

Appendix N, Neighbour Representations

A significant number of individual letters of objection have been received from local residents. The representations are mainly from residents of Hinxton and Ickleton, but also from other nearby villages including Duxford, Great Chesterford, Whittlesford, Sawston, Pampisford and Linton. The following table summarises the responses from neighbour reps in relation to the original consultation and the following amendments consultation.

Issue
<p><u>Principle</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Land is not designated / allocated in the LP -Contrary to the LP and associated policies -Contrary to the NPPF -In the open countryside, not supported by rural policies -Outside the existing employment envelope -Proposal does not align with identified employment needs in the LP -Site should come through the LP allocation process -Site should come through an AAP process with other nearby sites -Site should not be developed in isolation to AgriTech or NUGC -Expansion should be in Cambridge / Fens / Midlands / North of England / other higher unemployment areas -Location not sustainable -Alternative options not fully explored (north of Hinxton) -Only the existing campus should be built upon -Granting permission would set a precedent -Proposal is in the national interest but supporting transport infrastructure not sufficient -Economic benefits to the Country as a whole not sustainable -SCDC does not need additional jobs, already low employment -The proposal is premature -Would prejudice the future LP review by making a strategic decision about the location of significant employment development ahead of that -Contrary to adopted policies S/2, S/7, E/12, E/13, E/16
<p><u>Traffic and Transport Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Existing network over capacity, will be grid-locked by proposal, particularly at peak hours -Strategic / radical solutions to A505 required -Strategic transport solutions with cumulative impact assessment required -Rat-running will increase through local villages and will be harmful (noise, pollution, safety, delays for local residents, damage to buildings and property, health impacts such as asthma) -Rat-running surveys in Ickleton show large existing problem (58,000 vehicles a month travel east-west, almost half speeding, rat running is increasing and will increase further with the proposal) -Rat-running cannot be controlled (smart phone apps re-direct people through Ickleton when the A505 is congested) -Application shows lack of understanding of existing rat-running issues -Hotel will attract external trips -Partners of workers and school children will generate external impacts not accounted for

- Travel plan unrealistic and unambitious (autonomous vehicle proposals removed)
- Absence of good quality alternative sustainable transport options
- Pedestrian/cycle access to Sawston is unsafe

- A505 proposal would only add to existing severe congestion
- A505 requires a radical solution to ease pressure

- A1301 trunk road status will be lost
- A1301 requires a bypass from the site to the A505
- A1301 30mph zone should be larger
- A1301 30mph zone will increase rat running
- A1301 needs underpass/overpass from existing site to Expansion Land
- A1301 should be diverted around the site
- A1301 more difficult to access from Hinxtton
- A1301 more dangerous if overlooked by active commercial uses

- McDonalds roundabout works unsafe for pedestrians/cyclists
- McDonalds roundabout requires an underpass/overpass
- McDonalds design not justified
- McDonalds signalisation will increase queuing

- M11, Jct 9 needs to be improved (4-way, north bound entrance, south bound exit)
- M11, Jct 10 backs up onto the main carriageway

- Whittlesford Parkway off-road cycle/pedestrian link needs to be provided
- Whittlesford Parkway parking over-capacity
- Public transport options are limited
- Not on existing bus routes
- Driverless bus route from Whittlesford Parkway has not materialised
- A new railway station in Hinxtton serving the development has not materilised

- Car parking levels not clear / too low
- Car ownership should be limited to one per household
- Overflow parking would occur in Hinxtton
- Insufficient car parking spaces proposed

- TA baseline out of date / not sufficient
- TA contains errors / misleading / data is skewed
- TA impacts under-estimated
- Linsig model does not accommodate 'blocking back' between junctions
- TA cumulative impact assessment with other large employment sites not undertaken

- Travel Plan modal target of 40% SOV unrealistic (stuck in the 44-47% range since coming down from 58%)
- Sustainable Transport Strategy is non-committal
- Existing capacity issues on the A505 should be resolved prior to the Genome being allowed to expand.
- Contrary to adopted policy TI/2

Plans

- Commercial buildings too high (20m)
- Residential three storey buildings too high (11m)
- Layout too dense (commercial and housing)
- Appearance of scheme would be urban and out character

- Expansion site is more suited to a campus which should be in a city
- Proposal disproportionately large
- Will dwarf local villages and hem-in Hinxton
- Siting too close to Hinxton
- Informal spaces insufficient, lack of clarity
- Inward looking
- Expansion land proposal out of character with existing campus (which is hidden from view and high quality)

- Site should be by-passed
- Parking should be underground
- Not enough links across the A1301
- Links across the A1301 should be bridges/underpasses
- A1301 will become an internal campus road
- Buildings too close to the A1301
- Changes to the A1301 out of character
- Site should not have the A1301 running through it
- Contrary to adopted policy HQ/1

