

# APPENDIX C

## North East Cambridge Area Action Plan Statement of Consultation - Draft Plan Stage 2020

### 1. Introduction

1.1 This document sets out how the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service has undertaken consultations in the preparation of the Draft North East Cambridge Area Action Plan. The statement provides an overview of the following:

- who was invited to make representations,
- how they were invited to do so,
- summaries of the main issues raised in the representations, and
- how these have been addressed in the Draft Plan.

1.2 This consultation statement complies with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) and the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service Statement of Community Involvement 2019. The document will be updated at each stage of the plan making process. It currently details consultation undertaken in relation to:

- Research, evidence gathering and front-loading engagement (2014)
- Issues and Options 1 consultation (2014)
- Issues and Options 2 consultation (2019)
- Proposed arrangements for Draft AAP consultation (2020)

1.3 The Local Development Schemes of both Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils have included an intention to prepare an Area Action Plan for this part of Cambridge since 2014. The current Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Local Development Scheme (October 2018) continues to include the Area Action Plan as a Development Plan Document to be prepared. The Local Development Scheme is available to view on the [Cambridge City Council](#) and the [South Cambridgeshire District Council](#) websites.

1.4 The current Greater Cambridge Local Development Scheme includes the following timetable for the next stages in the preparation of the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan.

- Consultation on Draft Area Action Plan – Summer 2020 – Current stage

- Proposed Submission Consultation – to be confirmed
- Submission of Area Action Plan to Secretary of State for independent examination – to be confirmed
- Adoption of Area Action Plan (subject to progress of independent examination) – to be confirmed

1.5 The AAP was previously referred to as the Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan in the Local Development Scheme; however, in order to reflect the more comprehensive vision being envisaged for the area, and the need to integrate development proposals with neighbouring communities the plan has been renamed the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan.

1.6 The adopted Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans (2018) both include policies allocating land in the north east of Cambridge for high quality mixed use development, primarily for employment within Use Classes B1, B2 and B8 as well as a range of supporting uses, commercial, retail, leisure and residential uses (subject to acceptable environmental conditions). Revitalisation of the area will be focused on the new transport interchange created by the development of Cambridge North railway station. Policies contained within both Local Plans state as follows: “The amount of development, site capacity, viability, timescales and phasing of development will be established through the preparation of an Area Action Plan (AAP) for the site. The AAP will be developed jointly between South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council and will involve close collaborative working with Cambridgeshire County Council, Anglian Water and other stakeholders in the area. The final boundaries of land that the joint AAP will consider will be determined by the AAP”.

1.7 Preparation of a joint AAP initially commenced in early 2014. The first Issues & Options Report was published for consultation in December 2014. Whether land within the Cambridge Science Park, to the west of Milton Road, should be included with the AAP area was one of the issues consulted upon at this stage. Responses to the consultation were reported to members of both Councils in 2015.

1.8 Preparation of the AAP was paused following the Issues & Options 1 consultation for the Councils’ respective Local Plans to be progressed. Since the close of the initial Issues & Options consultation, there have been a number of significant developments that have affected and informed the preparation of the Draft AAP. Of particular relevance is the submission of a Housing Infrastructure Fund Bid to relocate the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant off-site, and the completion of the Ely to Cambridge Transport Study.

1.9 A second Issues and Options consultation was undertaken in February and March 2019. This consultation covered a wider area, proposed a revised vision for the area, and issues and options where views were sought before the draft plan was prepared.

## **2. Research, evidence gathering and front-loading engagement (2014)**

2.1 As part of the initial work on developing a vision for the area a facilitated workshop was held on 12 April 2013. A range of stakeholders were invited to attend this visioning workshop including landowners, local resident groups, Parish Councils and businesses operating in the area. A list of those attending the event included:

- Anglian Water
- Bidwells
- Brookgate
- Cambridge Association of Architects
- Cambridge City Council
- Cambridge Past Present and Future
- Cambridgeshire County Council
- Cam Conservators
- Cheffins
- Fen Ditton Parish Council
- 5<sup>th</sup> Studio
- Formation Architects
- Friends of Stourbridge Common
- Frimstone Ltd
- Milton Parish Council
- Old Chesterton Residents' Association
- St. John's Innovation Centre
- Savills
- South Cambridgeshire District Council
- Stagecoach

2.2 The workshop included presentations from Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambridgeshire County Council, Anglian Water and 5th Studio. There were also group discussions on the issues, constraints and opportunities focusing on the four C's of the Cambridgeshire Quality Charter (Community, Connectivity, Climate, and Character).

2.3 The following main issues were highlighted during the event:

- Two key issues for action – Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant and Network Rail Depot
- Timescales - the need for coordinated timescales for the public and private sector
- Boundaries - needed to be reviewed in terms of delivery and delivery partnerships
- Type of Plan - Additional plans should be considered, including local area action plan
- Private/public partnership - private sector landowners should be invited to work with the local authorities to produce an overall document or jointly fund and commission.

2.4 Conclusions drawn from the workshop are summarised below:

- Good places need a successful long-term vision, coming from leadership, citizen engagement and technical input.
- Sense of place is not just physical factors; it is also social and economic ones.
- Place making is an evolutionary process. The professional role is about enabling the vision and co-production.
- The opportunity to exists to take the Innovation Areas to the next stage, to build on brand and to maintain the reputation for innovative thinking, making the area one of the most attractive places to work in Europe.

2.5 An Officer Steering Group was formed to coordinate the preparation of the Issues and Options 1 Report. The Steering Group comprised officers from Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council. A number of other meetings and discussions took place with landowners and other key stakeholders prior to the publication of the report.

### **3. Issues and Options 1 Consultation (2014)**

3.1 The [Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan Issues and Options 1](#) report set out the main issues for the site and a series of possible options for its future development.

3.2 A Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Scoping Report was published for consultation in accordance with the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive and Regulations. The consultation formally sought the views of a wide range of consultees, including the three statutory consultees: English Heritage; Natural England; and the Environment Agency. The purpose of the consultation was to gauge the views of consultees on the defined scope of the SA and the proposed

level of detail that should be included within the SA. The consultation period ran from 15 August until 19 September 2014.

3.3 The draft Issues and Options 1 Report was then prepared, and subject to an Interim Sustainability Appraisal. The draft report was approved for public consultation by the Cambridge City Council's Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee on 11 November 2014 and the South Cambridgeshire District Council's Planning Portfolio Holder's meeting on 18 November 2014. A series of evidence base documents were used to inform the preparation of the Issues and Options 1 Report.

3.4 An eight-week public consultation exercise was undertaken from 8 December 2014 until 2 February 2015. Representations were invited in respect of the Issues and Options Report, the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and the Interim Sustainability Appraisal. Representations could be made using an online consultation system linked to the Councils' websites. Alternatively, printed response forms were made available which could be posted or emailed to either Council.

3.5 The following methods of notification were used to publicise the consultation exercise:

- Public notice in the Cambridge Evening News
- Joint Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council press releases
- Articles in Cambridge Matters (Winter Edition 2014) and South Cambs Magazine (Winter Edition 2014)
- Twitter and Facebook updates
- Consultees listed in Appendix 3 were notified

3.6 Copies of the Issues and Options 1 Report was made available to purchase, and for inspection, along with supporting documents at the following locations:

- Cambridge City Council Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, Regent Street, Cambridge
- South Cambridgeshire District Council Reception, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne
- Arbury Court Library, Arbury Court, Cambridge
- Histon Library, School Hill, Histon
- Milton Road Library, Ascham Road, Cambridge
- Online via the Councils' websites.

3.7 Statutory consultees, including Duty to Cooperate Bodies and general consultation bodies as set out in Appendix 3 to this document were notified of the Issues and Options 1 report consultation by email or letter.

3.8 A series of exhibition events were held during December 2014 and January 2015 at which Council Officers were in attendance to explain the various options and to answer questions. The events took place at the following venues:

- St John's Innovation Centre, Cowley Road, Cambridge – Wednesday 10 December (13.00–19.00)
- North Area Committee, Buchan Street Community Centre, Cambridge – Thursday 18 December (16.00-20.00)
- The Trinity Centre, Cambridge Science Park, Cambridge – Wednesday 14 January – (13.00-17.00)
- Brown's Field Youth & Community Centre, Green End Road, Cambridge – Saturday 17 January (13.30-18.00)
- Milton Community Centre, Coles Road, Milton – Monday 19 January (14.00-20.00)

3.9 Representations received in respect of the consultation exercise are available to view in full on the Greater Cambridge Planning Service [consultation portal](#). A summary of the representations received is attached as Appendix 1 to this document.

3.10 The representations were reported to the meetings listed below, the minutes of which can be viewed on-line. In summary, Members noted the responses and agreed that further work should be undertaken on revised options for the site.

- [Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group](#) – 16 November 2015
- [South Cambridgeshire District Council's Planning Portfolio Holder's Meeting](#) – 17 November 2015
- [Cambridge City Council's Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee](#) – 17 November 2015

3.11 The responses received to the first Issues and Options Report were used to inform the preparation of the second Issues and Options Report in 2019 and the current Draft Area Action Plan. In many cases the Issues and Options 2 Report proposed further questions on issues, reflecting the revisions to the proposed vision for the area. Further details are provided in Appendix 1 attached to this document.

## **4. Issues and Options 2 Consultation 2019**

4.1 The draft Issues and Options 2 report was subject to an Interim Sustainability Appraisal, building on the scoping report and appraisal that accompanied the Issues and Options 1 report.

4.2 The [Issues and Options report 2](#) was considered by the following Council meetings prior to finalisation and consultation:

- [South Cambridgeshire Scrutiny and Overview Committee – 18 December 2018](#)
- [South Cambridgeshire Cabinet – 9 January 2019](#)
- [Cambridge Planning Policy and Transport Scrutiny Committee - 15 January 2019](#)

4.3 The following documents were used to inform the preparation of the Issues and Options report 2, along with other evidence documents listed in the report itself:

- [Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues and Options Report – Equalities Impact Assessment – Cambridge City Council 2018](#)
- [Cambridge Northern Fringe East Issues and Options Report – Equalities Impact Assessment – South Cambridgeshire District Council 2018](#)
- [Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan Issues and Options 2019 - Interim Sustainability Appraisal – Rambol on behalf of Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council.](#)

4.4 A six-week public consultation on the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan Issues and Options 2 report took place between 11 February and 25 March 2019. The report, along with other relevant documentation, was made available for inspection at the following locations:

- Cambridge City Council Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, Regent Street, Cambridge
- South Cambridgeshire District Council Reception, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne
- Arbury Court Library, Arbury Court, Cambridge
- Histon Library, School Hill, Histon
- Milton Road Library, Ascham Road, Cambridge
- Online via the Councils' website

4.5 A series of public exhibition events took place at which the Issues and Options report 2 was made available for inspection and where officers were in attendance to answer any questions. The dates, timings and venues of the events are set out below:

- Milton Community Centre, Coles Road, Milton – Monday 25 February (14.00–20.00)
- Cambridge North Station, Cowley Road, Cambridge – Wednesday 27 February (06.30 – 08.30 and 16.00-19.30)
- St John's Innovation Centre, Cowley Road, Cambridge – Friday 1 March – 10.00 – 16.00)
- Trinity Centre, Cambridge Science Park, Cambridge – Tuesday 5 March – (10.00 – 16.00)

- North Area Committee, Shirley Centre, Nuffield Road, Chesterton – Thursday 7 March – (18.00 – 20.00)
- Brown’s Field Youth and Community Centre, 31a Green End Road, Cambridge – Tuesday 12 March – (16.00 – 19.00)
- Nun’s Way Pavilion, Nun’s Way, Cambridge – Thursday 14 March – (14.00 – 20.00).

4.6 Copies of the Issues and Options 2 report, and the accompanying Interim Sustainability Appraisal, were available to purchase at the Cambridge City Council Customer Service Centre and at the reception of South Cambridgeshire District Council.

4.7 Representations were submitted using:

- the City Council online JDI consultation system or,
- a printed response form, available from Cambridge City Council’s Customer Service Centre and the reception at South Cambridgeshire District Council or downloaded and filled in electronically by visiting either of the Council websites and returned by email.

