15 outlines the transport infrastructure needed to serve Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road and provide travel choice. Achieving modal shift should help to address some of the concerns regarding highway capacity. Consultants have been appointed to undertake a Transport Strategy for Cambridge East, and as part of this more detailed work, will establish whether there is sufficient capacity and whether the measures proposed in Policy CE/15 are acceptable.	
8068 - The National Trust	Object	Reference should be included that the development of the area north of Newmarket Road will provide for cycle and footway links to the proposed Bridge of Reeds.	Paragraph D7.24 lists the external rights of way to be provided as part the Cambridge East development as a whole. This includes a link to National Cycle Network Route 11, which could utilise the proposed Bridge of Reeds.	
11256 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The requirement for two points of vehicular access onto Newmarket Road for the first phase of development is supported.	Support noted.	
<i>l</i>				
8293 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall remains to be convinced that a separate public transport access is required onto Newmarket Road. On advice, Marshall takes the view that that will not be achievable within Phase 1 but recognises that it may be possible during Phase 2. However, it is likely to rely on the current park and ride junction, modified as appropriate to take account of its role as an urban park.	In order to achieve a high quality, sustainable urban quarter it is necessary to provide high quality alternatives to the use of the car. Separate public transport access is a fundamental requirement in achieving High Quality Public Transport from the outset and how this can be achieved will be considered in the detailed masterplanning process.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D7.35</i>				
8267 - The Marshall Group	Object	The allotments to which reference is made have been developed for housing.	Noted.	Delete reference to the allotments in last sentence of paragraph D7.35 to read: "The development will be linked to the Jubilee Cycle Route and the Cemetery."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D7.36</i>				
8745	Object	There is far too little detail here. What bus priority measures are envisaged on the Barnwell Road roundabout, and how will they help? What form will new bus lanes along Newmarket Road between Barnwell Road and the railway bridge take? Will they be westbound only or in both directions? How will this affect cyclists, and how will it fit in the existing road?	Bus priority measures are, by their name, measures which give buses priority over other road traffic. Measures can include bus lanes, priority traffic signals at junctions, and bus only routes / access controlled by bollards and will vary according to the local circumstances, taking account of factors such as road width. The bus priority measures will be a matter of detail for the masterplanning process.	
7803 - The camToo Project	Object	An alternative to new bus lanes on Newmarket Road would be to use the route of the old Mildenhall railway line to connect to the camToo cross river link for the guided bus.	The AAP forms one strand of the development plan for the Cambridge area. It will need to be read alongside the Cambridge Local Plan. The area between Cambridge East and the City Centre lies within the City of Cambridge. Proposed changes to the Cambridge Local Plan paragraph 8.19 do include reference to the camToo project. The reference states that a full social, environmental and economic appraisal of camToo would be required before it could be considered for inclusion as a formal proposal in the Development Plan. As the camToo project would not be located within the area addressed by the AAP this reference is considered to adequately address the potential of the project to provide transport linkages between Cambridge East and the commuter destinations.	
9345	Object	Cyclist priority should also be considered. Bus priority must not negatively impact cyclists including journey times. Green environment must be maintained.	Noted. This is a matter for consideration during the detailed masterplanning process.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>1</i>				
8295 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall remains concerned that the lowering of car parking standards in housing areas is going to lead to contentious problems with neighbour disputes about parking. Marshall would suggest that an indication is given that residential car parking standards will be revisited in the light of experience gleaned from other sites within the City currently being developed, where an understanding of the implications of lowering provision can be achieved.	The proposed change is unnecessary in that the development of the Airport will follow after the commencement of development of land north of Newmarket Road, of other urban extensions to Cambridge and of Northstowe. Experience gained in these locations will be available to influence future revisions of the AAP, the masterplanning process and of consideration of planning applications. It is not possible at this stage to anticipate the outcome of that future consideration.	
<i>7</i>				
9385 - GO-East	Object	Paragraph 7 refers to the policy requirements in PPG3: Housing being 1.5 car parking standards per dwelling. This is incorrect as the policy requires an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling ACCROSS A DISTRICT (this was clarified in a Ministerial statement by Keith Hill). This should be reflected in the submission AAP. It is important that in implementing the car parking standards garages are included as a space(s) to ensure that the most effective and efficient use is made of land. [Soundness test iv]	Accept. Parking provision at Cambridge East will be monitored in annual monitoring reports in relation to the 1.5 car parking spaces per dwelling standard for each district set by PPG3 and the Ministerial Statement. Paragraph 7 should be amended to make it clear the average relates to the district wide average. Garages are counted as parking spaces and this should be made clear in the text.	Amend second sentence of paragraph 7 in Appendix 1 to read: "In addition to these ratios provision should be made for visitors at the ratio of 1 space for every 4 units, provided that off-street car parking spaces resulting from the development would not be above the district-wide average of 1.5 car parking spaces per dwelling, in accordance with PPG3." Add new sentence at the end of Table 1: "Note: garages are counted as parking spaces."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Objectives</i>				
11414 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall support Objectives D8/a to D8/h and will continue to work with South Cambridgeshire District Council to ensure that they are achieved. The objectives have been taken account of in preparation of the Preliminary Landscape Plan within the Cambridge East Living Spaces report.	Support noted.	
<i>CE/16 Landscape Principles</i>				
8490 - English Heritage	Object	Policy CE/16 Landscape Principles - This policy should refer to the need to analyse the character of the landscape using the Historic Landscape Character database held by the County Council.	Disagree because this heavily managed Airport site has very little historic landscape character remaining.	
8297 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is generally supportive both of the objectives and the policy content of CE/16.	Support noted.	
<i>I</i>				
11415 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall agrees that a Landscape Strategy for Cambridge East should be submitted, approved and implemented to help deliver a quality landscape setting for Cambridge East. Marshall has already embarked on the preparation of such a strategy (see the Cambridge East Living Spaces report) and this supports all of the principles of Policy CE/16(1).	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>b</i>				
9810 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Object	"Important Countryside Frontages" need to be protected by law to prevent encroachment and to enable currently environmentally important use to continue.	"Important Countryside Frontages" are a policy designation which although part of the Development Plan for South Cambridgeshire cannot have legal protection. They area nevertheless areas where development will not normally be permitted if it compromised the purpose of the designation.	No change.
<hr/>				
<i>2</i>				
11416 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports Policies CE/16(2) and CE/16(4) which stipulate the treatment of construction spoil on site in a manner appropriate to the local topography and landscape character, and the retention of existing landscape features on the site which are appropriate to the local landscape character. These principles have been incorporated into the Preliminary Landscape Masterplan proposed within the Cambridge East Living Spaces report and will be developed further as the masterplan progresses.	Support noted.	
<hr/>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
3 11418 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall support the principle that water should be a defining characteristic feature of Cambridge East but consider that it is important that this is delivered in a sustainable manner by, for example, using natural runoff, groundwater and existing watercourses, and that these features can be easily and economically maintained. LDA Design's Preliminary Landscape Masterplan contained within the Cambridge East Living Spaces report indicates potential water features but the feasibility of these has yet to be tested by further design and engineering studies. Marshall therefore suggest that Policy CE/16(3) is re-worded to say 'Water in the form of lakes and watercourses will be a defining characteristic of Cambridge East if the ground conditions and environmental conditions prove amenable.'	Water to be managed as part of a Sustainable Urban Drainage system is considered to have potential to form an important design feature of the development. This should take full advantage of the natural characteristics of the site to deliver a low maintenance surface water drainage system. The type, nature and scale of such water features will be determined through further studies and masterplanning.	Amend Policy C16/3 to read: "Water in the form of lakes and watercourses which take full advantage of the natural characteristics of the site to deliver a low maintenance sustainable urban drainage system will be a defining characteristic of Cambridge East."
4 11417 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports Policies CE/16(2) and CE/16(4) which stipulate the treatment of construction spoil on site in a manner appropriate to the local topography and landscape character, and the retention of existing landscape features on the site which are appropriate to the local landscape character. These principles have been incorporated into the Preliminary Landscape Masterplan proposed within the Cambridge East Living Spaces report and will be developed further as the masterplan progresses.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>5</i>				
11419 - The Marshall Group	Object	<p>Marshall proposes that Policy CE/16(5) is reworded to say:</p> <p>'The existing tree belt along the northern boundary of the site, along the disused railway line and High Ditch Road, will be retained and enhanced as strategic landscaping to the development. The existing tree belts on the western boundary of the development where it adjoins the existing edge of Cambridge, and the eastern edge of Phase 1 where it currently runs between two arable fields, will be retained as woodland but developed as LEAPs (Local Equipped Areas for Play). This could include selective thinning to create clearings and the introduction of appropriate play equipment, picnic furniture etc.'</p>	<p>Children's play areas need to be located where they are conveniently accessible to the children they are to serve and for safety reasons where there is overlooking from surrounding houses. The majority of play areas will therefore be within rather than on the edge of the development. Woodlands also present practical difficulties for formal play areas with the potential for root damage, increased maintenance costs from having to clear leaves as well as safety issues from lower levels of supervision. This would suggest that relatively large areas would need to be cleared. There may nevertheless be opportunities for informal play in these woodlands, but this would be more appropriately addressed through detailed consideration in the masterplanning process.</p>	No change.
<i>D8.5</i>				
11420 - The Marshall Group	Object	<p>Marshall proposes that the following sentence is added to paragraph D8.5 consistent with our objection to Policy CE/16(3): 'It is recognised that further design and engineering studies will be needed to test the feasibility of water features and that they will only be implemented if they can be delivered in a sustainable manner using natural runoff, groundwater and existing watercourses, and if the features can be easily and economically maintained.'</p>	<p>Agreed as part of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System for Cambridge East which will obviate the need for expensive and artificial surface water drainage systems.</p>	<p>Add the following to the end of paragraph D8.5: "Essential to the delivery of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) for Cambridge East, design and engineering studies will be needed to test the feasibility of water features and that they will only be implemented if they can be delivered in a sustainable manner, including using natural runoff, groundwater and existing watercourses, and if the features can be easily and economically maintained."</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D8.7</i>				
11421 - The Marshall Group	Object	Paragraph D8.7 should be re-worded to say that the existing tree belts on the western and eastern boundaries of the development, which will lie within the urban area, should become public open space in the form of woodland play and picnic areas. The tree belts will retain their woodland character and appearance. Marshall agrees that the northern sections of this tree belt, which runs along the disused railway line and High Ditch Road, and which will mark the new Green Belt boundary, should be retained as strategic landscaping. This is consistent with Marshall's objection to Policy CE/16(5).	Children's play areas need to be located where they are conveniently accessible to the children they are to serve and for safety reasons where there is overlooking from surrounding houses. The majority of play areas will therefore be within rather than on the edge of the development. Woodlands also present practical difficulties for formal play areas with the potential for root damage, increased maintenance costs from having to clear leaves as well as safety issues from lower levels of supervision. This would suggest that relatively large areas would need to be cleared. There may nevertheless be opportunities for informal play in these woodlands, but this would be more appropriately addressed through detailed consideration in the masterplanning process.	No change.
<i>I</i>				
8069 - The National Trust	Object	A fourth category should be added on which Green Fingers should be based ie. 'planned cycle and footway facilities such as route to the Bridge of Reeds'.	This policy addresses the issue of green fingers within the development. Cycle and footway routes are addressed in Policy CE/14. Whilst there may be some occasions where green fingers provide opportunities for routes for non-car modes, this is not a key principle.	
11422 - The Marshall Group	Support	Policies CE/17(1 and 4) Green Fingers - support Marshall supports these policies relating to Green Fingers.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>2</i>				
11424 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall supports the principle that water should ideally be a central feature in many of the Green Fingers but consider that it should be where it can be delivered in a sustainable manner. The policy should be re-worded to say 'Water will be a central feature in many of these Green Fingers if ground conditions and environmental conditions prove amenable.'	Agreed as part of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDs) for Cambridge East.	Amend Policy CE17/2 to read: "Water will be a central feature in many of these Green Fingers as part of the delivery of a natural and low maintenance Sustainable Urban Drainage System."