Landscape, Character

- Expansion land is rising, rolling chalk landscape and the proposal would be far more visible than the existing well landscaped lower lying site
- Significant harm would arise to the landscape
- Would blight the landscape
- LVIA viewpoints need increasing and extended outwards
- Views will be lost (from Hinxton, Coploe Pit)
- Lighting will urbanise the area and be out of character
- Character of expansion will be urban not rural
- Multi-storey car parks will harm the landscape and be out of keeping
- Rural setting of Hinxton would be significantly diminished
- Existing tree belts should be left in place
- Landscaping will never fully mitigate the visual impact

Heritage

- Harm to conservation areas (Hinxton, Ickleton, Gt. Chesterford)
- Harm to setting of listed buildings
- Contrary to adopted policy NH/14

Agriculture

- Loss of agricultural land (BMV)
- Loss is unsustainable
- Land is needed for growing food for a growing population
- Will lead to increase in food imports
- Contrary to adopted policy NH/3

Flood Risk

- Would cause / increase likelihood of flooding

Cumulative Impact

- ES should cumulatively assess AgriTech, NUGC and other major schemes
- AgriTech and NUGC cumulatively with the application would harm landscape and result in severe impact on the road network
- NUGC would meet the demand for housing
- SCDC should make a joint strategy with Uttlesford DC

Non-Residential Uses

- Existing research and development function of the site valued but increased commercialisation of the campus not justified
- Application not associated with the core R&D function of the existing campus; nature of the campus will change
- Quantum of floorspace not justified / speculative proposal
- Employment Annual Monitoring Report indicates sufficient land and floorspace availability elsewhere in the District which is suitably flexible to allow growth in the genomics industry
- Size of the proposal should be reduced
- Only land within the existing employment envelope should be developed
- Existing campuses (Babraham, Granta, Chesterford RP) can accommodate the growth (Illumina – global genomics company has recently established on Granta Park)
- No account taken of expansion of other science parks
- Co-location needs (including of large and small companies) not justified, firms can rely on improved IT
- Clustering benefits are not just obtained from a single site but from the Cambridge area more generally with existing co-operation across sites in the Cambridge area
- Success of emerging or grow-on genomics companies not dependent on co-location
- Occupational genomics only condition (10yrs) not fit for purpose
- Proposed retail uses will not survive
- Hotel is larger than necessary and will take trade away from other guest businesses in the area
- Proposed shops will have a detrimental effect on local shops and facilities
- B2 and B8 uses have no justification as part of the proposed mix of uses.
- Just another business park

Community

- Wellcome community engagement misleading
- Wellcome has not listened to the local community
- Proposal has increased in size since the pre-application consultation
- Detrimental impact on medical services and existing schools
- Existing residents will want access to on-site shops and facilities
- New residents will have no investment in the existing local community, many being on short term contracts
- Proposal does not include anything that encourages integration with the existing local community
- Absence of clarity regarding community facilities
- Phasing of provision of social infrastructure unclear
- Lost trust with Wellcome re bridge repair, orchard proposals
- Wellcome previously promised not to develop on the land (S106)

Housing

- Need is not justified, survey information of limited value
- Too many houses, insufficient evidence of demand

- Absence of affordable housing
- Typologies (flats etc) out of keeping
- Housing should be rental only and not sold to avoid open market onward sale
- Young people will prefer to live in Cambridge
- Timescale on restrictions not identified
- People will not want to live and work in the same environment
- Tied housing will end up as being sold to the open market
- Proposed housing ties will leave housing stock empty

Environmental Impacts

- Increases in pollution (dust, air quality, noise, light, vibration) -and reduced quality of life of existing residents
- Missed opportunity for wildlife and well-being improvements across the Wellcome property portfolio around Hinxtton such as through Living Landscapes.
- Threat to ground water supply, site within ground water protection zone
- Harmful impacts on existing wildlife, loss of flora and fauna
- Development will increase likelihood of flooding
- Weir should be installed to mitigate flood impact near Hinxtton Water Mill
- Carbon footprint of the proposal is not sustainable
- Contrary to adopted policy SC/12 (local air quality)

Amendments

- The amendments do not overcome the concerns already raised

Other

- Does not create wealth equality across the UK
- Should be located elsewhere in the UK, another academic hub with better transport links
- Agree with Hinxtton PC and Ickleton PC representations
- Outline application inappropriate type of application
- Harm to green belt
- SmithsonHill was refused permission. Wellcome should be refused permission on similar grounds
- Proposal would damage Wellcome's reputation
- Proposal on expansion land rests with the Wellcome's investment arm who will only invest if there is profit to be made
- Wellcome's motivations are commercial
- Wellcome will develop other land to the north of Hinxtton in time
- Wellcome promised they would never build on the Expansion Land and this is embedded into a S106 agreement