4.8 Statutory consultees, including Duty to Cooperate Bodies and general consultation bodies as set out in Appendix 4 to this document were notified of the Issues and Options 2 report consultation by email or letter.

4.9 Other methods of notification used to publicise the consultation exercise included:

- a public notice placed in the Cambridge Independent
- joint Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council news releases
- dedicated pages on each of the Council websites.
- twitter and facebook updates.
- posters displayed at local libraries and other community facilities.
- Landowner and Community Forums held during the consultation period.

## **5. Draft Area Action Plan preparation**

5.1 The draft Area Action Plan has been prepared following consideration of the representations received in respect of the Issues and Options 2019 consultation. Representations received are available to view in full on the Greater Cambridge Planning [consultation portal](#). A summary of representations is included as Appendix 2 to this document.



5.2 During 2018 a series of liaison forums were established to enable discussions with local interest groups during the preparation of the Area Action Plan. The aim of these is to provide support and advice on the development of the AAP and ensure an appropriate and successful plan is produced in accordance with current regulations. The three forums are as follows:

- Community Liaison Forum
- Landowner and Developer Interest Liaison Forum
- Local Ward Member forum

### **Community Liaison Forum**

5.3 Membership of the Community Forum comprises representatives of the following local groups:

- Cambridge Council for Voluntary Services in Arbury Court
- Cambridge Regional College
- Cambridge Sports Lake Trust
- Camcycle
- Chamber of Commerce
- FECRA Residents Association
- Fen Ditton Parish Council
- Fen Estates and Nuffield Road Residents Association (FENRA)
- Histon Road Area Residents Association (HRARA)
- Milton Parish Council
- Milton Road Residents Association
- North Cambridge Academy
- North Cambridge Community Partnership, Kings Hedges
- Nuffield Road Allotment Society
- Old Chesterton Residents Association
- Travel Plan Plus

5.4 The Community Forum was established to provide a means of continuous community input into the preparation of the AAP. Meetings of the Community Liaison Forum have continued throughout the preparation of the draft plan, usually at a venue in North East Cambridge with Council Officers in attendance. Presentations and issues discussed have included an overview of the Area Action Plan, responses to the Issues and Options 2019 consultation, evidence base reports, biodiversity, landscape character and visual appraisal, typologies, a Community and Cultural Infrastructure workshop and the forthcoming consultation process for the Draft AAP.

### **Landowner & Developer Interest Liaison Forum**

5.5 Membership of the Landowner and Developer Interest Forum comprises:

- Anglian Water (Carter Jonas)

- AWG Group Property
- Brookgate (Network Rail)
- Cambridge City Council (Carter Jonas)
- Cambridge Science Park (Trinity)
- Cambridgeshire County Council
- Cambus Ltd
- Chesterton Partnership
- Orchard Street Investment Management
- St. Johns College (Savills)
- Stagecoach East
- The Crown Trust (Cambridge Business Park)
- Trinity College (Bidwells)
- Trinity Hall (Dencora)
- U & I

5.6 Regular meetings of the Landowners and Developer Interest Forum have continued throughout the preparation of the draft plan. Presentations and discussions have included various the evidence based studies, infrastructure provision and timescales for development.

### **Local Ward Member Forum**

5.7 Membership of the Local Ward Member Forum comprises:

- Cambridge City Ward Members for East Chesterton – 3 members
- Cambridge City Ward Members for Kings Hedges – 3 members
- South Cambridgeshire District Ward Members for Fen Ditton & Fulbourn – 3 members
- South Cambridgeshire District Ward Members for Milton & Waterbeach – 3 members
- Cambridgeshire County Council Ward Member for Kings Hedges
- Cambridgeshire County Council Ward Member for Waterbeach

5.8 Meetings of the Local Ward Member Forum, attended by officers from the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service, have been held regularly throughout the preparation of the Draft plan.

### **Design Workshops 2019**

5.9 In addition to the three Liaison forums listed above, a sub-group of the Landowner & Developer Interest Forum was formed to further develop the design strategy underpinning the Area Action Plan. A series of Design Workshops were

held which were attended by urban designer and/or master planner representatives on behalf of each landowner.

5.10 Six Design Workshops were held during the summer of 2019 as follows:

- Design Workshop 1: Working towards a spatial framework – 24 May 2019
- Design Workshop 2: Working towards Sub-area frameworks – 11 June 2019
- Design Workshop 3: Green and Blue Infrastructure – 21 June 2019
- Design Workshop 4: Land Use – 28 June 2019
- Design Workshop 5: Community – 28 June 2019
- Design Workshop 6 – Connectivity – 4 July 2019

5.11 Event records from the Design Workshops will be available to view on the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning website, along with other supporting documents when the Draft AAP is published for consultation.

## Cultural Placemaking Strategy Consultation 2020

5.12 In February and March 2020 a series of consultation events were held in North East Cambridge which provided the opportunity for local residents, students and workers to suggest community facilities and activities that could contribute to the integration of new development proposals for North East Cambridge. The responses received at these events have fed into the NEC Cultural Placemaking Strategy which will be published alongside the Draft Area Action Plan.

5.13 The Cultural Placemaking engagement events are set out below:

- Cambridge Science Park – Tuesday 25 February 2020 – (12.00 – 14:00)
- Cambridge Regional College – Wednesday 26 February 2020 – (12.00 – 14:00)
- Cambridge Regional College – Friday 28 February 2020 – (12.00 – 14:00)
- Arbury Community Centre – Saturday 29 February 2020 – (12.00 – 18:00)
- Brownsfield Community Centre – Wednesday 4 March 2020 – (16.00 – 20.00)

## 6. Draft Area Action Plan Consultation Summer 2020

6.1 A ten-week consultation period for the Draft Area Action Plan will take place from **Monday 20 July 2020 (9.00am) to Friday 25 September 2020 (5.00pm)**.

6.2 The Draft Area Action Plan will be available for inspection, along with various supporting documents and evidence base studies on the [Greater Cambridge Shared](#)

[Planning Service website](#) during the consultation period. Interested parties will be able to submit comments via the online consultation system linked to the website.

6.3 A contact telephone number and email address for the Planning Policy Team will be provided on all publicity material allowing interested parties without access to the internet to arrange to inspect the consultation documents at the following venues (subject to Covid-19 restrictions):

- Cambridge City Council Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, Regent Street, Cambridge
- South Cambridgeshire District Council Reception, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne

6.4 A contact telephone number and email address for the Planning Policy Team will be provided on all publicity material allowing interested parties to purchase a copy of the Draft Area Action Plan.

6.5 Regular updates regarding the Draft Area Action Plan will be posted throughout the consultation period across all social media platforms for both the City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. Posts will include short 'Frequently Asked Questions' videos and will publicise North East Cambridge webinars or web chats and any face to face engagement events that may become possible during the consultation period (subject to Covid-19 restrictions).

6.6 Other ways of publicising the draft plan will include:

- Distributing a paper summary leaflet, along with a postal feedback form, to addresses on the site and in the surrounding area
- Email notifications to Statutory Consultees, including Duty to Cooperate Bodies and general consultation bodies
- Posters will be displayed at frequently visited venues i.e. local supermarkets
- A series of 'pop-up' engagement events at community venues, subject to any Covid-19 restrictions in place at the time
- A public notice in the Cambridge Independent newspaper and joint Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council press releases
- Distributing an information leaflet to the Gypsy and Traveller community adjacent to the North East Cambridge AAP site inviting feedback on the draft plan.
- An article in the South Cambridgeshire residents magazine – Spring 2020 edition

6.7 Contact details for further information:

- Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service Policy Team – telephone number: (01954) 713183 / 07514 922444 or Email: [planningpolicy@greatercambridgeplanning.org](mailto:planningpolicy@greatercambridgeplanning.org)

# Appendix 1

## Cambridge Northern Fringe Area Action Plan

### Issues and Options 1 (2014)

#### Summary of main comments made against each question

##### Chapter 2 – Question 1 (Vision)

Do you support or object to this vision for CNFE? Do you have any comments?

- Respondents – 28
- Support (including qualified) - 13
- Object - 6
- Comment - 9

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q1 Vision (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Considerable support for the vision for CNFE</li><li>• New railway station is supported along with retention of railhead</li><li>• Support for new and existing waste management facilities</li><li>• The CB4 site/Chesterton Partnership able to deliver a comprehensively planned re-development of the largest brownfield site in Cambridge, without the involvement of multiple land-owning parties, ensuring the regeneration of CNFE in tandem with the new rail station opening.</li><li>• Plan will promote/create a network of green spaces and corridors to support local ecology and surface water mitigation.</li></ul>
Q1 Vision (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Object to relocation of sewage works</li><li>• Site redevelopment will require considerable public investment because:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The site is in an inaccessible location</li><li>Anglian water sewage works and railway sidings hampers development potential</li><li>Power lines need to be removed</li><li>Stagecoach will need to be relocated</li><li>New railway station could increase traffic</li><li>Brookgate would have to develop site in a way that would work coherently with potential future</li></ul></li></ul>

	<p>development in the area Transport links would need to be improved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relocate Sewage Works to enable residential use</li> <li>• Put commercial units beside A14, to provide a sound/pollution barrier</li> <li>• Need for housing rather than more commercial units</li> <li>• The aggregates railhead should be accessed by westbound off- and on-slips from and to the A14. Aggregates vehicles should not travel via the Milton Road.</li> <li>• The Household Waste Recycling Centre should stay at Butt Lane.</li> <li>• Masterplan should safeguard a route for a road across into Fen Road Chesterton. Provide a new level crossing or a bridge over the railway or extend planned foot/cycle bridge to Fen Road.</li> <li>• Vision should encourage greater site intensification.</li> <li>• Vision is unrealistic and contains no clear implementation timescales, with specific reference to: transport funding and improvements; mitigation of incompatible land uses; relocation of existing uses; land ownership fragmentation; and market demand.</li> <li>• New development must not have a detrimental effect on established businesses.</li> <li>• Specific mention of biodiversity required.</li> <li>• Include reference to the proposed Waterbeach New Town.</li> <li>• Need for much more housing and employment</li> <li>• Housing need on this site is uncertain</li> <li>• The vision needs to provide high quality urban centre</li> <li>• Site's continued use for aggregates and waste management will detract from the key objective to deliver a high-quality business centre;</li> <li>• Given the employment-led focus, 'sustainable urban living' should comprise part of the overall vision</li> </ul>
Q1 Vision (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for masterplan and comprehensive planning of CNFE</li> <li>• The development should provide everything for its residents including doctors, schools, and cemetery.</li> <li>• New Household Waste Recycling Centre unnecessary</li> <li>• Need policies for renewable and low carbon energy generation and sustainable design and construction</li> <li>• Greater emphasis on developing area as an internationally renowned business, research and development centre.</li> <li>• Site must address current access and infrastructure difficulties.</li> <li>• Essential that the whole area is master planned.</li> <li>• Station access via new road adjacent to sewage works</li> <li>• Provide covered square at CNFE and pedestrianised boulevard on existing Cowley Road</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relocate Police Station to CNFE</li> <li>• New NIAB-sized site for 4000+ houses adjacent to the station, in addition to the residential towers</li> </ul>
Councils' response	A revised vision has been proposed in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation.