<i>3</i>				
11425 - The Marshall Group	Object	The first sentence of this policy should be re-worded to say 'They will have landscaping and biodiversity value and also perform a recreational function for formal and informal recreation, and children's play'. This would be consistent with supporting paragraph D8.10 which states that 'There may be potential for the wider areas of the Green Fingers to accommodate some formal sports provision...' and with the Cambridge East Living Spaces report which proposes courts and formal pitches as well as children's play within these fingers in a manner which will contribute positively to their character and vitality.	Not agreed. Policy CE/17 (3) proposes that the Green Fingers will be provide for informal recreation and children's play. It does not rule out sports provision. The written justification in paragraph D8.10 only indicates that there might be some possibility for formal sports provision without detracting from their overall landscape and biodiversity role.	No change.
<i>4</i>				
11423 - The Marshall Group	Support	Policies CE/17(1 and 4) Green Fingers - support Marshall supports these policies relating to Green Fingers.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>5</i>				
11426 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports these policies which set out some design principles relating to the existing edge of the City, landscaping of the built environment, the Urban Park and landscaping of open spaces.	Support noted.	
<i>6</i>				
11427 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports these policies which set out some design principles relating to the existing edge of the City, landscaping of the built environment, the Urban Park and landscaping of open spaces.	Support noted.	
<i>7</i>				
11428 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports these policies which set out some design principles relating to the existing edge of the City, landscaping of the built environment, the Urban Park and landscaping of open spaces.	Support noted.	
<i>8</i>				
11429 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports these policies which set out some design principles relating to the existing edge of the City, landscaping of the built environment, the Urban Park and landscaping of open spaces.	Support noted.	
<i>D8.9</i>				
11430 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall supports the principle of green fingers but proposes that the last sentence should be re-worded to say 'Water will be a central feature of many of these Green Fingers if the ground conditions and environmental conditions prove amenable.' Water features should only be created where they can be delivered in a sustainable manner. This is consistent with our objection to Policy CD/17(2).	Agreed as part of a Sustainable Urban Drainage system (SUDs) for Cambridge East.	Amend the final sentence of paragraph D8.9 to read: "Provided that the ground conditions and environmental prove amenable, water will be a central feature of these Green Fingers as part of a Sustainable Urban Drainage system for Cambridge East thus enhancing this aspect of the character of the new urban quarter."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D9/i</i>				
11257 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Important that any management strategy links with the landscape strategy.	Support noted.	
<i>CE/19 Biodiversity</i>				
9173 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust fully supports this policy.	Support noted.	
<i>CE/20 Existing Biodiversity Features</i>				
11097 - Environment Agency 9169 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	General support for the policy and protection of existing biodiversity features.	Support noted	
<i>CE/21 New Biodiversity Features</i>				
11098 - Environment Agency 9164 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 9156 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	General support for this policy and the proposal for a Country Park on land north of Teversham.	Support noted.	
<i>2</i>				
10352 - Teversham Parish Council 8298 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support for this policy and the proposal for a Country Park on land north of Teversham.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Objectives</i>				
8491 - English Heritage	Object	We welcome this section. It is important that the analysis of historic interest contributes to the form of the new development, whether in detailed design and materials, or in its layout. Protection of historic environment assets is important, but the characteristics of the site should be used to develop a distinctive new urban area. As stated above, historic landscape data can provide greater understanding of the existing landscape, by providing time depth, and contributing an understanding of the significance of features in the landscape. Reference to this new tool should be incorporated into the policy framework of the plan.	It is not considered that the landscape character of Cambridge East represents an historic landscape character that it would be appropriate, or indeed practicable, to seek to protect through the development. A major new urban quarter will inevitably change the open character of the Airport and the open character largely devoid of landscaping would not be appropriate for the development. Notwithstanding, relevant information sources such as historic landscape data would be useful in providing contextual background for the development of appropriate archaeological and landscaping strategies.	
<i>CE/22 Archaeology</i>				
11258 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Will ensure an appropriate level of assessment and evaluation will be undertaken in support of planning applications, allowing for appropriate mitigation measures to be developed.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE/23 Built Heritage</i>				
8299 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall is generally supportive of this policy. It is troubled by comments in paragraph D10.4 (separate representation) that there might be buildings on the North Works site that are to be elevated above the ordinary. The listed terminal on the South Works is to be retained and become a focal point at the end of an open space corridor, to enhance its setting.	Support noted. Paragraph D10.4 states that although there are substantial built structures within the action plan area, those on the North Works site are not important as built heritage for either their architectural quality or their historical associations.	
10354 - Teversham Parish Council	Support	Teversham Parish Council support the proposal to require a comprehensive site survey to identify which buildings and structures should be retained within the Cambridge East development for their heritage value. The Council considers that such buildings and structures are symbolic of the history and landscape of the area and should be preserved within the Cambridge East development.	Support noted.	
<i>D10.4</i>				
8300 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall is troubled by comments in this paragraph that there might be buildings on the North Works site that are to be elevated above the ordinary. The listed terminal on the South Works is to be retained and become a focal point at the end of an open space corridor, to enhance its setting.	Disagree. Paragraph D10.4 states that although there are substantial built structures within the action plan area, those on the North Works site are not important as built heritage for either their architectural quality or their historical associations.	
10355 - Teversham Parish Council	Support	The Parish Council is keen that the heritage value of buildings upon the current airport site is fully considered and that strenuous attempts are made to retain and/or reuse Airport buildings, and in particular the control and terminal building (paragraph D10.4) and the tall control tower (paragraph D10.5).	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D10.5</i>				
8371 - The Marshall Group	Object	To suggest that the Control Tower has heritage value is overstating its role.	Disagree. Paragraph D10.5 merely states that any survey undertaken as required by Policy CE/23 should consider whether features such as the control tower have a heritage value and assess the potential for reuse within the development. Further, it is acknowledged that such buildings are distinctive features in the wider Cambridge townscape.	
10356 - Teversham Parish Council	Support	The Parish Council is keen that the heritage value of buildings upon the current airport site is fully considered and that strenuous attempts are made to retain and/or reuse Airport buildings, and in particular the control and terminal building (paragraph D10.4) and the tall control tower (paragraph D10.5).	Support noted.	
<i>Objectives</i>				
11431 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports objectives D11/a to D11/d and these are features which have been built into the proposed masterplan for Cambridge East.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE/24 Public Open Space and Sports Provision</i>				
8848 - RAVE	Object	Reconciling the open Space Requirements for the projected 25,000 - 29,000 persons expected to come to Cambridge East with the site area and projected densities has not been possible. Achieving this provision within the site area is not really credible.	The dwelling capacities identified have regard to the wide range of supporting infrastructure both built and open uses that are required to support the new urban quarter. However, the AAP advocates a design-led approach to the development and the yield identified is an indicative assessment and not a fixed requirement. The objective is to maximise yield to make best use of land but only to an extent compatible with achieving a high quality new urban quarter.	
8372 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the open space and recreation standards as set out in Appendix 3. Those standards are excessive and do not accord with the National Playing Fields' Association's guidance. LDA Design has prepared a document, which is submitted under separate cover, setting out the basis for the objection to the standards in Appendix 3.	Sport England East advises that the standards in Appendix 3 provide a sound basis for ensuring that adequate outdoor sports facility provision is made in the Cambridge East development because the standard proposed for outdoor sport (1.2 ha per 1000 people) is locally derived and based on the assessment of local need that has been undertaken by Cambridge City Council. The standards are considered robust and would accord with the guidance in paragraphs 6-8 of PPG17. Cambridge City Council's standards are considered to be more appropriate than those of South Cambridgeshire for the Cambridge East development because the development will functionally be an extension of Cambridge and will have open space needs that are more likely to be comparable to those in urban Cambridge than the villages in rural South Cambridgeshire	No change.
9356 - Sport England East	Support	Policy CE/24 is strongly supported.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>1</i>				
11432 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall support that provision for outdoor sports facilities, teenagers and children, informal open space and allotments should be made in Cambridge East but object to the standards set out in Appendix 3. The reasons for this and the proposed revisions to the Open Space and Recreation Standards for Cambridge East are discussed in Marshall's objection to Appendix 3.	Sport England East advises that the standards in Appendix 3 can be supported as the standard proposed for outdoor sport (1.2 ha per 1000 people) is locally derived and based on the assessment of local need that has been undertaken by Cambridge City Council. The standards are considered robust and would accord with the guidance in paragraphs 6-8 of PPG17. Cambridge City Council's standards are considered to be more appropriate than those of South Cambridgeshire for the Cambridge East development because the development will functionally be an extension of Cambridge and will have open space needs that are more likely to be comparable to those in urban Cambridge than the villages in rural South Cambridgeshire. The standard for allotment provision is also locally derived and is based on the present pattern of useage within Cambridge City.	No change.
<i>3</i>				
8373 - The Marshall Group	Object	CE/24/3 Marshall objects to the bald statement that The requirements of the strategy would be funded in full by the development. The material set out at various places in D.11 indicates that certain facilities serving a sub-regional function might appropriately be located at Cambridge East, given the fact that they cannot successfully be accommodated in Cambridge itself. In such circumstances, it would be entirely appropriate for other funding to be sought and found, to deliver that element of the facilities that are not reasonably related to the development itself.	It is appropriate and consistent with national planning policy for planning obligations for the development at Cambridge East to fund in full recreation and sporting uses which is directly related to the development. However, for any sub-regional facilities which are located at Cambridge East only a contribution related in scale and kind to the benefit to be enjoyed by the development could be required.	Amend policy CE/24 (3) to read:"The requirements of the strategy for formal sports provision which are directly related to the needs of the future residents of Cambridge East will be met in full by the development."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>4</i>				
8374 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the inclusion of a 25 metre indoor swimming pool, squash courts, floodlit artificial turf pitches for hockey and football, outdoor and indoor bowls facilities, an athletics track and golf facilities, as they do not reasonably arise in relation to the development itself.	The AAP identifies an indicative list of facilities that are likely to be required to serve a development of the scale of Cambridge East, prepared in consultation with Sport England. The final list will be subject to the findings of the sub-regional formal sports strategy and the site specific strategy for Cambridge East.	
<i>5</i>				
8433 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the indication that grass pitches at secondary or primary schools will not count towards the provision of the required public open space. That is too severe. Some consideration of those playing fields should be taken into account. In any transaction transferring any land to the Education Authority, Marshall will make it plain that the facilities to be provided, including playing fields, should be made available for public use, subject to that use being responsibly pursued.	Formal sports facilities are available to the wider community and sports pitches provide an important large green space for a number of different community activities. If they are based at schools, the Councils' experience is that the community access to its public open space is severely restricted. The County Council has advised that it does not want school playing fields to be included as part of the formal sports provision. There is no guarantee that the facilities will be available when wanted, particularly in school holidays and furthermore that the increased wear and tear will require an increase in maintenance which in turn may lead to less availability for both school and community.	
11259 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports the expectation that school playing fields will not be included as part of the overall open space standard.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