### Chapter 3: Question 2 (Development Objectives)

**Do you support or object to these objectives and how would you improve them?**

- Respondents – 24
- Support (including qualified) - 14
- Object - 4
- Comment – 6

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q2 Development Objectives (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The important issues have been identified</li> <li>• Obj. 2 supported but should support higher densities.</li> <li>• Obj. 2 and wider development objectives should reference residential land use.</li> <li>• Wildlife Trust welcomes inclusion of objective 7</li> <li>• Plan will promote / create a network of green spaces and corridors to support local ecology and surface water mitigation.</li> <li>• Objective 3 &amp; 6 considered most important</li> </ul>
Q2 Development Objectives (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objectives are currently too generic and require further clarity.</li> <li>• Objectives need strengthening to reflect scale/ density of development necessary to attract momentum. Specific goals are key to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• achieve relocation/ reconfiguration of water treatment plant</li> <li>• provide substantial new employment opportunities</li> <li>• provide residential development on a sufficient scale - more vibrant/ highly sustainable</li> <li>• consider denser utilisation/ regeneration (eg Science Park)</li> <li>• create connectivity between Science Park, city centre, NE/E Cambridge, villages, beyond</li> <li>• enable preparation of detailed, phased master plan -</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



a clearer vision underpinning redevelopment of overall area - including integration of denser developments - enhanced viability and associated quality

- Objectives should ensure the importance of integrating new development with existing development. Appropriate land use relationships need to be secured between new and existing development to ensure neighbouring land uses are compatible with each other.
- Objectives are ambitious and not based upon fully researched realistic outcomes.
- Objectives should focus on:
  - what is deliverable in next five years
  - development standards
  - phasing of land use changes with implementation of new transport links
  - relocation of existing industrial uses (including assessment of alternative locations)
  - Objectives should also focus on mixed use scheme while retaining as many existing industrial uses
- Proposed objectives should:
  - emphasis the contribution CNFE will make to the wider regeneration and growth agenda of Cambridge
  - include the need to ensure a well-coordinated and integrated approach between CNFE and Waterbeach New Town
  - emphasis the need to maximise the potential of the railway station
- Include a specific reference to residential to provide support for better balance of land uses.
- Include a specific reference to mixed use development; zoning approach could work against well designed buildings.
- Stronger connections required to wider area for effective integration.
- Highly zoned mono use land blocks works against the objective for a well-integrated neighbourhood.
- Current imbalance of land uses could increase carbon footprint, encourage unsustainable travel behaviour and add to emissions.
- Further objective needed which highlights potential interface of site not only with immediate neighbourhood but also with more distant locations which can access it through sustainable travel modes.
- Complex scheme higher ambitious/ coherent manner needed regarding the quality and type of employment uses proposed for the AAP area within these objectives.
- When Sewage Works are removed, area needs to incorporate a new residential area with low-energy housing,

	community facilities, public open spaces, school and shops linked primarily with foot/cycle paths and bus/roads on the periphery.
Q2 Development Objectives (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No excuse to move the Sewage Works</li> <li>• Just as important to maximise affordable housing and schools as it is to maximise employment opportunities</li> <li>• Consideration for a new direct route for cyclists from Abbey to the new station needed</li> <li>• Objective 2 - Amend to ensure the land uses are compatible with neighbouring uses.</li> <li>• New objective to encourage low carbon lifestyle, minimisation of waste both during construction and occupational use and address climate change issues.</li> <li>• New / amend objective to include the consideration for health</li> <li>• The CNFE plan will promote the creation of a network of green spaces and corridors, incorporating ecological mitigation and enhancement and measures to manage surface water.</li> <li>• Important to ensure that the current business research and development and technology function is not diluted.</li> <li>• Useful to identify 'character areas' to confirm the established nature of different parts of the AAP area.</li> <li>• Consideration needs to be given to how to integrate with the wider community given the perceived and physical barriers surrounding the CNFE.</li> <li>• Important to emphasise the quality of the employment opportunities, reflecting the significant training and apprenticeships opportunities that the employment use here could generate, both during construction and afterwards.</li> <li>• Any new local centre needs to capitalise on both local needs and those using the new station to make sure sustainable and vibrant for extended hours. This ideally means co-location of such facilities but if the planned location of the station prevents this, links between the two are considered important.</li> <li>• This should also mean being well-connected with existing users so for example the owners of Cambridge Business Park and St John's Innovation Centre could be encouraged to create better physical connections, particularly for pedestrian and cyclists, with the new station and the remainder of the CNFE AAP area.</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Objectives has been proposed in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation.

## Chapter 4 – Question 3 (AAP boundary)

### Do you support or object to the current area identified for the AAP?

- Respondents – 26
- Support (including qualified) - 17
- Object - 6
- Comment - 3

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q3 AAP boundary (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area needs rejuvenation and should improve the North side of the City</li> <li>• Support CNFE area and Option B boundary extension</li> <li>• CNFE boundary is concurrent with the Draft Local Plans</li> <li>• The economic development perspective is supported</li> </ul>
Q3 AAP boundary (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand eastern boundary to include current Traveller's site for new housing.</li> <li>• Remove sewage works from CNFE</li> <li>• St Johns Innovation Centre and the other business premises including the Cambridge Business Park do not need redevelopment or intensification</li> <li>• The St John's Innovation land should be included within the CNFE provided that there are no more onerous conditions or policies applied to the CNFE plan area</li> <li>• Boundary needs to include the area to the East of the railway (Fen Road)</li> <li>• The eastern boundary should be re-drawn to include land either side of Fen Road and up to the River Cam, with the proviso that development in that area should not compromise Green Belt principles.</li> </ul>
Q3 AAP boundary (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The AAP boundary is defined in the respective draft Local Plans for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire and therefore in procedural terms any amendments may be problematic and should only be contemplated if there are clear and convincing merits in so doing. St John's Innovation Park should only be retained within boundary if it can be allowed to be intensified otherwise it should be excluded</li> <li>• Retain screening within plan and be taken into account for potential waste applications on Anglian Water site</li> <li>• The relationship to the Traveller and Gypsy site should be explored in order to protect the site and associated access.</li> </ul>
Councils'	Views are sought on a revised AAP boundary in the Issues and

response	Options 2019 consultation.
----------	----------------------------

## Chapter 4: Question 4 (AAP boundary extension – Option A Cambridge Science Park)

### Do you support or object to the extension of the CNFE AAP to include Option A – The Cambridge Science Park?

- Respondents – 27
- Support (including qualified) - 12
- Object - 9
- Comment - 6

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q4 AAP boundary extension Option A – Cambridge Science Park (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area should be included in order to retain control over intensification</li> <li>• Include Cambridge Science Park in order to fully address site and station</li> <li>• Include Cambridge Science Park because this would provide comprehensive redevelopment principles to both sites, which are adjacent, benefit from the same transport hub, and share similar problems of access</li> <li>• Support for proposed boundary and Option 'A' extension to include Cambridge Science Park to ensure satisfactory transport modelling is completed.</li> </ul>
Q4 AAP boundary extension Option A – Cambridge Science Park (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusion of the Science Park would require a dilution of the aims set out in the proposed AAP vision and objectives</li> <li>• Little or no direct relevance of the Science Park to the significant development opportunities that exist further to the east</li> <li>• Sufficient policy controls already exist for the Cambridge Science Park</li> <li>• Cambridge Science Park is an existing facility while CNFE is a regeneration development</li> <li>• Cambridge Science Park should be treated as a separate AAP if redevelopment guidance for the park is needed.</li> <li>• No explicit need for the Cambridge Science Park to be included in CNFE boundary</li> <li>• Unclear why Cambridge Regional College has been included in boundary</li> <li>• AAP not needed to drive large scale redevelopment onsite</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy E/1 of the draft South Cambridgeshire Local Plan would facilitate the redevelopment of the Cambridge Science Park</li> <li>• Science Park already developed; option to include it is confusing and unwarranted.</li> </ul>
Q4 AAP boundary extension Option A – Cambridge Science Park (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replace buildings 2 to 24b at the Cambridge Science Park with medium density development with carbon-neutral, radical, sustainable development</li> <li>• Unclear about the reasons for including the Cambridge Science Park other than for reasons to do with traffic entering/leaving the area.</li> <li>• Inclusion of the Cambridge Science Park (Option A) may be beneficial in the long-term in delivering a more sustainable and well-connected development and in achieving Draft Policy E/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. However, the inclusion should be further explored regarding Local Plans development' its inclusion should not delay the proposed investment and development on the remainder of the CNFE area.</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Views are sought on a revised AAP boundary in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation which includes the Science Park.

## Chapter 4 – Question 5 (AAP boundary extension – Option B Chesterton Sidings Triangle)

### Do you support or object to the extension of the CNFE AAP to include Option B – The additional triangular area south of Chesterton Sidings?

- Respondents – 27
- Support (including qualified) - 25
- Object - 0
- Comment – 2

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q5 AAP boundary extension Option B – Chesterton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option will support Objective 6 &amp; 8</li> <li>• Support the lands inclusion if it is needed to for the comprehensive development of the new station and immediate surroundings.</li> </ul>

Sidings Triangle (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include if it maintains or improves access to the railway station</li> <li>• Option enhances the green transport options for CNFE</li> <li>• Option enhances important cycle and pedestrian links to the south</li> <li>• Option will support improved cycle and pedestrian links and the Chisholm Trail</li> </ul>
Q5 AAP boundary extension Option B – Chesterton Sidings Triangle (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the approved station plans, this area is earmarked for species-rich grassland as part of ecological mitigation</li> <li>• Link across the railway and river very important</li> <li>• Keen for the Chisholm Trail to progress</li> <li>• Area should be a designated transport connection between the station, surrounding developments and the Chisholm Trail.</li> <li>• Replacement location needed before existing site can be released</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Modifications to the Local Plan included this area within the Cambridge Northern Fringe East policy area.

## Chapter 4 – Question 6 (Naming the development area)

**This area is planned to change significantly over coming years. What do you think would be a good new name for this part of Cambridge?**

- Respondents – 17
- Support (including qualified) - 3
- Object - 0
- Comment – 14

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q6 Naming the development area (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area name should not be decided by an individual landowner</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Issues and Options 2019 identifies the area as Cambridge Northern Fringe.

## Chapter 4 – Question 7a (Naming the proposed new railway station Cambridge Science Park)

### Do you support or object to the new railway station being named Cambridge Science Park Station?

- Respondents - 24
- Support (including qualified) - 11
- Object – 12
- Comment – 1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q7a Naming the proposed new railway station (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is already 'known' as that.</li> <li>• It identifies the location of the new station</li> <li>• The Cambridge Science Park is the best known of the groups of offices in this area and is often referred to as representing all of them</li> <li>• World renowned centre of technological and business excellence</li> </ul>
Q7a Naming the proposed new railway station (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge North so when Addenbrookes has a station that can be called Cambridge South</li> <li>• Station not on Science Park; the name is misleading</li> <li>• Station is more than just for the Science Park</li> <li>• Cambridge Science Park is 1/2mile west of the station</li> <li>• Object to name Chesterton Interchange Station</li> <li>• Naming new station after Science Park would be misleading resulting in poor legibility</li> <li>• Station not at the Science Park</li> <li>• Should not be called Cambridge Science Park</li> <li>• Name is misleading and confusing</li> </ul>
Q7a Naming the proposed new railway station (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Station will benefit from name based affiliation</li> <li>• If option (a) emerges as a key descriptor then name should become Cambridge Science Parks in recognition of proximity of several relevant campuses.</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Railway station has been named Cambridge North.

## Chapter 4 – Question 7b (Naming the proposed new railway station Chesterton Interchange Station)

Do you support or object to the new railway station being named Chesterton Interchange Station?

- Respondents – 15
- Support (including qualified) - 0
- Object - 14
- Comment – 1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q7b Naming the proposed new railway station (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge North so when Addenbrookes has a station that can be called Cambridge South</li> <li>• It is neither in Chesterton nor is it an interchange</li> <li>• Nobody outside Cambridge will know where it is</li> <li>• Gives wrong impression</li> <li>• Searching online, people will not realise this station in Cambridge without Cambridge at the beginning</li> <li>• Station is not an interchange; it is a new destination</li> <li>• Unimaginative</li> <li>• Cambridge North</li> <li>• Name is misleading; Station is not an interchange with other railways</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Railway station has been named Cambridge North.

## Chapter 4 – Question 7c (Naming the proposed new railway station Cambridge North Station)

Do you support or object to the new railway station being named Cambridge North Station?

- Respondents - 30
- Support (including qualified) - 24
- Object - 2
- Comment: 4



Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q7c Naming the proposed new railway station (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes what it will be</li> <li>• Makes sense</li> <li>• Cambridge North so when Addenbrookes has a station that can be called Cambridge South</li> <li>• Appropriate as tied to the wider geographical area that it serves is more inclusive</li> <li>• Name is suited giving the area a higher profile</li> </ul>
Q7c Naming the proposed new railway station (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unimaginative</li> </ul>
Q7c Naming the proposed new railway station (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already called Cambridge Science Park and clearly identifies the location</li> <li>• Name must start with Cambridge to aid online searching</li> <li>• CNFE station should be called Cambridge Park Station &amp; City station should be called Cambridge station to improve legibility and help tourists who visit the city</li> <li>• If "science park" emerges as part of this consultation as a key descriptor, we contend that it should be used in the plural - "Cambridge Science Parks" - in recognition of proximity of several relevant campuses.</li> <li>• Identifies in Cambridge and geographically to the north.</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Railway station has been named Cambridge North.

## Chapter 4 – Question 7d (Naming the proposed new railway station Cambridge Fen Station)

### Do you support or object to the new railway station being named Cambridge Fen Station?

- Respondents – 13
- Support (including qualified) - 1
- Object - 11
- Comment – 4

<b>Question</b>	<b>Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation</b>
Q7d Naming the proposed new railway station (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beside Fen Road at Chesterton Fen, near Fen Ditton, and at the junction to Fen Drayton</li> </ul>
Q7d Naming the proposed new railway station (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Misleading - Station not in the Fen</li> <li>• Name not representative of the location</li> <li>• Undermines proposed vision which is for integration into Cambridge</li> <li>• Won't be in Fens once built around</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Railway station has been named Cambridge North.

## **Chapter 4 – Question 7e (Naming the proposed new railway station - other suggestions)**

### **Do you have any other suggestions for naming the new railway station?**

- Respondents - 10
- Support (including qualified) - 0
- Object - 1
- Comment - 9

<b>Question</b>	<b>Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014</b>
Q7e Naming the proposed new railway station (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge North</li> <li>• Cambridge Science Park</li> <li>• CNFE station should be called Cambridge Park Station &amp; City station should be called Cambridge station to improve legibility and help tourists who visit the city</li> <li>• Cambridge Fen Gateway Station</li> <li>• Milton</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Railway station has been named Cambridge North.

## Chapter 6 – Question 8 (Site context and constraints)

**Do you have any comments on the site context and constraints, and what other issues and constraints should be taken into account in the preparation of the Area Action Plan?**

- Respondents – 27
- Support (including qualified) - 1
- Object - 3
- Comment - 23

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q8 Site context and constraints (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting focus on cycle and pedestrian infrastructure and prioritising this. Ensure area is easy and safe to get to by bike – this is crucial if the council is to limit increased vehicular congestion.</li> </ul>
Q8 Site context and constraints (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site Constraints. These include:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Financial viability.</li> <li>○ Inaccessible location</li> <li>○ Anglian Water sewage works and railway sidings hampers development potential</li> <li>○ Power line would need to be removed.</li> <li>○ Relocation of stagecoach needed.</li> <li>○ New station could increase traffic.</li> <li>○ Brookgate would have to develop site in a way that would work coherently with potential future development in the area.</li> <li>○ Transport links would need to be improved.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• We object strongly to the siting of such a new recycling centre as shown in the four options.</li> </ul>
Q8 Site context and constraints (Comment)	<p>Facilities/land uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reconsider relocation of water recycling centre</li> <li>• Sewage works should remain where they are</li> <li>• The Sewage Works should be removed to permit a greater proportion of residential development where the ground conditions permit</li> <li>• If the site is largely unsuitable for dwellings both in terms of costs to mitigate contamination and odour issues why would it be conceivable that developments such as restaurants and cafés would be viable?</li> <li>• There is the potential through the redevelopment of the site to enhance the First Public Drain, with surface water mitigation, ecological or aesthetic values using a number of possible hydrogeological improvements.</li> </ul>

- Lack of information on traffic and junction layout prevents the assessment of relative impact of options.
- Household Waste Recycling Centre could be relocated; further research will be needed to explore this constraint
- Need for housing uncertain on this site against competing land uses
- Relocation of non-conforming uses is desirable
- Open space needs careful thought
- Loss or replacement of the golf driving range not adequately addressed
- Protection of the waste facility is contradictory to the aim of the AAP
- Unsuitable access for household recycling facility; too close to Jane Coston Bridge and crosses protected verge land.

#### Transport

- Network Rail's disused private access road from Milton Road to Chesterton railway sidings running along the north side of the Business Park should be made into a public footpath and cycleway travelling to and from the new railway station.
- Crown Estate should install side entrances on the North side of the Cambridge Business Park
- Local parking will have an impact on local residents
- How will local buses be improved
- Milton Road is already at capacity. Direct access to and within the site should be prioritised for pedestrians, cyclists and users of the guided bus (to discourage use of cars).
- Aggregate lorries should be restricted to the northern perimeter.
- Highway capacity remains a significant constraint requiring further investigation with a mitigation strategy developed as part of any future development proposals.
- Need to reflect all transport modes
- Until updated evidence base including sensitivity testing and transport modelling data is available and understood, there is no benefit with developing the AAP until they are available.
- CNFE should not proceed without Network Rail allowing a cycle and foot path along their land south of Cowley Road
- Need to focus on cycle and pedestrian infrastructure
- Good access for pedestrians and cyclists requires careful consideration

#### Utilities

- Consider safeguarding the old surface water drain under the sidings (and existing railway) straight through to Camside Farm, which could be a cheaper route for a sewage connection under the railway to Fen Road residents.
- Surface water runoff should be controlled to avoid flooding commercial premises and residences in Fen Road.

	<p>Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buildings on the site should be no taller than three floors.</li> <li>• There should be NO ugly/massive/inhuman 'statement' or 'gateway' buildings on the site.</li> </ul> <p>Links with neighbouring developments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to provide contextual strategic developments to ensure well-coordinated and integrated developments i.e. Waterbeach and associated transport links</li> <li>• Greater focus should be given to how the wider region (e.g. major housing development West of Cambridge) can access CNFE</li> </ul> <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contamination should not be overstated and seen as a barrier to development. The current odour maps do not reflect Anglian Water's proposed WRC upgrades and should be re-visited</li> <li>• The issue of land ownership and a commitment of landowners to bring forward land remains a critical feature of the Plan. Whilst the presence of Anglian Water is important it is the case that development can still proceed nearby where appropriate mitigation measures are put in place.</li> <li>• Would the regeneration of the AAP site for residential, office and R&amp;D purposes be the most advantageous way to provide employment opportunities on this site for those as described in paragraph 6.4 of the consultation document, adjacent "disadvantage communities"?</li> <li>• Need to safeguard the old surface water drain under the sidings (and existing railway) straight through to Camside Farm, a potentially cheaper route for a sewage connection under the railway to Fen Road residences.</li> <li>• Odour issues for WRC key</li> <li>• Density strategy is key and locations for this need careful thought as well.</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Views are sought on constraints in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation, and other issues including transport, design, and surface water drainage.

## Chapter 7 – Question 9 (Development Principles)

Do you support or object to the Development Principles (A to P)? Please add any comments or suggestions.

- Respondents – 25
- Support (including qualified) - 12
- Object - 6
- Comment - 7

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q9 Development Principles (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principles               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for A, B, D, F, G, L, M, N, O &amp; P</li> <li>• Support B, leisure facilities and open space.</li> <li>• Principals E, F and G will maximise the Employment opportunities of the area.</li> <li>• Support development principle M; in particular the recognition of the importance of biodiversity features being part of a well-connected network.</li> <li>• Subject to highways access issues highlighted above, support these principles to maximise employment opportunities, but would like to see further emphasis on the B1(b) uses.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objectives               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend Objective B to read "By creating a sustainable, cohesive and inclusive area by ensuring there is appropriate support, improving access to jobs, homes, open space, leisure facilities and other services within the development and to the wider community".</li> <li>• 2 &amp; 3 most important</li> <li>• Support for the principle of locating higher density development in close proximity to the transport hubs.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Q9 Development Principles (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Without changing Development Principles, these will be used to justify the relocation of the Sewage Works to a greenfield site. The existing Sewage Works and underground piping represents a vast investment.</li> <li>• Objective 1               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A -Current planning mustn't be overturned by commercial interests.</li> <li>• A - Is a piecemeal approach lacking the coherence and critical mass needed to maximise the potential the area has to contribute to the future of the City and South Cambs.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B - No to commercial/industrial as this would attract more attract traffic</li> <li>• Objective 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need explicit references to: high densities given the highly sustainable location of CNFE the provision of residential use to meet the need identified in para 1.13</li> <li>• C - Object to the development of R&amp;D, industrial or commercial purposes unless these are on the perimeter of the site.</li> <li>• D - The guided busway route should retain wide pedestrian and cycle paths beside it, with trees and hedges to protect each from the other and to provide wind protection. Footpaths and cycle paths should be permitted the direct routes; cars should be directed via longer routes to preserve open green space.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objective 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E - Should be a greater proportion of residential development than industrial.</li> <li>• G - Sewage works should be moved.</li> <li>• G – relocate</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objective 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• H - A sustainable new community should be developed with community buildings, local shops houses and a school.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objective 5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I - object to 'development forms' which are large, tall, ugly, conceived as a 'gateway' and poorly designed. I would require human-scale, attractive buildings which are fit for purpose with green space attractive for public use between them.</li> <li>• J - cyclists/pedestrians should have priority. Cars should use the periphery.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objective 6 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K - Object to the 'creation of a gateway' which implies a combination of tall, overbearing buildings and draughty, overshadowed streets between them.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development, by trying to satisfy development for everyone lacks focus.</li> <li>• There is significant economic potential to promote the wider Cambridge North area including Cambridge Northern Fringe and A10 corridor such as the Research Park and Waterbeach New Town.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>Q9 Development Principles (Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access and traffic must be fully addressed</li> <li>• Refer to the Water Recycling Centre as the Sewage Works</li> <li>• Opportunities identified for the CNFE reflect need to</li> </ul>

maximise employment opportunities & the St. John's Innovation Park must play a role in this approach

- Objective 4 (Principles C & D)
  - C - Is too commercially focussed and could work against the need for balanced mix of uses to deliver the most sustainable place that is well integrated with adjoining communities and provides real benefit to those communities. A principle relating to the new residential community envisaged within the AAP area would provide better balance.
  - C - Should be strengthened to make it abundantly clear that the Council is seeking for CNFE to be delivered as a high quality, exemplar commercial-led scheme. As written the objective does not provide for this important aspiration.
  - C - Inadequate emphasis to the employment-led priority for the area and appears to give too much encouragement to residential uses;
  - D - Do not agree that this should be focused "around the transport hub" which implies the new railway station. May be appropriate for CB1 but not for CNFE
  - C & D - do not make any reference to residential under Objective 2.
- Objective 3 (Principles E, F & G)
  - Objective 3 shouldn't get highest priority.
  - Maximising employment opportunities should include existing developments and brownfield regeneration sites.
  - F - "Where possible" too loosely worded; Principle dependent on cost. Developers should provide the same facilities at a limited % extra cost to where they are currently, or for a limited time. Current light industrial users may not be able to afford to stay with no obvious location for them to move to.
  - F - Should have a higher ambition of relocating existing businesses, particularly where they are non-conforming, as being "appropriate" and not merely as "possible".
  - G - Should not be automatically assumed that the strategic aggregates railhead will be required to be retained on the CNFE site in perpetuity. There may be opportunities to consider other locations whereby its presence will not detract from the quality of development that the Council should be properly seeking at CNFE.
  - G - Gives unqualified support for difficult uses (aggregates and waste) without recognising their potential to compromise the quality of the development achievable.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objective 5 (Principles I &amp; J) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to mixed use development should be included; zoning approach could work against well designed buildings.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objective 6 (Principles K &amp; L) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stronger connections required to wider area for effective integration. Highly zoned mono use land blocks works against the objective for a well-integrated neighbourhood.</li> <li>• K - Needs to be broadened to reflect and recognise the other transport modes and routes by which people will access the CNFE area. As written it largely assumes that the railway station and the busway alone are what makes the area a transport hub. That is short-sighted as there is other transport infrastructure such as cycle routes, roads and conventional buses that can equally provide ready access to and from CNFE.</li> <li>• Care needed with delivery of Principle L alongside existing and planned mineral and waste activity to avoid conflict.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objective 7 (Principles M, N &amp; O) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dev Principle M. Allow the strip of land beside the ditch along Cowley Road to remain a green space with a footpath along it.</li> <li>• As watercourses are included, we suggest a change to "...a network of green and blue spaces..."</li> <li>• We also suggest removing the word "attractive" as this is a very subjective idea and not relevant to benefitting biodiversity.</li> <li>• N - Every opportunity should be taken to make the site greener. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• O – Caveat this objective by the addition of the words "where necessary".</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objective 8 (Principle P) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires a mixed community - current imbalance of land uses will increase carbon footprint, encourage unsustainable travel behaviour and add to emissions.</li> <li>• Larger scale and denser development should be centrally located within the AAP area and should not be reflected by the erection of large scale buildings at the eastern edge of the wider site - i.e. where the railway station is to be situated.</li> <li>• The scale, massing and density of development should step down where the CNFE area adjoins and interacts with open countryside and could impact adversely on the setting of the City unless carefully managed and integrated.</li> <li>• There is an obvious interface for an aggregation of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>larger scale buildings where the designated CNFE area meets with the existing parks in the area, such as St John's Innovation Park, the Cambridge Business Park and the Cambridge Science Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for the addition of a new local centre within the AAP area which will meet the needs of existing and future workers and residents.</li> <li>• Additional development principle needed to ensure essential services /infrastructure retained or provided such as Household Recycling Centre.</li> <li>• Include 'health' to address deprivation in/around Chesterton.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Councils' response	Views are sought on a revised approach to the area in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation.