6 8434 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the proposition that all homes should be within 1,000 metres of outdoor sports provision. In seeking to create a healthy new quarter, the imposition of this range as the maximum acceptable for outdoor sports provision seems curious in the extreme. Many of the homes will be within that maximum distance but there will be others, because of the location both of the homes and of the proposed sports fields, that will not lie within that distance. Having to take more exercise in reaching such destinations will be acceptable.	The overall objective for locating outdoor sports provision within Cambridge East is that it should be conveniently located for all age groups of users. The standard reflects this aim. At the detailed planning stage it may not be practicable to ensure that 100% of users will be within 1,000m of some form of outdoor sports provision, but it must be demonstrated why this is the case and that it will still meet the needs of the community.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7 8435 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the requirement that no homes should be more than 60 metres from a local area for play. That seems far too limited a range given that the majority of children using such areas are likely to be the subject of direct parental supervision. Such provision could reasonably be within 240 metres of any homes.	The objective is to ensure that all homes have easy access of local open space suitable for informal play, particularly by young children. The 60m threshold comes from the NPFA standards. South Cambs DC is currently developing its own standards reflecting local circumstances as required by PPG17, which suggests that a threshold of 100m would be more appropriate. It is considered that this would be appropriate for Cambridge East as a whole, where access to informal open areas is particularly important given its high density character.	Revise Policy CE/24 criterion 7(m) to read: "No home will be more than 100m from a Local Area for Play (LAP)."
9523 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Fairview object to the requirement to involve local children and young people in the design of all play areas. Such requirements potentially affect the viability of delivering development at the site and should not jeopardise the main priorities of the Plan. They should be considered in the context of other requirements and the overall viability of the proposed development.	The objective is to involve children in the design of equipped play areas. The policy should therefore apply to all play areas except LAPs. The process of involving young people in the design of play areas close to them is important to help increase ownership of such facilities and responsible treatment of them. This will be a community development project working with local schools and should not be too onerous on the developer or have a material impact on viability.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8 9892 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	Urban Park to north of Newmarket road □ such more formal amenity is welcomed however a similar formal/urban park should be allocated at this stage to both of the southern development areas (i.e. urban extension south of the Newmarket Road and the urban extension to north of Church End/Cheery Hinton) linked with the proposed District Centre and Green Corridor (the latter being of a more informal/semi-natural nature). This is to cater for all and particularly those who cannot walk large distances and wish to have more formal amenities (from lawn areas to bedding schemes, sports/playing fields and allotments). In relation to the proposed phasing (page 149 Policy CE/39) the Society considers it paramount to include an urban park to the Cherry Hinton/Church End Extension to enable adequate community provision at this early stage of the site development.	The purpose of the urban park is to provide a large open space within the built up area to serve the area around Newmarket Road which will be some distance from the Green Corridor. Whilst it will be different in character to the Green Corridor, it is not considered that it is necessary to require other formal parks in the built up areas north and south of the Green Corridor. However, both these areas will need to have significant areas of open space provision, including formal sports provision and children's play and could also include an area for informal recreation which could have a more formal character.	
11433 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall support the provision of an Urban Park within the site of the existing park and ride, provided that the park and ride can be re-located elsewhere, but consider that the list of potential sports and play facilities should be extended to include equipped children's play, outdoor youth provision and a cricket pitch, in addition to the tennis courts and bowls specifically mentioned.	The purpose of the Urban Park is to provide an outdoor venue for informal entertainment and community events and act as a peaceful yet at times vibrant area close to where people live. There are many examples in Cambridge of such a space, the best example of which is Jesus Green. Some form of additional equipped children's play and other outdoor sports provision could be included which would be compatible with those uses but including 'land hungry' uses such as cricket would be likely to require a larger area to be devoted to the Park than would otherwise be the case. Nowhere in Cambridge is there a sufficiently large space that all of the uses raised in this objection co-exist at the same time.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8436 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall suggests that the urban park to be created on the side of the existing park and ride site may well be suitable for some playing fields. Indeed, it may be that given the nature of the construction of the extensive areas of car parking, it might be possible to adapt part of those areas to provide all-weather playing surfaces. In addition, this is a location where floodlighting might well raise significantly fewer problems than it might do in the more open landscape of the rest of the urban quarter.	The purpose of the Urban Park is to provide an outdoor venue for informal entertainment and community events and act as a peaceful yet at times vibrant area close to where people live. There are many examples in Cambridge of such a space, the best example of which is Jesus Green. Some form of additional equipped children's play and other outdoor sports provision could be included which would be compatible with those uses but including 'land hungry' uses such as cricket would be likely to require a larger area to be devoted to the Park than would otherwise be the case. Nowhere in Cambridge is there a sufficiently large space that all of the uses raised in this objection co-exist at the same time.	
<i>10</i>				
10942 - House Builders Federation	Object	The policy states that recreational facilities and landscaping will be required to provide commuted maintenance sums for a minimum of 10 years index linked. Policy SF/12 of the Development Control Policies DPD states that commuted maintenance sums will be required for 10 years. There would appear to be no justification for seeking a higher figure for the Cambridge East Area than elsewhere. Therefore, the figures should be the same across the two documents, and the word "minimum" deleted.	In response to representations to the Core Strategy and the publication of Circular 05/2005 in July after the draft LDF documents were published, it is proposed to delete the specific time period for maintenance contributions in the LDF and to prepare SPD which will address the implications of the circular. The detail required to address different types of obligation within a development of this scale is best addressed through SPD.	Revise 2nd sentence of CE/24 criterion 10 to read: "Commuted maintenance sums will be required IN ACCORDANCE WITH SPD."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D11.3</i>				
11434 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall support that provision for outdoor sports facilities, teenagers and children, informal open space and allotments should be made in Cambridge East but object to the standards set out in Appendix 3. This is consistent with Marshall's objection to Policy CE/24(1) and the reasons for this, and the proposed revisions to the Open Space and Recreation Standards for Cambridge East, are described under their objection for Appendix 3.	Sport England East advises that the standards in Appendix 3 provide a sound basis for ensuring that adequate outdoor sports facility provision is made in the Cambridge East development. The standard proposed for outdoor sport (1.2 ha per 1000 people) is locally derived and based on the assessment of local need that has been undertaken by Cambridge City Council, the standards are considered robust and would accord with the guidance in paragraphs 6-8 of PPG17. Cambridge City Council's standards are considered to be more appropriate than those of South Cambridgeshire for the Cambridge East development because the development will functionally be an extension of Cambridge and will have open space needs that are more likely to be comparable to those in urban Cambridge than the villages in rural South Cambridgeshire. The allotment standard is also locally derived and is based on the pattern of existing useage of allotments in Cambridge City.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D11.15</i>				
11435 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall support the provision of an Urban Park within the site of the existing park and ride, provided that the park and ride can be re-located elsewhere, but consider that equipped children's play, outdoor youth provision and a cricket pitch should be located here in addition to the tennis courts and bowls specifically mentioned in paragraph D11.15.	The purpose of the Urban Park is to provide an outdoor venue for informal entertainment and community events and act as a peaceful yet at times vibrant area close to where people live. There are many examples in Cambridge of such a space, the best example of which is Jesus Green. Some form of additional equipped children's play and other outdoor sports provision could be included which would be compatible with those uses but including 'land hungry' uses such as cricket would be likely to require a larger area to be devoted to the Park than would otherwise be the case. Nowhere in Cambridge is there a sufficiently large space that all of the uses raised in this objection co-exist at the same time.	
<i>D11.16</i>				
11436 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the limited use of the Green Corridor stipulated by paragraph D11.16 and considers that it should also contain playing fields, courts and equipped children's play areas. These facilities could be provided in a way that creates an attractive and vibrant open space. It would reflect the rich variety and character of the City's existing Green Corridors, support government and other urban design and green space design guidance which promotes the multi-functional use of green spaces, and promote the efficient and sustainable use of land.	The Green Corridor is intended to have an informal character. The best way to provide sports pitches is to provide a group of up to 8 pitches located together, with a multi purpose clubhouse/pavilion. There may also be advantages to locating these adjacent to the secondary school pitches where the opportunity to share floodlit facilities exists. Facilities involving hard surfaces and which are available all year round and permanently available for public use through a dual use agreement can count towards open space standards. For these reasons, the Green Corridor does not lend itself to this scale or type of formal recreation provision.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D11.20</i>				
8437 - The Marshall Group	Object	There is no evidence to suggest that the demand for allotments may increase disproportionately. Recent trends in Cambridge suggest that the demand for allotments has fallen and continues to fall. On that basis, Marshall objects to the specified requirement of 0.4 hectare per 1,000 people (Appendix 3).	The standard of allotment provision is based on the pattern of allotments usage within Cambridge City. It is not inconceivable that demand for allotments at Cambridge East could be higher than elsewhere in the city as development densities across the site will be higher than for Cambridge as a whole and gardens will on average be smaller.	
<i>CE/25 Countryside Recreation</i>				
8483 - The Marshall Group	Object	Appropriate recognition should be given to the fact that this country park will have a sub-regional function as opposed to one confined simply to the needs of the residents in the new urban quarter. That wider role will need to be taken into account in the issue of longer-term funding.	The new strategic open space standard proposed in response to other representations in all the South Cambs LDF documents requires that all new development makes contributions towards strategic open space to serve its own needs. Only in circumstances where provision required by the AAP exceeded that standard would the development not be required to provide it. It is recognised that it will also attract visitors from outside the development, but its provision is nonetheless a reasonable requirement of the development. The nature and timescale for contributions will be determined as part of planning obligations package having regard to the requirements of circular 05/2005.	
8070 - The National Trust	Object	After the reference to National Trust add the words 'via the proposed Bridge of Reeds'.	The Bridge of Reeds is not yet a formal agreed project and it would be inappropriate to include it in the policy. However, it is referred to in paragraph D11.26.	
8438 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall supports the provision of a country park to the north of Teversham.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>I</i> 11264 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Whilst supporting the provision of a country park for Cambridge East, the process for identifying the location proposed is questioned. Has there been an assessment of its integration into the wider landscape, the existing public Rights of Way network and existing biodiversity/wildlife features?	In considering the suitable site for the country park, regard was had to the need for it to be accessible to the majority of the new urban quarter, link with the Green Corridor, make best use of existing landscape features and opportunities to link into existing rights of way and also potential to share car parking with the relocated park and ride site. The identified site was clearly preferable having regard to these criteria.	
10353 - Teversham Parish Council 11437 - The Marshall Group 9896 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Support	General support for the proposal of a country park.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
2 11438 - The Marshall Group 9894 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	Cambridge Preservation Society - The proposal map should highlight existing and new crossings of the existing railway route and envisaged pedestrian, cycle and horse rider's access routes and crossings between urban extension areas and along the edge of the Green Corridor and linking with the countryside beyond (similarly as undertaken with the Southern fringe concept Plan). Marshalls - supports the principle that footpath, bridleway and cycleway links should be provided to the north to the River Cam and to the extension to Wicken Fen but point out that these are outside the control of the Cambridge East development where they lie outside land owned by Marshall. The wording of the second sentence of Policy CE/25(2) should be revised to say: 'Links should be provided to existing or potential new rights of way adjoining the site to the north, which lead to the River Cam and to the extension to Wicken proposed in the long-term by the National Trust.'	The Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan shows 'desire lines' for public access. Detailed routes will be explored and put in place during the implementation stages of the proposes development. Marshall's representation draws attention to land not within their control and whilst linking to existing rights of way will be important, the County Council will use its rights of way powers or agreements with landowners to extend the network across such land.	Amend Policy CE/25 (2) to read: "Links should be provided to existing or potential new rights of way adjoining the site to the north, which lead to the River Cam and to the extension to Wicken Fen proposed in the long-term by the National Trust."
7947	Support	An actual bridleway network has to be established which provides for current and future horse riders in and around Cambridge (and which can also be used by cyclists and pedestrians)	Support noted. The details of the new network can be explored during the implementation stages of the development.	
9178 - Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	Support	Welcome reference to the provision of an enhanced network of footpaths, bridleways and cycleways.	Support noted.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Councils' Assessment