## Chapter 8 – Question 10 (Redevelopment Options – Option 1)

**Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in Option 1? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.**

- Respondents – 40
- Support (including qualified) - 17
- Object - 15
- Comment - 8

<b>Question 10 –</b>	<b>Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014</b>
Option 1 - Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not a strategic vision</li> <li>• Greater ambition is required to deliver a transformational gateway regeneration scheme.</li> <li>• Inefficient use of the site</li> <li>• Does not offer sufficient ambitious vision for this vitally important site</li> <li>• Option would be appropriate as it leaves provisions for sensible future development of the water recycling site</li> <li>• Anglian Water's preferred option.</li> <li>• The most realistic outcome given land ownership, land use and infrastructure delivery constraints associated with AAP site.</li> <li>• Will not deliver successful regeneration of the wider area, maximise sustainable urban living opportunities or suitable</li> </ul>

	<p>density of development required to exploit the significant investment in the transport.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would limit the development potential, the infrastructure and connectivity improvements and the role of the new station</li> </ul>
Option 1 - General land uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support mixed use approach with emphasis on the area's primary role to avoid dilution of this core/distinctive and valuable focus of the area</li> <li>• Key and the plan need amending to ensure that plot densification also applies to the St John's Innovation Park.</li> <li>• Fails to propose any new residential development or a local service hub</li> <li>• No opportunity for urban living.</li> <li>• Will not provide a mix of land uses at densities that make best use of the site.</li> <li>• Inconsistent with the development objectives to create a sustainable community</li> <li>• Fails to acknowledge the potential for "plot densification" on the Innovation Park.</li> <li>• Juxtaposition of areas which host very differing use classes will be difficult to control in terms of noise, odour and vibration</li> <li>• The B1 provision should not feature B1(b) uses.</li> <li>• Leaves significant area of underused land with non-conforming use</li> <li>• Does not maximise the opportunity for a vibrant new employment-led development and maintains the status quo to a very substantial degree save for localised redevelopment of specific plots.</li> <li>• Support identification of Cambridge Business Park as offices/R&amp;D with potential for intensification</li> </ul>
Option 1 – Specific use issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove Wastewater Treatment Centre or significantly modernised to stop any odour-nuisance to neighbours.</li> <li>• The odour footprint should be updated</li> <li>• HWRC would be a compatible use with the WRC.</li> <li>• Household Waste Recycling Centre and inert recycling facility on the Anglian Water site not compatible to the nature and character of the uses on the Innovation Park.</li> <li>• Definitive line between odour zones seems somewhat arbitrary to defining uses within the CNFE</li> </ul>
Option 1 - Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The aggregates area in this option effectively blocks any possible level crossing to Fen Road.</li> <li>• Support promotion of sustainable transport and movement by improving permeability and access to key routes</li> <li>• Lack of information about traffic and junction layout does</li> </ul>

	<p>not allow an assessment to be made about the impact on existing businesses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fails to consider pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users, including disabled on buses, by placing a Multi-storey carpark right next to the station.</li> <li>• Station car park and taxi rank should be sited a minimum of 100 metres away.</li> <li>• Cowley Road should be pedestrianised</li> <li>• New pedestrian access points to the Business Park</li> <li>• Nuffield Road access should be via Milton Road</li> <li>• Current environment along Cowley Road is very unwelcoming, especially for pedestrians.</li> <li>• More detailed transport assessment work required</li> </ul>
Option 1 - Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough green space</li> <li>• A great opportunity for providing the City of Cambridge with a new green lung, which could include appropriate leisure opportunities and help to re-balance the current trend to over-development.</li> <li>• Improved landscaping supported</li> <li>• Leaves open the option of a sensible future development of the water recycling site that could (and should) include a major new green area (at least 75% of the site).</li> <li>• None of the current proposals add any significant green open spaces. The only green areas shown are no more than token buffer spaces.</li> <li>• Great opportunity for providing the City with a new green lung, which could include appropriate leisure opportunities and help re-balance the current trend to over-development.</li> </ul>
Option 1 - Viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Viability testing needed.</li> <li>• Not the best option, but viable as a solution, with no obvious problems.</li> </ul>
Option 1 – Other comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The "Household Waste Recycling Centre and inert recycling facility" referred to in Option 1 requires a definition in Appendix 3 (Glossary of Terms).</li> </ul>

## Chapter 8 – Question 11 (Redevelopment Options - Option 2)

Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in Option 2? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

- Respondents – 41
- Support (including qualified) - 13
- Object - 19
- Comment - 9

Question 11	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Option 2 - Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not a strategic vision</li> <li>• Does not offer sufficient ambitious vision for this vitally important site</li> <li>• This quantum of development would be more likely to allow for the development principles outlined in the Issues and Options paper to be implemented.</li> <li>• Need to demonstrate that this option will not cause negative impacts on existing residents, workers and investors.</li> <li>• Will not deliver successful regeneration of the wider area, maximise sustainable urban living opportunities or suitable density of development required to exploit the significant investment in the transport.</li> <li>• Appears to strike a good balance between delivery and ambition however it is not without its own constraints</li> <li>• Proposes a more balanced mix of land uses and maintains the potential for early delivery, however there remains scope to further improve upon the efficiency of the use of the land</li> </ul>
Option 2 – General land uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Sacrifices' commercial land for more residential land when the emerging Local Plan is not dependent on such development coming forward.</li> <li>• Will potentially result in the loss of the bus depot</li> <li>• Support mixed use approach with emphasis on the area's primary role to avoid dilution of this core/distinctive and valuable focus of the area</li> <li>• Support identification of Cambridge Business Park as offices/R&amp;D with potential for intensification</li> <li>• St John's Innovation Park should be considered as having the same potential for the intensification of employment provision.</li> <li>• Re-configured aggregates railhead and sidings supported to replace the existing aggregates railhead lost by the development of the new station.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The replacement of this railhead is paramount to the continued supply of aggregates for development of both the local and wider Cambridgeshire area.</li> <li>• Leaves significant area of underused land with non-conforming use (WWTW) which constrains development</li> <li>• Approve of the housing development, must insist on 40% affordable</li> <li>• Not clear that area would be attractive place to live and therefore not convinced that this option is appropriate at this time.</li> <li>• Residential development, particularly near the station is supported as is the proposed increase in Offices/R &amp; D with associated job creation and the development of a local centre.</li> </ul>
Option 2 – Specific use issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove Waste Water Treatment Centre or significantly modernised to stop any odour-nuisance to neighbours.</li> <li>• The odour footprint should be updated</li> <li>• Definitive line between odour zones seems somewhat arbitrary to defining uses within the CNFE</li> <li>• HWRC would be a compatible use with the WRC. Exact location of it would need to be the subject of further investigation.</li> <li>• Replacement bus depot location needed before existing site can be released</li> <li>• Residential development within the 1.5 odour contour should be removed</li> <li>• Household Waste Recycling Centre and inert recycling facility on the Anglian Water site not compatible to the nature and character of the uses on the Innovation Park.</li> <li>• Does not take into account the loss of the golf driving range.</li> </ul>
Option 2 - Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The aggregates area in this option effectively blocks any possible level crossing to Fen Road.</li> <li>• More detailed transport assessment work required</li> <li>• The provision of a new Heavy Goods Vehicle access is supported to provide a more efficient, direct and safe access to the railhead and other industrial areas.</li> <li>• Shows heavy goods vehicle access through Stagecoach site. No details on how, where and financing of a relocated bus depot</li> <li>• Fails to consider pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users, including disabled on buses, by placing a Multi-storey carpark right next to the station.</li> <li>• Cowley Road should be pedestrianised</li> <li>• New pedestrian access points to the Business Park</li> <li>• Nuffield Road access should be via Milton Road</li> <li>• Station car park and taxi rank should be sited a minimum of</li> </ul>

	<p>100 metres away.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support promotion of sustainable transport and movement by improving permeability and access to key routes</li> <li>• Lack of information about traffic and junction layout does not allow an assessment to be made about the impact on existing businesses</li> <li>• There is significant doubt on whether necessary infrastructure upgrades such as the Milton Road interchange will all be in place on time to meet with the residential, office and R&amp;D sector demands.</li> </ul>
Option 2 - Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved landscaping, and a 'green boulevard' along Cowley Road</li> <li>• Support proposed increase in informal open space provision, but could be improved.</li> <li>• Leaves open the option of a sensible future development of the water recycling site that could (and should) include a major new green area (at least 75% of the site).</li> <li>• None of the current proposals add any significant green open spaces. The only green areas shown are no more than token buffer spaces.</li> <li>• Great opportunity for providing the City with a new green lung, which could include appropriate leisure opportunities and help re-balance the current trend to over-development.</li> </ul>
Option 2 - Viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Viability testing needed</li> <li>• Option most likely should Option 3 not be feasible or viable</li> </ul>

## Chapter 8 – Question 12 (Redevelopment Options - Option 3)

**Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in Option 3? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.**

- Respondents – 43
- Support (including qualified) - 11
- Object - 21
- Comment - 11

<b>Question 12</b>	<b>Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014</b>
Option 3 - Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More considered option than 1 and 2</li> <li>• Need to demonstrate that this option will not cause negative impacts on existing residents, workers and investors.</li> <li>• Urge the local authorities and Anglian Water to work together to find solutions that would allow it to be achieved.</li> <li>• Option too ambitious and will never happen.</li> <li>• A better option than 1 or 2 but density approach is flawed</li> <li>• Waste water consolidation does not provide for enhanced balance of uses and delivery of place that supports sustainable urban living with well balanced mix of uses.</li> <li>• Current zonal planning of the residential areas as shown on the plan needs additional design</li> <li>• The area will benefit more from strategic long term transformation</li> </ul>
Option 3 – General land uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support mixed use approach with emphasis on the area's primary role to avoid dilution of this core/distinctive and valuable focus of the area</li> <li>• Replacement of railhead paramount to continued supply of aggregates for development of both local and wider Cambridgeshire area.</li> <li>• Approve of the housing development, must insist on 40% affordable</li> <li>• Option 3 is a stepping-stone to this option and could be an interim solution. Further housing could be added later.</li> <li>• Support identification of Cambridge Business Park as offices/R&amp;D with potential for intensification</li> <li>• The imbalance between residential and employment uses coupled with the focus on industrial and storage development will not lead to the successful regeneration of the wider area.</li> <li>• Further B1 and research and development uses would complement the area around the St John's Innovation Park and at Cambridge Business Park</li> </ul>
Option 3 – Specific use issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove Waste Water Treatment Centre or significantly modernised to stop any odour-nuisance to neighbours.</li> <li>• Not advisable to relocate the Water Recycling Centre and no alternative site suggested.</li> <li>• The reconfiguration of the Waste Water Recycling Centre site is not realistic within the plan period. The option is unproven</li> <li>• Object to indicative location of Household Recycling Centre. Should be located further to the east within B2/B8 uses not adjacent to Offices/R&amp;D</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partially support reducing the area covered by WWTW, but object to proposed B2/B8 uses adjacent to Vitrum Building / St Johns Innovation site.</li> <li>• Inappropriate to have HWRC use in close proximity to B1 offices and research and development uses as a result of noise, dust and other environmental impacts.</li> <li>• Improvements to the Water Recycling Centre are welcome so long as this does not delay improvements to the area nearer the station.</li> <li>• No evidence that the Water Recycling Centre could be suitably contained to make the site an attractive area to live.</li> <li>• New residential space around the station and on Nuffield Road would create a better balance of activities and increase the sustainability credentials in this part of the City</li> <li>• Re-configured replacement bus depot location needed before existing site can be released. No details on how, where and financing.</li> <li>• Aggregates railhead and sidings is supported to replace the existing aggregates railhead lost by the development of the new station.</li> <li>• The odour footprint should be updated</li> <li>• Loss of the golf driving range not taken into account</li> <li>• Important that plan objective to maximise employment opportunities is afforded across the existing employment areas</li> </ul>
Option 3 - Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The aggregates area in this option effectively blocks any possible level crossing to Fen Road.</li> <li>• Keen to see industrial traffic moved away from Cowley Road</li> <li>• New heavy goods vehicle access is supported but may not be deliverable as it primarily serves landowners other than the City Council mainly on whose land it is sited</li> <li>• Northern access road must be completed in order to facilitate further growth.</li> <li>• Shows heavy goods vehicle access through Stagecoach site. No details on how, where and financing of a relocated bus depot</li> <li>• Improved Cambridge Business Park links are good. Consideration should be given to improving these further and opening the site up more to the north and east so better integrated with the wider CNFE.</li> <li>• The promotion of sustainable transport and movement by improving permeability and access to key routes</li> <li>• Lack of information about traffic and junction layout does not allow an assessment to be made about the impact on existing businesses.</li> <li>• Station car park and taxi rank should be sited a minimum of</li> </ul>

	<p>100 metres away.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport investment not exploited.</li> <li>• Fails to consider pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users, including disabled on buses, by placing a Multi-storey carpark right next to the station.</li> </ul>
Option 3 - Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support improved landscaping and 'green boulevard' along Cowley Road</li> <li>• Put green protected open space over the busway and create public spaces around the station relating to the new residential uses.</li> <li>• None of the current proposals add any significant green open spaces. The only green areas shown are no more than token buffer spaces.</li> <li>• Great opportunity for providing the City with a new green lung, which could include appropriate leisure opportunities and help re-balance the current trend to over-development.</li> </ul>
Option 3 - Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not clear that the sewage works can provide sufficient capacity and how any increase in capacity if needed, would be handled or located.</li> </ul>
Option 3 - Viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant viability concerns</li> <li>• Doubt that this option is viable</li> <li>• Concerned about viability and deliverability of Option 3, which is reliant upon the upgrading and reduction in area of the Water Recycling Centre - a significant issue – questioning the deliverability</li> <li>• The land currently within the Waste Water Recycling Centre identified for re-use would be heavily contaminated and costs of remediating that land would not be attractive to investors given that the returns gained from the development would be for B2 and/or B8 Uses.</li> <li>• Significant highway works due to the increased quantum of development will further affect viability and deliverability.</li> <li>• Need to confirm the rationalisation of the water recycling plant is feasible, viable and would not delay development on the remainder of the site.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 8 – Question 13 (Redevelopment Options - Option 4)

Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in Option 4? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

- Respondents – 46
- Support (including qualified) - 11
- Object - 24
- Comment - 11

Question 13	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Option 4 - Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to think strategically and holistically</li> <li>• Need to demonstrate that this option will not cause negative impacts on existing residents, workers and investors.</li> <li>• Removal of WWTW means area can be looked at/redeveloped properly without restriction</li> <li>• Comprehensive planning difficult due to the differences in site phasing resulting in piecemeal development contrary to the proposed CNFE vision.</li> <li>• Overarching objective to create a transformative gateway with a strong employment focus should remain consistent</li> <li>• Option will be heavily constrained by efforts to relocate the Water Recycling Centre.</li> <li>• The current zonal planning of the residential areas as shown on the plan need a more detailed urban design framework.</li> <li>• Delivery of this quantum of development could allow for the development principles outlined in the Issues and Options paper to be implemented.</li> <li>• CNFE is rightly identified largely for employment uses, with the more residential themes being located in and around any new railway station.</li> <li>• Would support the proposal for a mixed use site, with more housing meeting the City's objectives - subject to the issues about connectivity being addressed. There could be more residential included in this option.</li> <li>• Unlikely to occur, so focus effort on achievable solution</li> </ul>
Option 4 – General land use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support mixed use approach with emphasis on the area's primary role to avoid dilution of this core/distinctive and valuable focus of the area</li> <li>• Option should maximise housing provision and open spaces</li> <li>• Density needs to be maximised in order to make the</li> </ul>

	<p>development as efficient as possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support identification of Cambridge Business Park as offices/R&amp;D with potential for intensification</li> <li>• Support removal of WRC and proposed B1/R&amp;D uses opposite St Johns Innovation Centre.</li> <li>• Proposed mix of land uses is unbalanced and Option 4 will not facilitate early delivery.</li> <li>• The development outcome would be for 630 dwellings in an area which would provide for 27,600 jobs. This is not considered to be a sustainable balance of homes to jobs.</li> <li>• Exacerbated imbalance between residential and employment uses and coupled with the focus on industrial and storage development will not lead to the successful regeneration of the wider area.</li> <li>• The new condition created and inappropriate emphasis of B2/B8 uses within City boundary does not maximise opportunity created by the complete re-location of the WWTW.</li> <li>• Concerned process of relocating Water Recycling Centre will delay the regeneration of the area nearer the station.</li> </ul>
<p>Option 4 – Specific use issues</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the associated need to relocate the water recycling centre and in principle any general improvement to the treatment works</li> <li>• Strongly object to moving the sewage works - huge investment has already been made into the existing site and would be likely to use greenfield site elsewhere</li> <li>• Alternative site for WRC has not been identified.</li> <li>• No operational or regulatory reasons to justify relocation of WRC. Anglian Water is unable to include such relocation in its business plan.</li> <li>• Evidence has not been provided to illustrate that moving the Water Recycling Centre is financially viable.</li> <li>• Object to indicative location of Household Recycling Centre. Should be located further to the east within B2/B8 uses not adjacent to Offices/R&amp;D. Use is not compatible with adjacent B1 offices and research and development uses.</li> <li>• Re-configured replacement bus depot location needed before existing site can be released. No details on how, where and financing.</li> <li>• Residential accommodation on this site beyond that in options 1 to 3 would be inappropriate in view of odour problems and undesirability of making population of Cambridge even bigger than it already is.</li> </ul>
<p>Option 4 - Transport</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New heavy goods vehicle access is supported but may not be deliverable as it primarily serves land owners other than</li> </ul>

	<p>the City Council mainly on whose land it is sited</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved Cambridge Business Park links are good. Consideration should be given to improving these further and opening the site up more to the north and east so better integrated with the wider CNFE.</li> <li>• Fails to consider pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users, including disabled on buses, by placing a Multi-storey carpark right next to the station. Shows heavy goods vehicle access through Stagecoach site. No details on how, where and financing of a relocated bus depot</li> <li>• Station car park and taxi rank should be sited a minimum of 100 metres away.</li> <li>• Concern about traffic impact</li> <li>• Lack of information about traffic and junction layout does not allow an assessment to be made about the impact on existing businesses.</li> <li>• Transport investment not exploited</li> </ul>
Option 4 - Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support improved landscaping and 'green boulevard' along Cowley Road</li> <li>• The Waste Water Recycling Centre would be heavily contaminated and costs of remediating that land would not be attractive to investors.</li> <li>• None of the current proposals add any significant green open spaces. The only green areas shown are no more than token buffer spaces.</li> <li>• Great opportunity for providing the City with a new green lung, which could include appropriate leisure opportunities and help re-balance the current trend to over-development.</li> </ul>
Option 4 - Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Entirely reliant upon relocation of the Water Recycling Centre offsite. The viability of this is unknown and there are significant technical, financial and operational constraints.</li> </ul>
Option 4 - Viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Likely to encounter more delivery risks associated with the potential relocation of the WRC (identifying a site, funding, and timing) and this could impede the overall development.</li> <li>• Sub-optimal (unviable) land uses provided on valuable site provided by WWTW relocation.</li> <li>• Significant viability concerns.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 8 – Questions 10 to 13 (Redevelopment Options 1-4)

<p><b>Questions 10 to 13 – Options 1 - 4</b></p>	<p><b>Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014</b></p>
<p>Additional comments on Options 1 - 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question the apparent mutual exclusivity between residential and employment uses within the redevelopment options. Plan for a balance between these two uses to reduce the need for travel and the tidal nature of the trips to and from the development.</li> <li>• Car park development should not be 600 capacity (as it is proposed), but 6,000 car park. Otherwise residents of the surrounding area will be affected.</li> <li>• Much more residential required; over supply of offices once CB1 is finished</li> <li>• New orbital bus route for Cambridge</li> <li>• All reliant on link roads to Fen Ditton and Wadloes Road.</li> <li>• Undertaking low and medium development can be done immediately without the need to wait for AW to relocate (something which is not viable). There is an immediate demand for BI(c), B2, B8 space within the city and without this site being developed immediately these occupiers will be forced to leave the city. Moving occupiers from Clifton Road, The Paddocks etc will also free up Brownfields sites for residential within the city. Cowley Road is the only site for them within Cambridge.</li> <li>• Priority should be given to improving the smelliest parts of the Wastewater Treatment Plant's operation, which now seems to be the open storm tanks that smelly water goes into when it rains hard after a long dry spell. This type of weather will become more common, and there seems to be no justification for having the waste tanks open to the air. They should be covered and the air extracted should be scrubbed so that the smell is removed.</li> <li>• More affordable residential housing with green spaces, shops, banks, post office etc</li> <li>• More car parking space on the the site if this project is going to reduce traffic on the M11 going south, the A14 going east and west and the A10 going north. The whole idea is to get people on to the main railway for the long journey.</li> <li>• Option 2a, an enhanced medium level of redevelopment would facilitate a significantly greater number of dwellings near the station, increased Offices/RD provision with associated increase in job creation and an increased amount of new informal open space. It would facilitate more efficient use of the land, with a balanced mix of land</li> </ul>

	<p>uses at densities which make the best use of the highly sustainable location. A hotel is proposed adjacent to the station and overall early delivery remains achievable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residential development needs careful consideration given the Water Recycling Centre (Options 1-3), strategic aggregates railheads (Options 1-4) and waste uses (Options 1-4). These facilities and proposed waste management uses, have consultation / safeguarding areas designated by adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan. These Areas seek to prevent essential existing / planned facilities being prejudiced. If residential development is proposed it should be located away from these uses and demonstrate that existing and allocated waste management / aggregate facilities will not be prejudiced.</li> </ul>
<p>Councils' response to comments on Options 1 - 4</p>	<p>While the results from the consultation indicated a strong preference for variations of Options 2 and 4, Cambridge City Council members considered the cost and challenge of relocating the WRC under Option 4 was unfeasible, rendering the option a non-starter. Work on the AAP was paused at this point to consider the way forward, and whilst the Councils Local Plans were progressed.</p> <p>Taking account of changes in circumstances since the previous consultation, the Issues and Options 2019 seeks views on revised options for development of the area.</p>

## Chapter 8 – Question 14 (Redevelopment Options)

**Are there alternative redevelopment options you think we should have considered? For example, do you think the redevelopment options should include more residential development, and if so to what extent?**

- Respondents – 34
- Support (including qualified) - 3
- Object - 1
- Comment - 30