Change to Draft DPD

D11.21

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11439 - The Marshall Group	Object	Proposed new paragraph between D11.21 and D11.22: It needs to be clearly stated that the Country Park will only be delivered if the airport is re-located and the whole Cambridge East development proceeds. A new paragraph should be introduced which says: 'The delivery of the Country Park will not be confirmed until the re-location of the airport is certain and the whole Cambridge East development can proceed.'	At the time of writing the Pre-Submission Draft of the AAP, work was still in progress, led by the County Council, on a county wide standard for strategic open space. This was recognised in paragraph D11.22. In the light of the County Council's recommendation that a standard of 5.1ha per 1000 people is an appropriate standard for Cambridgeshire which reflects current levels of strategic open space provision and seeks to ensure that levels of provision per head of population are not reduced as a result of development, it is now appropriate to include a standard in the AAP. The use of a standard would mean that Phase 1 would need to make a contribution towards strategic open space (SOS). The most appropriate form and timing of that contribution is a matter best addressed through discussions on any planning application, but it could be in the form of financial contributions used within or close to the site of Phase 1 either alongside the development or some time afterwards. Alternatively, it could potentially take the form of a legal undertaking that the area of land required by the standard will be provided at the country park when it comes forward in association with a later stage of development. This needs to be reflected in the recreation chapter and also in the planning obligations chapter.	<p>Add the following to Policy CE/25 at the end of paragraph 1:</p> <p>"CAMBRIDGE EAST WILL PROVIDE STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION STANDARDS SET OUT IN APPENDIX 3."</p> <p>Delete paragraph D11.22 and replace with the following:</p> <p>"THE COUNTY AND DISTRICT COUNCILS HAVE DEVELOPED THE CONCEPT OF STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE (SOS). SOS PROVIDES MORE THAN A LOCAL FUNCTION AND SPACES ARE GENERALLY LARGER, MORE VARIED, AND PROVIDE A DIFFERENT VISITOR EXPERIENCE TO VILLAGE OPEN SPACES. A DEFINITION OF STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE IS INCLUDED WITH THE STANDARD IN APPENDIX 3, BUT IN BROAD TERMS INCLUDES PARKS, GARDENS AND AREAS OF NATURAL AND SEMI-NATURAL GREENSPACE THAT PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR INFORMAL RECREATION AND PUBLIC ACCESS, AND WHICH ARE GREATER THAN 25HA IN EXTENT. THE APPLICATION OF A STANDARD RELATING TO POPULATION LEVELS WOULD MEAN THAT ALL PHASES</p>

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******Councils' Assessment******Change to Draft DPD***

OF DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING PHASE 1, WOULD MAKE A CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE (SOS). THE MOST APPROPRIATE FORM OF THAT CONTRIBUTION AND HOW AND WHEN IT SHOULD COME FORWARD IS A MATTER BEST ADDRESSED THROUGH DISCUSSIONS ON ANY PLANNING APPLICATION. ONLY IF ANY OF THE AREAS IDENTIFIED FOR SOS ARE FOUND TO BE IN EXCESS OF THE NEEDS OF CAMBRIDGE EAST ITSELF WILL THAT PART OF THE COUNTRY PARK BE FUNDED BY MEANS OTHER THAN DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS.

Add the following to Appendix 3, Open Space and Recreation Standards as a new category at the top of the list:

TYPE OF OPEN SPACE: STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE
 DEFINITION: PARKS, GARDENS AND AREAS OF NATURAL AND SEMI-NATURAL GREENSPACE THAT PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR INFORMAL RECREATION AND PUBLIC ACCESS, ARE GREATER THAN 25HA IN EXTENT (EXC. WOODLAND* AND OPEN WATER) AND FULFIL FIVE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:
 -MEET STRUCTURE PLAN AND/OR

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******Councils' Assessment******Change to Draft DPD***

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES
 -CONTRIBUTE TO LARGE-SCALE PUBLIC ACCESS SCHEMES
 -CONTAIN A NETWORK OF LINEAR ACCESS ROUTES
 -PROVIDE FREE AND OPEN ACCESS ACROSS THE SITE
 -ARE SECURED FOR OR HAVE A RIGHT OF PUBLIC USE IN PERPETUITY
 -HAVE A STATUS OR AN INTENT TO ALLOW PUBLIC ACCESS
 -THE PROVISION OF FACILITIES THAT ASSIST PUBLIC ACCESS
 -MEET LOCAL BIODIVERSITY ACTION PLAN TARGETS
 *GIVEN THE NATURE OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND THE LACK OF WOODLAND IN THE COUNTY, PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE WOODLAND UNDER 25HA THAT MEETS FIVE OF THE ABOVE CRITERIA AND WHICH LIES WITHIN ENHANCEMENT AREAS WHERE THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF WOODLAND EXCEEDS 25HA SHOULD BE INCLUDED AS IT IS STRATEGICALLY AND ENVIRONMENTALLY IMPORTANT. STANDARD: 5.1HA PER 1000 PEOPLE.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D11.24</i>				
11278 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	A country park will also provide publicly accessible wildlife areas and habitats, and areas solely for nature conservation. This should be reflected in the text.	This would be a useful clarification of the wider characteristics of a country park.	Add the following to the 1st sentence of paragraph D11.24: "...with provision of publicly accessible wildlife areas and habitats, and areas solely for nature conservation.
<i>D11.25</i>				
11279 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support the expectation that the green corridor will have a more urban feel and that the country park will provide a more informal recreation function.	Support noted.	
11261 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Welcome the reference to the need to provide Strategic Open Space through the creation of a country park with a contribution from the green corridor.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D11.26</i>				
11280 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The policy and supporting text is supported. We would wish to see a reference to the Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP). This is a statutory plan required by the CROW Act 2000. The ROWIP should support improvements to the RoW network over the whole county, and it is anticipated that the County Council will work with districts and other partners to achieve this. The County would like to see a reference within Policy CE/25 para 2 to ROWIP as follows; "A strategy will be developed WITH REFERENCE TO THE RIGHTS OF WAY IMPROVEMENT PLAN to..." with an explanatory reference to the role of the ROWIP in the supporting text para 11.26..	Agreed.	Amend 1st sentence of Policy CE/25 para 2 to read: "A strategy will be developed WITH REFERENCE TO THE RIGHTS OF WAY IMPROVEMENT PLAN to link..." In paragraph D11.26, after the 1st sentence add the following new sentence: "This should be developed having regard to the Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP). This is a statutory plan required by the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000. The ROWIP will support improvements to the Rights of Way network over the whole county, and it is anticipated that the County Council will work with districts and other partners to achieve this."
11281 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Welcome mention of the Landscape East project of the 'Bridge of Reeds'. This will provide connectivity with Cambridge East and the wider countryside and is in line with Strategic objectives in the recently adopted Rights of Way Improvement Plan. It should be noted however that the planning of this bridge and the proposed replacement junction onto the A14 to serve Cambridge East must be closely co-ordinated.	Support noted. It is agreed that the relationship between the Bridge of Reeds proposal and any new road link to the A14 will require close coordination.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Table</i>				
11440 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall support the standards for Outdoor Sports (1.2ha per 1000 people), Provision for Children and Teenagers (0.3ha per 1000 people) and Informal Open Space (1.8ha per 1000 people), but only if a proportion of Outdoor Sports and Provision for Children and Teenagers can be located in the Green Corridor, the existing tree belt north of Newmarket Road, the Green Fingers and the Urban Park. Marshall objects to the standard for Allotments (0.4ha per 1000 people).	The standards of provision for recreation are based upon the forecast recreation requirements of the future population of Cambridge East. The availability of suitable land for recreational purposes is a separate issue and has no bearing on the standard of provision to be sought. The standard for allotment provision is derived from the existing patterns of usage of allotments within Cambridge City.	No change.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11263 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The County would like to see Strategic Open Space defined and added to this appendix. The standard is 5.1ha of SOS per 1000 people.	At the time of writing the Pre-Submission Draft of the AAP, work was still in progress, led by the County Council, on a county wide standard for strategic open space. This was recognised in paragraph D11.22. In the light of the County Council's recommendation that a standard of 5.1ha per 1000 people is an appropriate standard for Cambridgeshire which reflects current levels of strategic open space provision and seeks to ensure that levels of provision per head of population are not reduced as a result of development, it is now appropriate to include a standard in the AAP. The use of a standard would mean that Phase 1 would need to make a contribution towards strategic open space (SOS). The most appropriate form and timing of that contribution is a matter best addressed through discussions on any planning application, but it could be in the form of financial contributions used within or close to the site of Phase 1 either alongside the development or some time afterwards. Alternatively, it could potentially take the form of a legal undertaking that the area of land required by the standard will be provided at the country park when it comes forward in association with a later stage of development. This needs to be reflected in the recreation chapter and also in the planning obligations chapter.	<p>Add the following to Policy CE/25 at the end of paragraph 1:</p> <p>"CAMBRIDGE EAST WILL PROVIDE STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION STANDARDS SET OUT IN APPENDIX 3."</p> <p>Delete paragraph D11.22 and replace with the following:</p> <p>"THE COUNTY AND DISTRICT COUNCILS HAVE DEVELOPED THE CONCEPT OF STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE (SOS). SOS PROVIDES MORE THAN A LOCAL FUNCTION AND SPACES ARE GENERALLY LARGER, MORE VARIED, AND PROVIDE A DIFFERENT VISITOR EXPERIENCE TO VILLAGE OPEN SPACES. A DEFINITION OF STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE IS INCLUDED WITH THE STANDARD IN APPENDIX 3, BUT IN BROAD TERMS INCLUDES PARKS, GARDENS AND AREAS OF NATURAL AND SEMI-NATURAL GREENSPACE THAT PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR INFORMAL RECREATION AND PUBLIC ACCESS, AND WHICH ARE GREATER THAN 25HA IN EXTENT. THE APPLICATION OF A STANDARD RELATING TO POPULATION LEVELS WOULD MEAN THAT ALL PHASES</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
			<p>OF DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING PHASE 1, WOULD MAKE A CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE (SOS). THE MOST APPROPRIATE FORM OF THAT CONTRIBUTION AND HOW AND WHEN IT SHOULD COME FORWARD IS A MATTER BEST ADDRESSED THROUGH DISCUSSIONS ON ANY PLANNING APPLICATION. ONLY IF ANY OF THE AREAS IDENTIFIED FOR SOS ARE FOUND TO BE IN EXCESS OF THE NEEDS OF CAMBRIDGE EAST ITSELF WILL THAT PART OF THE COUNTRY PARK BE FUNDED BY MEANS OTHER THAN DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS.</p>
			<p>Add the following to Appendix 3, Open Space and Recreation Standards as a new category at the top of the list:</p>
			<p>TYPE OF OPEN SPACE: STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE DEFINITION: PARKS, GARDENS AND AREAS OF NATURAL AND SEMI-NATURAL GREENSPACE THAT PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR INFORMAL RECREATION AND PUBLIC ACCESS, ARE GREATER THAN 25HA IN EXTENT (EXC. WOODLAND* AND OPEN WATER) AND FULFIL FIVE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA: -MEET STRUCTURE PLAN AND/OR</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
				LOCAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES -CONTRIBUTE TO LARGE-SCALE PUBLIC ACCESS SCHEMES -CONTAIN A NETWORK OF LINEAR ACCESS ROUTES -PROVIDE FREE AND OPEN ACCESS ACROSS THE SITE -ARE SECURED FOR OR HAVE A RIGHT OF PUBLIC USE IN PERPETUITY -HAVE A STATUS OR AN INTENT TO ALLOW PUBLIC ACCESS -THE PROVISION OF FACILITIES THAT ASSIST PUBLIC ACCESS -MEET LOCAL BIODIVERSITY ACTION PLAN TARGETS *GIVEN THE NATURE OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND THE LACK OF WOODLAND IN THE COUNTY, PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE WOODLAND UNDER 25HA THAT MEETS FIVE OF THE ABOVE CRITERIA AND WHICH LIES WITHIN ENHANCEMENT AREAS WHERE THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF WOODLAND EXCEEDS 25HA SHOULD BE INCLUDED AS IT STANDARD: 5.1HA PER 1000 PEOPLE.
10943 - House Builders Federation	Object	The proposed standards seem unduly onerous in comparison with those for other areas.	Developments on the edge of Cambridge which span the District boundary will be subject to the locally derived recreation standards for Cambridge City.	No change.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9362 - Sport England East	Support	The standards in Appendix 3 are supported as they provide a basis for ensuring that adequate outdoor sports facility provision is made in the Cambridge East development. Furthermore, as the standard proposed for outdoor sport (1.2 ha per 1000 people) is locally derived and based on the assessment of local need that has been undertaken by Cambridge City Council, the standards are considered robust and would accord with the guidance in paragraphs 6-8 of PPG17. Cambridge City Council's standards are considered to be more appropriate than those of South Cambridgeshire for the Cambridge East development because the development will functionally be an extension of Cambridge and will have open space needs that are more likely to be comparable to those in urban Cambridge than the villages in rural South Cambridgeshire.	Support noted.	
<i>Objectives</i>				
9289 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards	Support	The Boards support the objectives of D12 an Integrated Water Strategy and Policy CE/26 Land Drainage, Water Conservation, Fould Drainage and Sewer Disposal.	Support noted.	
<i>D12/a</i>				
11282 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Welcome the acknowledgement of the forecast effects of climate change.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE/26 Land Drainage, Water Conservation, Foul Drainage And Sewage Disposal</i>				
8364	Object	Concreting over 250 hectares to build Cambridge East will significantly increase the flood risk for Teversham.	The issue of surface water drainage and the need to ensure that the Cambridge East proposals will not have adverse implications for adjoining areas, including Teversham, is an important requirement. Policy CE/26 should be strengthened to require a strategic surface water drainage scheme to be provided at an early stage for the whole Cambridge East area.	Add the following to Policy CE/26 at the end of paragraph 1: "... A STRATEGIC SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE SCHEME WILL BE REQUIRED AT AN EARLY STAGE FOR THE CAMBRIDGE EAST AREA."
8856 - RAVE	Object	This group of policies sets out the criteria which will need to be achieved. It does not contain any requirement to assess how these criteria may be met and whether such plans are remotely credible.	The role of the AAP is to set the appropriate tests against which any planning applications will be assessed to ensure that it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the local planning authority, in consultation with key stakeholders, that the proposals will plan effectively for a wide range of water related issues at Cambridge East. Various strategies will be required to be submitted alongside any planning application to demonstrate how the criteria in the policy will be met. These are highlighted in the Planning Obligations chapter. In addition to those listed, a strategic surface water drainage scheme will be required at an early stage. Planning permission will not be granted unless the criteria in the AAP are met. It is not for the AAP to be prescriptive on the solutions.	Add the following to Policy CE/26 at the end of paragraph 1: <input type="checkbox"/> "... A STRATEGIC SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE SCHEME WILL BE REQUIRED AT AN EARLY STAGE FOR THE CAMBRIDGE EAST AREA." Add to the table under para E2.7, at the row on surface water drainage, as a new first point in the columns on Phase 1 and Cambridge East as a whole: "A STRATEGIC SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE SCHEME WILL BE REQUIRED."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11099 - Environment Agency	Object	Whilst we support the inclusion of an integrated water strategy, it must be made clear that any surface water drainage scheme has to be STRATEGIC for the whole site. Piecemeal drainage systems will not be deemed appropriate.	This requirement is agreed. As a consequence, it should also be included in the schedule of planning obligations in chapter E2.	<p>Add the following to Policy CE/26 at the end of paragraph 1:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> "... A STRATEGIC SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE SCHEME WILL BE REQUIRED AT AN EARLY STAGE FOR THE CAMBRIDGE EAST AREA."</p> <p>Add to the table under para E2.7, at the row on surface water drainage, as a new first point in the columns on Phase 1 and Cambridge East as a whole:</p> <p>"A STRATEGIC SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE SCHEME WILL BE REQUIRED."</p>
11327	Object	East Anglia is one of the lowest rainfall areas in the country. Most summers a hose-pipe ban is in force reflecting the delicate balance of supply and demand already experienced. Additional housing in our area can only put further pressure on our water supply and sewerage treatment. The sewage treatment works at Milton are already struggling judging by the appalling stench from there as you pass Milton.	The principle of the development of Cambridge East as part of the overall Cambridge Sub Region strategy was considered at the examination into the Structure Plan. This included consideration of water supply and the Panel took the view that the scale of development could be accommodated satisfactorily. It is now for the AAP to set the appropriate policy requirements of any detailed proposals for development to ensure that they address issues of water supply in a satisfactory way. The AAP includes a requirement for water conservation measures as an integral part of the development to help achieve this.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10944 - House Builders Federation	Object	It is not evident as to why all water bodies and water courses will need to be maintained and managed by a single organisation in order to allow development to go ahead. Why should the managing organisation need to be managed in perpetuity at the cost of the development, why can't existing relevant water authorities become responsible?	(a) At the Preferred Options stage for each of the Area Action Plans, the District Council indicated its preference for a single body to take responsibility for all surface water drainage infrastructure at each development and that the adopting bodies should be funded in perpetuity by the development. This has been the approach at Milton Keynes. (b) It is the responsibility of the developers of Cambridge East to secure surface water drainage measures for their development, including long term maintenance. (c) Planning permission will not be granted until secure measures are agreed the long term drainage of phase 1 (north of Newmarket Road), phase 2 (north of Cherry Hinton) or phase 3 (the Airport). (d) Whilst more than one body could be involved, at the time of grant planning permission the LPA will need to know that all bodies responsible for the surface water drainage systems at Cambridge East are taking an integrated approach to provision and maintenance. (e) Development is on such a scale that existing surface water drainage systems in the area, which are mainly for agricultural purposes or to drain relatively small villages, and the organisations currently responsible for maintenance will be wholly inadequate. In many cases this will be riparian owners. (f) Without a legally binding agreement to maintenance in perpetuity it would be irresponsible for the LPA to grant planning permission. (g) Development should not even commence until surface water drainage matters have been agreed as unoccupied development will discharge water from roofs and other hard surfaces.	Amend policy CE/26(3) & (4) to allow for more than one body to take responsibility for surface water drainage subject to a requirement to integrate management and maintenance regimes with all other relevant bodies as follows: "3. All water bodies and watercourses required to serve the development will be maintained and managed by one or more organisations publicly accountable organisations to ensure a comprehensive and integrated approach to surface water drainage with clearly defined areas of responsibility and funding to ensure that: d. Flooding does not occur within Cambridge East; e. No additional discharge is made into surrounding water courses or onto surrounding land than that naturally discharging from the site in its current undeveloped form; f. Water quality and levels are maintained within Cambridge East's and receiving surface water drainage systems sufficient to support and encourage natural habitats; g. The managing organisation will be funded in perpetuity. 4. No development shall commence until the written agreement of the Local Planning Authority has been secured that organisations with sufficient powers, funding, resources, expertise and integrated management have legally committed to maintain and manage all surface water systems for