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q14 Redevelopment options (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge Cycling Campaign questions the apparent mutual exclusivity between residential and employment uses within the redevelopment options. Advisable to plan for a balance between these two uses as this balance will reduce the need for travel at the development. Reducing the trips needed reduces private car use and provides increased opportunities for walking and cycling. A balance in the development's uses will also reduce the tidal nature of the trips that are generated, lessening the impact on the transport network.</li> <li>• The car park development should not be 600 capacity (as it is proposed), but 6,000 capacity. Otherwise residents of the surrounding area will be affected.</li> </ul>
Q14 Redevelopment options (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slightly concerned about “intensive” use of land (options 3 and 4)</li> </ul>
Q14 Redevelopment options (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much more residential required; over supply of offices once CB1 is finished</li> <li>• New orbital bus route for Cambridge</li> <li>• All reliant on link roads to Fen Ditton and Wadloes Road.</li> <li>• The mix looks optimal</li> <li>• Any development of residential accommodation on this site beyond that in options 1 to 3 would be inappropriate in view of:the odour problems; and the undesirability of making the population of Cambridge even bigger than it already is.</li> <li>• Option 3 - the area will benefit more from strategic long term transformation.</li> <li>• Option 4 - unlikely to occur, so focus effort on achievable solution. Most important thing is sufficient parking and traffic measures to access train station by car.</li> <li>• Options 2, 3 and 4 show heavy goods vehicle access through Stagecoach site. No details on how, where and financing of a relocated bus depot.</li> <li>• Undertaking low and medium development can be done immediately without the need to wait for AW to relocate (something which is not viable). There is an immediate demand for B1(c), B2, B8 space within the city and without this site being developed immediately these occupiers will be forced to leave the city. Moving occupiers from Clifton Road, The Paddocks etc will also free up Brownfields sites for residential within the city. Cowley Road is the only site for them within Cambridge.</li> <li>• Support for Options 1 and 2 because they leave open the</li> </ul>



option of a sensible future development of the water recycling site that could (and should) include a major new green area (at least 75% of the site).

- None of the current proposals add any significant green open spaces. The only green areas shown are no more than token buffer spaces.
- This is a great opportunity for providing the City or Cambridge with a new green lung, which could include appropriate leisure opportunities and help re-balance the current trend to over-development.
- Whichever option 1-4 is chosen, priority should be given to improving the smelliest parts of the Wastewater Treatment Plant's operation, which now seems to be the open storm tanks that smelly water goes into when it rains hard after a long dry spell. This type of weather will become more common, and there seems to be no justification for having the waste tanks open to the air. They should be covered and the air extracted should be scrubbed so that the smell is removed.
- More affordable residential housing with green spaces, shops, banks, post office etc
- More car parking space on the site if this project is going to reduce traffic on the M11 going south, the A14 going east and west and the A10 going north. The whole idea is to get people on to the main railway for the long journey.
- Option 2a, an enhanced medium level of redevelopment would facilitate a significantly greater number of dwellings near the station, increased Offices/RD provision with associated increase in job creation and an increased amount of new informal open space. It would facilitate more efficient use of the land, with a balanced mix of land uses at densities which make the best use of the highly sustainable location. A hotel is proposed adjacent to the station and overall early delivery remains achievable.
- Need more car parking space on the site to reduce traffic on the M11 and A14, with people using the main railway for the long journey.
- Residential development needs careful consideration given the Water Recycling Centre (Options 1-3), strategic aggregates railheads (Options 1-4) and waste uses (Options 1-4). These facilities and proposed waste management uses, have consultation / safeguarding areas designated by adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan. These Areas seek to prevent essential existing / planned facilities being prejudiced. If residential development is proposed it should be located away from these uses and demonstrate that existing and allocated waste management / aggregate facilities will not be prejudiced.

Councils' response	<p>While the results from the consultation indicated a strong preference for variations of Options 2 and 4, Cambridge City Council members considered the cost and challenge of relocating the WRC under Option 4 was unfeasible, rendering the option a non-starter. Work on the AAP was paused at this point to consider the way forward, and whilst the Councils Local Plans were progressed.</p> <p>Taking account of changes in circumstances since the previous consultation, the Issues and Options 2019 seeks views on revised options for development of the area.</p>
--------------------	---

## Chapter 9 – Question 15 (Policy Options)

### Do you support or object to the proposed approach for place and building design, and why?

- Respondents – 12
- Support (including qualified) - 8
- Object - 2
- Comment – 2

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q15 Place and Building Design (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad support for proposed place and building design approach in principle</li> <li>• Support for a high-density approach, in particular around transport interchanges</li> </ul>
Q15 Place and Building Design (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not appropriate to set design standards before setting quantum and types of development.</li> <li>• No clear explanation of what the proposed approach means.</li> </ul>
Q15 Place and Building Design (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design objectives should be similar to those at North West Cambridge site</li> <li>• Bespoke design approach is needed to respond to site significance and context</li> <li>• Consideration needed for the use and site context when setting out the requirements for place and building design especially for waste uses, e.g. adjacent to the A14 with existing screening and surrounding uses.</li> <li>• Concerned that agreeing a detailed design strategy is not deliverable due to the number of different landowners. Set</li> </ul>

	<p>a detailed design strategy for CB4 site which can then inform future CNFE area phases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High density development requires accompanying sufficient open space, with careful design to break-up massing of tall buildings close to the road.</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Revised options regarding design are proposed in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation.

## Chapter 9 – Question 16 (Policy Options)

### Do you support or object to the proposed approach on densities, and why?

- Respondents – 19
- Support (including qualified) - 10
- Object - 5
- Comment - 4

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q16 Densities (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from most respondents for the proposed approach</li> <li>• Exploit footprint capabilities through height</li> <li>• Support higher density approach, providing more housing and employment.</li> <li>• Support a design-led approach reflecting the different land uses and viabilities within the CNFE, matching recent approach at Cambridge Science Park.</li> <li>• Support for a bespoke approach reflecting site context.</li> </ul>
Q16 Densities (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed approach is too vague.</li> <li>• Not appropriate to set design standards before setting quantum and types of development.</li> <li>• Object to assertion that greatest density should be focused on new railway station interchange, as it is peripheral to the site and is on the edge of Cambridge, unlike the CB1 area developments around Cambridge rail station.</li> <li>• Highest density should be at centre of CNFE area where buildings would be juxtaposed with pre-existing large-scale commercial buildings.</li> </ul>
Q16 Densities (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developments around Cambridge Station are too high to be used at CNFE.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Density should reflect general low density across Cambridge</li> <li>• Object to tall buildings, including proposal for a multi-storey car park</li> <li>• Alternative proposals including specific densities were provided.</li> <li>• Support from an economic development perspective</li> <li>• Considerations to be weighed against benefits of higher densities:</li> <li>• Access and impact on existing uses and the existing townscape</li> <li>• Effect on traffic.</li> <li>• Reflect edge of city location</li> <li>• Allow for open space, cycle and pedestrian routes.</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Revised options regarding design are proposed in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation.

## Chapter 9 – Question 17 (Policy Options)

### Do you support or object to the proposed approach on tall buildings and skyline, and why?

- Respondents – 19
- Support (including qualified) - 6
- Object - 3
- Comment - 10

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q17 Tall buildings and skyline (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for the proposed approach to tall buildings and protection of the skyline.</li> <li>• Support for further tall buildings policies specific to the AAP, including wording to require that existing form is taken into consideration.</li> <li>• Support for the principles described in Cambridge Local Plan 2014 Proposed Submission which recognise that outside the centre, buildings in Cambridge are mainly 2-3 residential storeys high.</li> </ul>
Q17 Tall buildings and skyline (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for using the Local Plan policy as a baseline for the development of more specific AAP specific policies.</li> <li>• Not appropriate to set design standards before understanding the types and quantum of development.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of tall building heights should be part of a site-specific master-planning exercise, taking into account relevant considerations.</li> <li>• Objection to any buildings over 4 storeys (16m) high.</li> <li>• Be innovative; don't be constrained by policy.</li> </ul>
<p>Q17 Tall buildings and skyline (Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for taller buildings which make more efficient use of land and add a dramatic aspect to development.</li> <li>• Agree in principle for skyline to be dealt with in line with eventual Local Plan policy, but currently seeking amendments to policy in submission Local Plan so premature to agree at this stage with this question.</li> <li>• The context provided by neighbouring buildings should be the key criteria for assessing the acceptability of building heights in the area.</li> <li>• Any proposals will need to take into account the requirements placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport (referral for 15m and above in this area). In addition to this consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional / unnecessary screening and landscaping.</li> <li>• Support from an economic development perspective.</li> <li>• The acceptability of building heights in the St John's Innovation Park area, were the principle of plot densification to be accepted, should be assessed within the context of surrounding uses and buildings.</li> <li>• Support for higher density in this area.</li> <li>• Support for the addition of buildings over six storeys.</li> <li>• Objection to any buildings higher than six storeys.</li> <li>• Propose buildings of up to 25 storeys if the maximum level of redevelopment were to be selected.</li> <li>• No clear explanation of what the proposed approach means.</li> </ul>
<p>Councils' response</p>	<p>Revised options regarding design are proposed in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation.</p>

## Chapter 9 – Question 18a (Building Heights)

Do you support or object to the proposed option (a) on building heights, and why?

- Respondents – 17
- Support (including qualified) - 6
- Object - 10
- Comment – 1
- 

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q18a Building Heights – Option a (Support)	<p>Support for this approach for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In order not to damage the general feel of the area and prevent a “large city” feel.</li> <li>• New buildings of a similar height to those on the existing Cambridge Business Park would not be likely to adversely impact on the setting of nearby heritage assets.</li> <li>• Tall developments like those at CB1 dwarf existing development and would not be appropriate at the edge of the city. Smaller, “human-sized” buildings would be more appropriate.</li> <li>• Support for this approach, provided that tall building policy wording states that existing building form should be taken into consideration.</li> </ul>
Q18a Building Heights – Option a (Object)	<p>Limitation of development to four floors is not desirable because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 storeys is a waste of land.</li> <li>• It would prevent a density of development in keeping with the sustainable location.</li> <li>• It would prevent the creation of landmark buildings on this site.</li> <li>• This option does not maximise the redevelopment opportunity.</li> <li>• Taller buildings would make more efficient use of the land, and would add a dramatic feature to the landscape.</li> <li>• With fens to the north, taller buildings would not affect the view of Cambridge.</li> <li>• This level of development will not maximise the use of the land, or allow for the creation of a sustainable and successful urban community.</li> <li>• There are no views to protect, therefore building heights should be unrestricted, with developers allowed to build as tall as possible, subject to design considerations.</li> <li>• Support for the principles described in Cambridge Local Plan 2014 Proposed Submission which recognise that outside the centre, buildings in Cambridge are mainly 2-3 residential storeys high.</li> </ul>

<p>Q18a Building Heights – Option a (Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building heights up to 16m may be acceptable and compatible with the safe operation of the airport.</li> <li>• Matching the site with its surroundings is key to protecting the landscape and the feel of the area.</li> <li>• Buildings of 4 storeys may not be economic for developers.</li> <li>• Any proposals will need to take into account the requirements placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport (referral for 15m and above in this area). In addition to this consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional/unnecessary screening and landscaping.</li> <li>• Support an approach which continues the scale and form of development of the Cambridge Business Park perhaps allowing the opportunity to create a single taller landmark building around the new station.</li> </ul>
---	---

## Chapter 9 – Question 18b (Building Heights)

**Do you support or object to the proposed option (b) on building heights, and why?**

- Respondents – 18
- Support (including qualified) - 5
- Object - 11
- Comment – 2

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
<p>Q18b Building Heights – Option b (Support)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limiting building heights to 4 storeys is a waste of land.</li> <li>• There are no views to protect, therefore building heights should be allowed to be unrestricted, with developers allowed to build as tall as possible, subject to design considerations.</li> <li>• This option would be less intrusive than option c.</li> <li>• This option provides a balance between impacts on community and traffic, and developer profit.</li> <li>• Support for this approach, which permits higher densities of development appropriate for this sustainable location.</li> <li>• This option permits the articulation of nodal points, vistas</li> </ul>