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
				Cambridge East in perpetuity."
9293 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards	Support	The Boards support the objectives of D12 an Integrated Water Strategy and Policy CE/26 Land Drainage, Water Conservation, Foul Drainage and Sewer Disposal.	Support noted.	
<i>g</i> 8439 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the requirement to fund in perpetuity a body which it will have previously established, which will be publicly accountable. The governance of this new urban quarter will need comprehensive scrutiny.	Paragraph B18 of Circular 05/2005 "Planning Obligations" makes it clear that it may be appropriate for a developer to make provision for maintenance in perpetuity where "the provision of facilities are predominantly for the benefit of users of the associated development". Because Cambridge East will be the only new development on the eastern edge of Cambridge, the surface surface water drainage system to be put in place to serve it will only be required for this development. Surface water drainage systems need to be maintained in perpetuity for the benefit of the development and downstream landowners as machinery can fail, blockages occur etc.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
4 9390 - GO-East	Object	In respect of paragraph 4 and the explanatory text at paragraph D12.8, we accept that it is important to ensure that management and maintenance arrangements are agreed and in place. We are not, however, as clear about the acceptability in the light of paragraphs B18 to B20 of Circular 05/2005, Planning Obligations of the implied funding of these arrangements in perpetuity by the developer. This needs to be considered further before this is included as a requirement in the submission AAP. [Soundness test iv]	Policy CE/26 (4) and paragraph 12.9 do not necessarily require that maintenance and management arrangements are funded in perpetuity by the development. They do however make it the responsibility of the developers of Cambridge East to make the necessary arrangements with an organisation to maintain and manage the surface water drainage systems serving the development in perpetuity. How it is funded will be the responsibility of the developers, but no development will be occupied until such management arrangements have been made the subject of a legal agreement.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
5 9790 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Object	Despite proposed water conservation of 25% reduction at the North Works development, we are concerned the water authorities will not be able to provide sufficient supply of water for these extra homes when we are under constant threat of water restrictions in the Cambridge area.	The issue of water supply was considered in the context of the Structure Plan Examination in Public and the Panel accepted that the proposed development strategy could be delivered. Notwithstanding the Council will wish it to be clearly demonstrated as part of any planning application that the development can be appropriately served by all required infrastructure. Note that in response to representations from GO-East criterion 5 regarding water conservation is proposed to be deleted as being outside the scope of the planning system to deliver.	
8440 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the reference to a 25% reduction in the use of piped water compared to the average. In doing so, Marshall is sympathetic to these objectives but would prefer to see a reference to a significant reduction as opposed to a prescribed level of reduction. If the impact of metering (estimated at 20% savings, para D12.3) can be taken into account, the 25% target may be achievable.	The Councils are keen to ensure that Cambridge East is as sustainable development as possible, including use of water resources. However, in view of the advice of GO-East that it is beyond the scope of the planning system to deliver such measures, the Councils agree reluctantly that criterion 5 should be deleted from the policy. The corresponding supporting text at paragraph D12.12 and D12.13 should be deleted. However, it is proposed to retain paragraph D12.11 to make clear that the Council considers that water conservation is an important issue at Cambridge East, although it lies outside the scope of the planning system. An extra sentence should be added to the end of the paragraph to make this clear.	Delete criterion 5 from Policy CE/26. Add new sentence to the end of paragraph D12.11 to read: "...THIS IMPORTANT ISSUE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS PART OF THE CAMBRIDGE EAST PROPOSALS, ALTHOUGH IT LIES OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE PLANNING SYSTEM." Delete paragraphs D12.12 and D12.13.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9392 - GO-East	Object	In respect of paragraph 5, whilst supportive of measures that seek to conserve water we are concerned that these measures may not be within the scope of the planning system to deliver. Other approaches should be investigated about how these important objectives in support of sustainable development might be achieved. [Soundness test iv]	The Councils are keen to ensure that Cambridge East is as sustainable development as possible, including use of water resources. However, in view of the advice of GO-East that it is beyond the scope of the planning system to deliver such measures, the Councils agree reluctantly that criterion 5 should be deleted from the policy. The corresponding supporting text at paragraph D12.12 and D12.13 should be deleted. However, it is proposed to retain paragraph D12.11 to make clear that the Council considers that water conservation is an important issue at Cambridge East, although it lies outside the scope of the planning system. An extra sentence should be added to the end of the paragraph to make this clear.	Delete criterion 5 from Policy CE/26. Add new sentence to the end of paragraph D12.11 to read: "...THIS IMPORTANT ISSUE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS PART OF THE CAMBRIDGE EAST PROPOSALS, ALTHOUGH IT LIES OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE PLANNING SYSTEM." Delete paragraphs D12.12 and D12.13.
9513 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Fairview object to the requirement in Policy CE/26 paragraph 5 for all development to incorporate water recycling facilities and at least 25% reduction in the use of piped water compared to the average water consumption for development which does not have water conservation measures. Such requirements potentially affect the viability of delivering development at the site and should not jeopardise the main priorities of the Plan. They should be considered in the context of other Section 106 requirements and the overall viability of the proposed development.	The Councils are keen to ensure that Cambridge East is as sustainable development as possible, including use of water resources. However, in view of the advice of GO-East that it is beyond the scope of the planning system to deliver such measures, the Councils agree reluctantly that criterion 5 should be deleted from the policy. The corresponding supporting text at paragraph D12.12 and D12.13 should be deleted. However, it is proposed to retain paragraph D12.11 to make clear that the Council considers that water conservation is an important issue at Cambridge East, although it lies outside the scope of the planning system. An extra sentence should be added to the end of the paragraph to make this clear.	Delete criterion 5 from Policy CE/26. Add new sentence to the end of paragraph D12.11 to read: "...THIS IMPORTANT ISSUE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS PART OF THE CAMBRIDGE EAST PROPOSALS, ALTHOUGH IT LIES OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE PLANNING SYSTEM." Delete paragraphs D12.12 and D12.13.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D12.3</i>				
8056 - The National Trust	Object	D12.3 to D12.7 - The management of the water systems will be crucial because:- 1. An increase in surface water drainage to the east could have a serious impact on the amount of water that feeds Lode Mill, the working watermill within the grounds of Anglesey Abbey. 2. There could be an adverse effect on the areas within Wicken Fen Vision where new wildlife habitats are to be created.	The strategies for dealing with water systems will need to take account of any wider implications to areas beyond the site and avoid any adverse impacts.	
<i>D12.8</i>				
9391 - GO-East	Object	In respect of paragraph 4 and the explanatory text at paragraph D12.8, we accept that it is important to ensure that management and maintenance arrangements are agreed and in place. We are not, however, as clear about the acceptability in the light of paragraphs B18 to B20 of Circular 05/2005, Planning Obligations of the implied funding of these arrangements in perpetuity by the developer. This needs to be considered further before this is included as a requirement in the submission AAP. [Soundness test iv]	Policy CE/26 (4) and paragraph 12.9 do not necessarily require that maintenance and management arrangements are funded in perpetuity by the development. They do however make it the responsibility of the developers of Cambridge East to make the necessary arrangements with an organisation to maintain and manage the surface water drainage systems serving the development in perpetuity. How it is funded will be the responsibility of the developers, but no development will be occupied until such management arrangements have been made the subject of a legal agreement.	No change.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE/28 Energy</i>				
10948 - House Builders Federation	Object	The achievement of SAP ratings is controlled by energy conservation rules embodied in the national building regulations. If any reference is required in the Plan it should just be that dwellings conform with the relevant requirement of Part L of the Building Regulations rather than specifying an arbitrary figure.	The Councils are keen to ensure that the development of this major urban quarter is as sustainable as possible hence the challenging policies included in the draft AAP. However, in view of the advice from GO-East that certain aspects are beyond the scope of the planning system, it is agreed to remove those specific aspects from the policy. The supporting text will be revised to make clear where other measures are a key element of overall energy reduction but where they are dealt with under other legislation.	Revise Policy CE/28 criterion 1 to read: "Cambridge East will be required to demonstrate that it will achieve a high degree of measures to increase the energy efficiency of buildings, for example through location, layout, orientation, aspect AND external design." Delete 3rd sentence of paragraph D14.4 and replace to read: "The policy requires a high degree of measures to increase the energy efficiency of new buildings through, for example, location, layout, orientation, aspect and external design. Other measures such as internal design and improved insulation are also important to energy use and are dealt with through the Building Regulations system."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10951 - House Builders Federation	Object	The house-building industry is supportive of the need to consider energy efficiency, or the incorporation of energy efficient technologies. However stipulations to investigate and/or incorporate certain technologies should not be made within Planning Legislation as should stipulations of design criteria.	The Councils are keen to ensure that the development of this major urban quarter is as sustainable as possible hence the challenging policies included in the draft AAP. However, in view of the advice from GO-East that certain aspects are beyond the scope of the planning system, it is agreed to remove those specific aspects from the policy. The supporting text will be revised to make clear where other measures are a key element of overall energy reduction but where they are dealt with under other legislation.	<p>Revise Policy CE/28 criterion 1 to read:</p> <p>"Cambridge East will be required to demonstrate that it will achieve a high degree of measures to increase the energy efficiency of buildings, for example through location, layout, orientation, aspect AND external design."</p> <p>Delete 3rd sentence of paragraph D14.4 and replace to read:</p> <p>"The policy requires a high degree of measures to increase the energy efficiency of new buildings through, for example, location, layout, orientation, aspect and external design. Other measures such as internal design and improved insulation are also important to energy use and are dealt with through the Building Regulations system."</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9394 - GO-East	Object	The policy requires developments to demonstrate that it would achieve a high degree of measures to increase energy efficiency through amongst other measures internal design and improved insulation. We consider that both these matters are likely to be beyond the scope of planning and are matters that would be dealt with through Building Regulations. Therefore any matters that are beyond the scope of planning should be deleted from the policy. Where those matters are related to the overall objective of the policy but delivered through an alternative mechanism, those matters and how they will be implemented could be set out in the supporting text. [Soundness tests vii and viii]	The Councils are keen to ensure that the development of this major urban quarter is as sustainable as possible hence the challenging policies included in the draft AAP. However, in view of the advice from GP-East that certain aspects are beyond the scope of the planning system, it is agreed to remove those specific aspects from the policy. The supporting text will be revised to make clear where other measures are a key element of overall energy reduction but where they are dealt with under other legislation.	Revise Policy CE/28 criterion 1 to read: "Cambridge East will be required to demonstrate that it will achieve a high degree of measures to increase the energy efficiency of buildings, for example through location, layout, orientation, aspect AND external design." Delete 3rd sentence of paragraph D14.4 and replace to read: "The policy requires a high degree of measures to increase the energy efficiency of new buildings through, for example, location, layout, orientation, aspect and external design. Other measures such as internal design and improved insulation are also important to energy use and are dealt with through the Building Regulations system."
11283 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	This policy is strongly supported.	Support noted.	
11101 - Environment Agency	Support	We support the promotion of energy efficiency through this proposal.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
2 10957 - House Builders Federation	Object	The HBF strongly objects to the Council's policy which in reality seeks to alter nationally set Building Regulations by 10% to different local standards which would be more onerous on developers. Planning policies should not replicate, cut across, or detrimentally affect matters within the scope of other legislative requirements, such as those set out in Building Regulations for energy efficiency.	The policy does not require a reduction in emissions which would be beyond the scope of the planning system to do. However, given the importance of creating a sustainable development and the role of energy in that, and the fact that certain measures within the scope of the planning system will impact on energy use and emissions, it is reasonable to include this aspiration in the AAP. GO-East has objected to certain aspects of the policy as being beyond the scope of the planning system but raises not objection to this part of the policy.	
9516 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Fairview object to Policy CE/28 paragraph 2 which seeks a reduction in the minimum amount of Carbon Dioxide emitted by 10% compared to the minimum Building Regulation requirement. Such requirements potentially affect the viability of delivering development at the site and should not jeopardise the main priorities of the Plan. They should be considered in the context of other requirements and the overall viability of the proposed development.	There are many objectives of the AAP, but a key one is the achieve a sustainable development in a wide variety of ways. Any issues of viability will be a matter for the planning application process and S106 agreement.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8441 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to this policy on the basis that it is a matter better controlled by Building Regulations as opposed to being achieved by planning legislation. Notwithstanding that, Marshall is generally sympathetic to securing carbon dioxide reductions.	The Councils are keen to ensure that the development of this major urban quarter is as sustainable as possible hence the challenging policies included in the draft AAP. However, in view of the advice from GO-East that certain aspects are beyond the scope of the planning system, it is agreed to remove those specific aspects from the policy. The supporting text will be revised to make clear where other measures are a key element of overall energy reduction but where they are dealt with under other legislation.	<p>Revise Policy CE/28 criterion 1 to read:</p> <p>"Cambridge East will be required to demonstrate that it will achieve a high degree of measures to increase the energy efficiency of buildings, for example through location, layout, orientation, aspect AND external design."</p> <p>Delete 3rd sentence of paragraph D14.4 and replace to read:</p> <p>"The policy requires a high degree of measures to increase the energy efficiency of new buildings through, for example, location, layout, orientation, aspect and external design. Other measures such as internal design and improved insulation are also important to energy use and are dealt with through the Building Regulations system."</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
3 8442 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the 10% figure as an imperative. It should be expressed as an aspiration, to say it 'should include technology'.	The policy in the AAP reflects policies in both the South Cambs Draft Development Control Policies DPD and Cambridge Local Plan Redeposit Draft as well as the draft Regional Spatial Strategy. There is no justification for a different policy approach to be pursued for Cambridge East where the scale of development offers a significant opportunity to explore a range of renewable technologies and to respond to developments in this fast moving field over time.	
9517 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Fairview object to Policy CE/28 paragraph 3 which requires the inclusion of technology for renewable energy to provide at least 10% of its predicted energy requirements. Such requirements potentially affect the viability of delivering development at the site and should not jeopardise the main priorities of the Plan. They should be considered in the context of other Section 106 requirements and the overall viability of the proposed development.	The policy in the AAP reflects policies in both the South Cambs Draft Development Control Policies DPD and Cambridge Local Plan Redeposit Draft as well as the draft Regional Spatial Strategy. There is no justification for a different policy approach to be pursued for Cambridge East where the scale of development offers a significant opportunity to explore a range of renewable technologies and to respond to developments in this fast moving field over time. Any issues of the viability of the development and the appropriate balance between various requirements of the AAP are a matter for the planning application stage in the normal way. There is no justification for amending the policy requirement.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D14.5</i>				
8057 - The National Trust	Object	D14.5 - D14.6: Reference should be made to the opportunity for growing short rotation coppice on the adjoining farmland to fuel an onsite CHP plant to serve the development.	The policy sets the requirement that the development includes technology for providing at least 10% of its predicted energy requirements via renewable energy sources. It is not prescriptive about how this should be done and this would not be appropriate. The change sought by the representation is too specific for the AAP. However, it would be helpful to amplify the supporting text to refer to work in relation to a Sustainable Energy partnership at Northstowe, which could be extended and/or replicated at Cambridge East, and to recognise the importance of incorporating energy infrastructure into the development at an early stage.	Insert new paragraph between paragraphs D14.7 and D14.8, to read: "Consideration is being given to the potential for a Sustainable Energy Partnership to be created at Northstowe which would be responsible for delivering investment in an integrated sustainable energy system that includes low carbon generation, energy distribution infrastructure and energy efficiency measures. If progressed, the partnership could be extended and/or replicated at Cambridge East. It is important to recognise that if a Combined Heat and Power solution were chosen, this would be dependent upon the necessary energy infrastructure (such as private wiring) being explored at a very early stage and designed in at the front end in order to minimise costs and to maximise opportunities.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE/32 Land Contamination</i>				
9395 - GO-East	Object	Correction - On a point clarification, we assume that this should refer to the local authorities in the plural rather than just the District Council.	Agreed.	Amend Policy CE/32 to read: "Where development is proposed where there is an issue of land contamination the District COUNCILS will..."
11103 - Environment Agency	Support	Whilst we support this contamination policy, we question whether it is required in this Area Action Plan when it exists in the development control policies DPD as policy NE/20.	Support noted. The AAP as a joint plan covering land in both South Cambs and Cambridge City should include all key policy requirements of the development to ensure a consistent approach to planning applications.	
<i>OBJECTIVE</i>				
11284 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Welcome the inclusion of exemplar projects within the development and hope they will be widely showcased to increase uptake within and outside the Cambridge East development.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE/33 An Exemplar in Sustainability</i>				
9521 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Fairview object to Policy CE/33 that Cambridge East should include exemplar projects in sustainable development using cutting edge technologies. Such requirements potentially affect the viability of delivering development at the site and should not jeopardise the main priorities of the Plan. They should be considered in the context of other Section 106 requirements and the overall viability of the proposed development.	The Councils are of the view that Cambridge East is of such a scale and importance that it is crucial that it is as sustainable as possible. The Structure Plan requires that the new town of Northstowe is "an example of excellence in the creation of a sustainable settlement" (Policy P9/3). Whilst the same explicit requirement is not included for Cambridge East, the Councils consider that it is reasonable and appropriate to take a similar approach. The policy is not prescriptive about how the terms of the policy will be met and this will be a matter for negotiation on any planning application. The viability of the development will be a material consideration in determining any planning application and will be the mechanism for identifying the appropriate obligations package on the development.	
9396 - GO-East	Object	We are supportive of the objectives underpinning this policy but it is unclear how they will be achieved in practice and whether the planning system is a viable or appropriate vehicle for this. The Submission DPD policy should be clearer about these matters.	The support for the objectives underpinning the policy is noted. The Councils are of the view that Cambridge East is of such a scale and importance that it is crucial that it is as sustainable as possible. The Structure Plan requires that the new town of Northstowe is "an example of excellence in the creation of a sustainable settlement" (Policy P9/3). Whilst the same explicit requirement is not included for Cambridge East, the Councils consider that it is reasonable and appropriate to take a similar approach. The policy is not prescriptive about how the terms of the policy will be met and this will be a matter for negotiation on any planning application.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>D15.1</i>				
8058 - The National Trust	Object	The National Trust supports the policy CE/33 but suggests that the supporting text (D15.1 to 15.5) could refer to the development of energy efficient homes at the Trust's Dunham Massey estate in Cheshire which is an exemplar in sustainability.	Support noted. It is not considered that it is appropriate to refer to specific examples in the AAP: there may be many examples in other parts of the country and elsewhere but the best examples may vary over the life of the AAP. The example suggested will be considered in the context of discussions on any emerging planning application.	
<i>D15.4</i>				
10908 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan (Policy WLP18) identifies all major development areas as preferred sites for a major waste management facility. There is an urgent need to find sites for the proposed provision in WLP; the ODPM has made clear that where site specific allocations are not made in the WLP it would be appropriate to provide sites by securing allocations of employment land within new development areas. Phase 1 is a preferred location for a major waste management facility e.g. a materials recovery facility. There is also provision in the WLP for a Household Waste Recycling Centre to be accommodated within Cambridge East. It would be sensible for this to be co-located with the major waste management facility and provision for employment land should take this into account.	This objection is addressed in relation to a separate representation to the employment chapter.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Councils' Assessment

Change to Draft DPD

Chapter E DELIVERING CAMBRIDGE EAST

OBJECTIVES

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9400 - GO-East	Object	The submission AAP will need to include more details about the delivery of the development at Cambridge East (in particular Phase 1) and its relationship with and dependency on other strategies and plans.	<p>The AAP has been prepared in consultation with stakeholders at 3 stages of consultation. The Councils are also involved in the preparation of other key strategies and plans such as their respective Community Strategies and strategies being prepared by others such as the Long Term Transport Strategy and Local Transport Plan. Cambridgeshire Horizons is leading on a number of sub regional strategies in which the Councils are involved, looking at issues such as formal sports, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Horizons is also assisting the local authorities with mechanisms to ensure prompt and efficient delivery of the major developments. Given the urgency to ensure that plans are in place to bring forward the major developments to meet the needs of the Cambridge Area, the AAP is inevitably a fairly strategic document which sets out the anticipated key requirements of the development where these are already known, and identifies where strategies are required to identify all the specific requirements of the development. A Steering Group chaired by Horizons has been established for over 2 years and a series of topic groups either have or are in the process of being established to facilitate further partnership working with the main stakeholders on key issues such as community facilities and drainage. Horizons will have a key role in helping to draw together the identified requirements of Cambridge East as work on a planning application for Phase 1 progresses and in facilitating discussions on a section 106 agreement.</p> <p>The submission AAP will have a new delivery</p>	<p>Add two new sections to Chapter E.</p> <p>"E3: Delivering Cambridge East" will include matters affecting delivery and a housing trajectory.</p> <p>"E4 Monitoring Cambridge East" will be drawn from the separate Monitoring Strategy and provide a framework to ensure that the implementation and delivery of Cambridge East is efficiently and effectively carried out.</p>

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Councils' Assessment

Change to Draft DPD

section which will include a housing trajectory and also a new monitoring section which will be drawn from the separate Monitoring Strategy and provide a framework to ensure that the implementation and delivery of Cambridge East is efficiently and effectively carried out.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>E1.1</i> 9299 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	The scale of the development involved and the necessary related infrastructure mean that the site is unlikely to deliver the completions anticipated in the Plan period. At this stage, it is also unhelpful to note that there is also uncertainty regarding the programming of the release of the Airport site.	Neither Council is relying on Cambridge Airport yielding dwellings by 2016. The only parts of Cambridge East that are assumed by the South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy DPD to come forward by 2016 are Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road and land north of Cherry Hinton, which can come forward whilst the Airport is still operating. Only part of the North Works site is proposed to be redeveloped and this is a relatively small part of Phase 1. Notwithstanding, Marshall's is in pre-application discussions with the District Council on an alternative site for some of the North Works operations and has advised that it currently anticipates submitting a planning application in spring 2006 with some relocated operations commencing on site in 2007. The City Local Plan only assumes that only land north of Cherry Hinton that is not constrained by the Airport to will come forward by 2016. There is no need to identify alternative locations for development.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11348 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd (Netherhall Farm)	Object	Smaller sites at the edge of Cambridge, such as Netherhall Farm, should be brought forward for development in the short term to address any shortfall in delivery.	Neither Council is relying on Cambridge Airport yielding dwellings by 2016. The only parts of Cambridge East that are assumed by the South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy DPD to come forward by 2016 are Phase 1 north of Newmarket Road and land north of Cherry Hinton, which can come forward whilst the Airport is still operating. Only part of the North Works site is proposed to be redeveloped and this is a relatively small part of Phase 1. Notwithstanding, Marshall's is in pre-application discussions with the District Council on an alternative site for some of the North Works operations and has advised that it currently anticipates submitting a planning application in spring 2006 with some relocated operations commencing on site in 2007. The City Local Plan assumes that only land north of Cherry Hinton that is not constrained by the Airport will come forward by 2016. Notwithstanding any specific issues relating to development at Netherhall Farm, there is no justification for identifying other land for residential development. If there were, this would be an issue for the Cambridge City Local Plan or South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy and not for the Cambridge East Area Action Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE/34 Construction Strategy</i>				
9547 9537	Object	Object to the proposed development of Cambridge East on the Cambridge Airport site. Recently purchased a property in Caribou Way and a large part of the reason behind choosing this property was the location, in that it is a quiet suburb but also allows easy access to the city centre and A14. A number of concerns about the proposed development and one of these includes: Concerned that the long-term construction project will affect our quality of life, as it will affect the view from the rear of our property and there will be air and noise pollution caused by the construction process.	The Airport is identified in the Structure Plan 2003 as a location for major development on the edge of Cambridge. This takes forward the policy of RPG6 2000 which set the principle of new housing on the edge of Cambridge subject to a review of the Green Belt. The AAP includes policies to ensure that the new urban quarter is "integrated and linked sensitively into the urban fabric of eastern Cambridge to preserve existing residential amenity" (Policy CE/7(17)). The aim is to enhance Cambridge not detract from it both in terms of its physical character and the services and facilities it provides.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11474 - GO-East	Object	<p>We think that the Core Strategy and other DPDs will need to include a clearer and more robust implementation and monitoring framework that should set out how delivery will be achieved and measured. Clearly, we recognise that this is not possible in a detailed manner for developments that will be phased towards the end of the Structure Plan period, such as the majority of the Cambridge East development. However, we would expect the Core Strategy to include a commentary on when the sites are expected to come forward for development, the anticipated delivery timescales, as well as some of the main dependencies, risks to delivery and any contingencies. This overall implementation framework should then be built on in further detail in respect of the main sites through the AAPs and allocations DPD.</p>	<p>The AAP has been prepared in consultation with stakeholders at 3 stages of consultation. The Councils are also involved in the preparation of other key strategies and plans such as their respective Community Strategies and strategies being prepared by others such as the Long Term Transport Strategy and Local Transport Plan. Cambridgeshire Horizons is leading on a number of sub regional strategies in which the Councils are involved, looking at issues such as formal sports, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Horizons is also assisting the local authorities with mechanisms to ensure prompt and efficient delivery of the major developments. Given the urgency to ensure that plans are in place to bring forward the major developments to meet the needs of the Cambridge Area, the AAP is inevitably a fairly strategic document which sets out the anticipated key requirements of the development where these are already known, and identifies where strategies are required to identify all the specific requirements of the development. A Steering Group chaired by Horizons has been established for over 2 years and a series of topic groups either have or are in the process of being established to facilitate further partnership working with the main stakeholders on key issues such as community facilities and drainage. Horizons will have a key role in helping to draw together the identified requirements of Cambridge East as work on a planning application for Phase 1 progresses and in facilitating discussions on a section 106 agreement.</p> <p>The submission AAP will have a new delivery</p>	<p>Add two new sections to Chapter E.</p> <p>"E3: Delivering Cambridge East" will include matters affecting delivery and a housing trajectory.</p> <p>"E4 Monitoring Cambridge East" will be drawn from the separate Monitoring Strategy and provide a framework to ensure that the implementation and delivery of Cambridge East is efficiently and effectively carried out.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
			section which will include a housing trajectory and also a new monitoring section which will be drawn from the separate Monitoring Strategy and provide a framework to ensure that the implementation and delivery of Cambridge East is efficiently and effectively carried out.	
2				
11285 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	It should be made clear in para 2 that is necessary to avoid adverse effects from site accesses and haul roads on the environmental amenities of biodiversity, rights of way and green spaces as well as on residents and businesses.	Agreed.	Add new penultimate sentence to Policy CE/34 criterion 2 to read: "THEY SHOULD ALSO AVOID ADVERSE EFFECTS ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL AMENITIES OF BIODIVERSITY, RIGHTS OF WAY AND GREEN SPACES."
3				
11286 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Suggest inclusion in para 3 of; "Developers must employ an agreed methodology for haul roads where they cross public rights of way." Good practice is being developed with district council planners and should be applied here.	This is a detailed issue which is best addressed through the preparation of the comprehensive construction strategy required under Policy CE/34 criterion 1. The AAP cannot be comprehensive on every issues that should be included in the strategy.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
4 10914 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>The County Council as Waste Planning Authority welcomes the requirement to establish a temporary waste management facility, encompassing the re-use/recycling of sustainable construction materials. In addition it would be appropriate to include a requirement for the principal applications for the new development areas to be supported by a Waste Management Strategy which should address such factors as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -□ Location of waste -□ Types of waste -□ Volumes of waste -□ Strategy for dealing with each waste stream (including sustainable construction materials) -□ Strategy for dealing with any residues on and off site (including details of where they are to be sent for disposal). <p>Implementation should be secured by planning condition.</p>	Support noted. The AAP requires the preparation of a Resource Re-Use and Recycling Scheme to address treatment of all waste arising during the development. This will be the appropriate mechanism for addressing this level of detail rather than the AAP.	
<hr/>				
E1.3 9762 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Support	Vehicles associated with the construction of the North Works development must not be permitted to proceed through Fen Ditton village.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>E1.8</i>				
8443 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the suggestion that the creation of one or more large mounds would introduce an alien character into this area of gentle relief. Indeed, any such mounds could be regarded as new landmark earthworks.	The approach to spoil is based on experience at Cambourne where the need for a planned approach to construction spoil as part of the initial design and masterplanning of the development is required to ensure an appropriate and integrated approach. This will be particularly important in this sensitive location on the edge of Cambridge. The Councils remain of the view that the creation of large mounds would not be acceptable in this area of gently relief. It will be for the construction and landscape strategies to consider the most appropriate way of dealing with construction spoil in a way that is most appropriate to the character of the area.	
<i>CE/36 Management of Services, Facilities, Landscape and Infrastructure</i>				
10962 - House Builders Federation	Object	The policy states management strategies for services, facilities, landscape and infrastructure will need to be submitted to the LPA for prior adoption to granting outline planning permission. This seems a completely unreasonable requirement given that applicants will be expected to provide such detailed information at potentially very high cost to themselves, prior to even knowing whether or not their specific proposals will be likely to obtain planning permission.	The management of services, facilities, landscape and infrastructure at Cambridge East is likely to require contributions from the development to be incorporated into the planning obligation agreement which can only be agreed when the outline planning permission is granted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>E1.24</i>				
9767 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Support	Planners of Cambridge East should liaise with the Civil Aviation authorities and the Department of Transport to ensure that the appropriate safety zones are maintained during the development. We do not consider this development to be a part of Fen Ditton Parish or named Fen Ditton when it is actually part of Cambridge City.	Support noted. These organisations are consulted at each stage of the plan making process.	
<hr/>				
<i>1</i>				
8457 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall welcomes the indication given here supporting the opportunity for some limited development north of Cherry Hinton with the airport operational.	Support noted. As made clear in Policy CE/39, any development north of Cherry Hinton with the Airport still operational will only be acceptable subject to environmental and health impact assessments which will be necessary to determine whether such development can create a suitable residential environment and will also require the closure of the grass runways.	
<hr/>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CE/40 Infrastructure Provision</i>				
8466 - The Marshall Group	Object	In the October 2004 Preferred Options Report, at para 19.3, in dealing with planning obligations, it was stated that authorities would be 'taking into account costs which fall to the development, including the relocation of the airport and associated activities and elements of the North Works site.' Marshall objects to the omission of those references and asks for their reinstatement.	Agreed.	Add new paragraph to the end of Policy CE/40 to read: "THE APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF CONTRIBUTIONS SOUGHT FROM THE DEVELOPMENT WILL TAKE INTO ACCOUNT COSTS WHICH FALL TO THE DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING THE RELOCATION OF THE AIRPORT AND ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES AND ELEMENTS OF THE NORTH WORKS SITE."
8071 - The National Trust	Object	The National trust would like to see reference within this policy to the opportunities for contributions to be made towards the provision and development of off-site facilities such as firstly, the strategic open space, recreation, landscape and biodiversity enhancements that will be offered by the implementation of the Wicken Fen Vision and secondly, to links to Anglesey Abbey.	The policy requires suitable arrangements to deliver all infrastructure necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms, which could include off-site works. Strategic open space is specifically included in criterion 4. The location and nature of the infrastructure secured will be determined through the detailed policies of the AAP and strategies required by it.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9511 - Fairview New Homes	Object	<p>Fairview require that the use of planning obligations as referred to in Policy CE/40 and throughout the document, should conform to the guidance issued in ODPM Circular 05/2005. In particular, they should adhere to the tests that a planning obligation must be:</p> <p>(i) relevant to planning;</p> <p>(ii) necessary to the make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms;</p> <p>(iii) directly related to the proposed development;</p> <p>(iv) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and</p> <p>(v) reasonable in all other respects.</p>	<p>The Councils agree that the planning obligations sought from the development should conform to Circular 05/2005, which was published after the draft AAP was prepared. Changes are proposed to the source policy in the South Cambs Core Strategy Policy DP/4 in response to representations to ensure the policy is entirely consistent with the circular and to clarify and amplify on some of the infrastructure listed as likely to be required by the development. Both to ensure a consistent approach between different parts of the South Cambs LDF and improve the policy and its consistency with Circular 05/2005, various revisions are proposed.</p>	<p>Add to bullet point 2 of policy CE/40:</p> <p>"Education (INCLUDING NURSERY AND PRE-SCHOOL CARE)"</p> <p>Amend bullet point 4 of Policy CE/40:</p> <p>"Public open space, SPORT AND recreation FACILITIES (including strategic open space)"</p> <p>Amend policy CE/40 bullet point 5:</p> <p>"IMPROVEMENTS(INCLUDING infrastructure) for pedestrians, cyclists, EQUESTRIANS, highways, and public and community transport."</p> <p>Amend bullet point 6 of policy CE/40:</p> <p>"Other community facilities (e.g. community centres, youth facilities, library services, SOCIAL CARE, AND THE PROVISION OF EMERGENCY SERVICES)"</p> <p>Add additional point to the list in Policy CE/40:</p> <p>"PRESERVATION OR ENHANCEMENT OF THE HISTORIC LANDSCAPE OR TOWNSCAPE."</p> <p>Amend 2nd paragraph of policy CE/40:</p> <p>"DEPENDING ON THE NATURE OF</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
				THE SERVICES AND FACILITIES, contributions may also be required to meet [running] MAINTENANCE AND / OR OPERATING costs EITHER AS PUMP PRIMING OR IN PERPETUITY, [of services and facilities] provided through an obligation."
11293 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Given the level of infrastructure necessary to enable the development to take place, in accordance with Circular 05/2005, Fairview object to the inclusion of requirements within the plan which are not absolutely necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and which are not sufficiently significant so that the development "ought not to be permitted without them" (Paragraph B8). As such, Fairview object to the requirements for contributions towards arts and cultural provision, public art, the funding of community development workers and youth workers and any other level of provision that is unreasonable and is not necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms.	The Councils consider that the list of obligations and the requirements set out in other policies of the AAP are reasonable requirements of the development in policy terms. If the viability of a development is affected but the level of obligations sought from a development, this will be a matter for negotiation at the planning application stage and a decision will need to be made on the relative priorities of the various calls on the development in order to achieve an appropriate overall package of obligations which would ensure an acceptable form of development. It may be that other sources of funding would also be sought to help ensure all necessary infrastructure is secured.	
10965 - House Builders Federation	Object	The HBF questions whether SPD's are the appropriate mechanism for dealing with matters of infrastructure provision. As the standards/formulae for the calculation of site development costs will be completely unknown Furthermore there will be limited opportunity to challenge their content as they will not be subject to independent public examination. The delegation of infrastructure requirements to SPD undermines the soundness of the Plan.	According to Planning Circular 05/05, development plan documents should include matters to be covered by planning obligations and factors to be taken into account when considering the scale and form of contributions. More detailed policies applying the principles set out in the Development Plan Document (e.g. application to specific localities and likely quantum of contributions) ought then to be included in Supplementary Planning Documents. This is consistent with the approach taken in the Area Action Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8465 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall recognises that the development should fund much of the supporting infrastructure and facilities, and will seek to ensure that any agreements that are achieved will sit comfortably within government guidelines on the matter.	Support noted.	
5				
9191 - Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	Object	This should include reference to equestrians to be consistent with other policies mentioned above.	Agreed. A further minor amendment would also help make the policy consistent with the South Cambs Core Strategy policy where amendments are proposed in response to other representations.	Amend Policy CE/40 bullet point 5: "IMPROVEMENTS(INCLUDING infrastructure) for pedestrians, cyclists, EQUESTRIANS, highways, and public and community transport."