	<p>and landmark buildings to aid legibility and orientation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of up to six storeys would enable employment objectives of maximising opportunities.</li> <li>• This option would create more flexibility in the delivery of the site.</li> <li>• Building heights should respond to site context - there is a need to exploit the limited resources of remaining land available in Cambridge to meet the needs of an expanding population.</li> <li>• Option B or C would be acceptable and would optimise density across the site.</li> </ul>
<p>Q18b Building Heights – Option b (Object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allowing six storey buildings would damage the feel of the area.</li> <li>• Since the new station is in the south east corner of the site, tall buildings in this area would adversely impact on the character and appearance of the Cambridge Central Conservation Area and Fen Ditton Conservation Area, and the settings of listed buildings in both conservation areas.</li> <li>• Option B (heights up to 24m) has potential to cause conflicts with safe airport and aircraft operations.</li> <li>• This option does not maximise the redevelopment opportunity.</li> <li>• One or two well designed tall buildings may be acceptable. A large number of poorly designed tall buildings would adversely affect the character of the city.</li> <li>• Taller buildings would make more efficient use of the land and would add a dramatic feature to the landscape.</li> <li>• With Fens to the north, taller buildings would not affect the view of Cambridge.</li> <li>• This level of development will not maximise the use of the land or allow for the creation of a sustainable and successful urban community.</li> <li>• This option would destroy the feeling in this part of the city.</li> </ul>
<p>Q18b Building Heights – Option b (Object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would have been helpful to see an evidence base showing the effect that various heights of buildings would have on heritage assets near to the site.</li> <li>• Request that the Councils engage early with Cambridge Airport to ensure that any building heights are compatible with airport operations.</li> <li>• It is not appropriate to try and set design standards, including building heights and densities, before understanding the types and quantum of development that would be required to make the site deliverable/viable.</li> <li>• Consideration of tall building heights should be part of a site-specific master-planning exercise, taking into account relevant considerations.</li> <li>• Any proposals will need to take into account the</li> </ul>



	<p>restrictions placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport, which includes height of buildings. In addition to this, consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional/unnecessary screening and landscaping.</p>
--	--

## Chapter 9 – Question 18c (Building Heights)

**Do you support or object to the proposed option (c) on building heights, and why?**

- Respondents – 18
- Support (including qualified) - 8
- Object - 9
- Comment - 1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q18c building Heights – Option c (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for this approach- build as high as possible in this well-connected area.</li> <li>• Support for innovative approaches.</li> <li>• Support for this option, given the sustainable location, relative distance from the historic core of the city, and proximity to the A14.</li> <li>• This option provides the potential to maximise the opportunities making best use of the site’s location.</li> <li>• Support – it’s important to maximise the commercial value of this development; there is no immediate historic skyline which needs protecting.</li> <li>• Taller buildings would make more efficient use of the land and would add a dramatic feature to the landscape.</li> <li>• With Fens to the north, taller buildings would not affect the view of Cambridge.</li> <li>• Allowing taller high-quality development here will enable the creation of a modern vibrant city quarter and will contribute to the financial viability of development options 3 and 4. Higher viability is essential to achieving high quality master-planning and community benefits gained through development levies.</li> <li>• Taller development here will enhance the environmental quality of the area, including existing surrounding neighbourhoods.</li> <li>• Option B or C would be acceptable and would optimise</li> </ul>

	density across the site.
Q18c building Heights – Option c (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removing restrictions on building heights could potentially result in a loss of the character of the area.</li> <li>• Without a robust evidence base demonstrating the impact of buildings of varying heights, we cannot support Option c.</li> <li>• This would presumably result in very tall buildings being built, which is not supported.</li> <li>• Removing restrictions on building heights could potentially result in a loss of the character of the area.</li> <li>• Taller buildings around the station will reduce sunlight for buildings to the south and west.</li> <li>• Option B (heights up to 24m) has potential to cause conflicts with safe airport and aircraft operations.</li> <li>• Not appropriate to set design standards before setting quantum and types of development.</li> <li>• Draft Local Plan 2014 policies should form the baseline for development of AAP specific policies.</li> <li>• Consideration of tall building heights should be part of a site-specific master-planning exercise, taking into account relevant considerations.</li> <li>• Object – Cambridgeshire is not an industrial area, and Cambridge itself is not urbanised enough to justify tall buildings. Allowing tall buildings here would adversely impact on the local character and landscape.</li> </ul>
Q18c building Heights – Option c (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request that the Councils engage early with Cambridge Airport to ensure that any building heights are compatible with airport operations.</li> <li>• Any proposals will need to take into account the requirements placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport (referral for 15m and above in this area). In addition to this, consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional/unnecessary screening and landscaping</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 18d (Building Heights)

**Do you support or object to the proposed option (d) on building heights, and why?**

- Respondents – 12

- Support (including qualified) - 0
- Object - 1
- Comment - 11

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q18d Building Heights – Option d (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These comments are provided on behalf of Marshall Group, which includes Cambridge International Airport. Expect building heights in Option A (heights up to 16m) may be acceptable, but Options B (heights up to 24m) and C (including “significantly taller forms of development”) in particular have potential to cause conflicts with safe airport and aircraft operations.</li> </ul>
Q18d Building Heights – Option d (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for this approach- build as high as possible in this well-connected area.</li> <li>• Any building proposals above 15m high require consultation with Cambridge Airport.</li> <li>• Building heights up to 16m may be acceptable and compatible with the safe operation of the airport.</li> <li>• Request that the Councils engage early with Cambridge Airport to ensure that any building heights are compatible with airport operations.</li> <li>• The physical context of the site provides opportunities to explore heights and densities inappropriate in other parts of Cambridge.</li> <li>• The AAP requires a masterplan that should inform building heights.</li> <li>• Any proposals will need to take into account the requirements placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport (referral for 15m and above in this area). In addition to this consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional / unnecessary screening and landscaping.</li> <li>• Consideration of tall building heights should be part of a site-specific master-planning exercise, taking into account relevant considerations.</li> <li>• Support for a flexible approach, aligning with the AAP’s promotion of quality design and placemaking.</li> <li>• There is scope for different heights and densities on different parts of the CNFE site.</li> <li>• Object to assertion that density should be focused on new railway station interchange, as it is peripheral to the site, and is on the edge of Cambridge, unlike the CB1 area.</li> <li>• Allowing taller high-quality development here will enable the creation of a modern vibrant city quarter and will</li> </ul>

	<p>contribute to the financial viability of development options 3 and 4. Higher viability is essential to achieving high quality master-planning and community benefits gained through development levies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taller development here will enhance the environmental quality of the area, including existing surrounding neighbourhoods.</li> <li>• It would have been helpful to have seen an evidence base showing the effect that various heights of buildings would have on heritage assets near to the site.</li> <li>• It is not appropriate to try and set design standards, including building heights and densities, before understanding the types and quantum of development that would be required to make the site deliverable/viable.</li> </ul>
Councils' response to questions 18a – 18d	Revised options regarding design are proposed in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation.

## Chapter 9 – Question 19 (Balanced and integrated communities)

**Do you support or object to the proposed approach and measures to integrate the area with the surrounding communities, and why?**

- Respondents – 22
- Support (including qualified) - 19
- Object - 1
- Comment - 2

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q19 Balanced and integrated communities (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for the proposals.</li> <li>• Include as many entrances as possible, including two new entrances to the Business Park, a pedestrianized boulevard on Cowley Road and links to a new area south of the railway line. Fen Road should have improved access as part of Fen Meadows scheme.</li> <li>• Let's not create an island.</li> <li>• This is especially important with regard to transport links; surrounding areas should not be negatively affected by increases in vehicular traffic.</li> <li>• Linking between new and existing infrastructure must be well thought out, with a focus on encouraging sustainable modes of transport, and should be in place by the time</li> </ul>

	<p>work begins on site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site has the potential to become a distinct quarter in its own right but needs integrating with the wider urban fabric.</li> <li>• Benefits from the development of this site, such as access to public transport, new amenity space, retail and local services/facilities should be available for the wider community.</li> <li>• When looking to integrate the area with surrounding communities, the integration of existing uses should also be considered, which includes minerals and waste uses.</li> <li>• Add/amend text to bullets as below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Access to appropriate support to ensure the development of cohesive community</li> <li>○ Informal and formal social spaces that support the needs of workers and residents.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The proposals on integration with the wider community are supported in order to build a successful, healthy and vibrant community.</li> <li>• Proposals must take account of existing development and not dominate it, including being appropriate in scale.</li> <li>• This policy needs enhancing to more effectively integrate the area with surrounding communities, and to respond to existing needs, aiding integration.</li> <li>• Active and public travel must be prioritised to avoid increasing motor traffic on the road network.</li> <li>• Walking/cycling connections into the area must be of highest quality; shared use facilities are not supported. Protected, direct and efficient crossings for bike and foot must be provided at off-site junctions.</li> <li>• Integration with the surrounding area is important to delivering a successful new city quarter here.</li> </ul>
<p>Q19 Balanced and integrated communities (Object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The surrounding community, identified as one of the most disadvantaged in the city, would best be integrated into the site by an increase in lower-skilled employment and apprenticeship opportunities.</li> </ul>
<p>Q19 Balanced and integrated communities (Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need to balance the desire to integrate new development with the wider city, with the need to minimise negative impacts on existing residents/occupiers.</li> <li>• A number of sites within the AAP area contain commercial premises which cannot be accessible to the public.</li> <li>• One of the key objectives of the proposals should be to break down the bounded nature of the site. It would have been useful to illustrate in detail, and give more importance to, any options that have been explored for the following, in terms of vehicular, pedestrian and cycle routes: improvements to the section of Milton Road</li> </ul>

	<p>adjacent to the site; improvements to, or new, connections into Milton from the site; potential connections over the river, railway, and/or guided busway and cycle path to the south. If including these has been explored and dismissed, knowing the reasons would be useful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It should be made clear that the “wider communities” are not limited to those adjacent to the site. It should be an objective to make the site accessible to those arriving from some distance, whether by road, rail or public transport.</li> <li>• References should be included regarding connecting CNFE with planned new communities, most significantly Waterbeach new town.</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Revised options regarding design are proposed in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation, including how the area can be integrated with surrounding communities.

## Chapter 9 – Question 20 (New Employment Uses)

**Do you support or object to the proposed approach for employment uses, and why?**

- Respondents – 20
- Support (including qualified) - 12
- Object - 2
- Comment - 6

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q20 New employment uses (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for this approach.</li> <li>• Support employment development, building on Cambridge's existing strengths.</li> <li>• This approach fulfils the need to integrate with the wider area.</li> <li>• There should not be heavy industry in this area.</li> <li>• Provides a range of options supporting the Cambridge economy.</li> <li>• Support for specific policies relating to employment uses.</li> <li>• The area is suitable for supporting the identified sectors, especially technology and R&amp;D, given the juxtaposition with the Science Park and evidence of existing demand.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the intention to provide a range of unit types and sizes, hybrid buildings and laboratory space.</li> <li>• The potential of the CNFE to support the cluster of high technology and R&amp;D development is noted. However, it is also one of the very few locations in the Cambridge area which accommodates B2, B8 and sui generis uses which support and provide essential infrastructure for the Cambridge area. This role is reflected in the options and should not be diminished.</li> </ul>
Q20 New employment uses (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In opposition to paragraph 9.15, which states that some of the office development could take place after 2031, we contend that at current take up rates, Cambridge will run out of R&amp;D land in the next five years. The plan needs to demonstrate that it can bring forward land rapidly to meet requirements for a full range of R&amp;D uses in the short and longer term.</li> <li>• The R&amp;D sector is diverse and location sensitive. Is it clearly understood if the identified high value employment uses will want to locate to a mixed-use site close to waste and industrial uses, close to some other uses in the sector but geographically divorced from others?</li> <li>• The employment uses listed include office and R&amp;D, but it is unclear whether market research has been completed to support the sectors listed.</li> <li>• Support for a mixed development with employment and substantial residential provision.</li> <li>• Too much emphasis on employment uses, and in particular B2 and B8 uses in development Options 3 and 4.</li> </ul>
Q20 New employment uses (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the sewage works remain in place, then employment should be office led. If the sewage works move there may be opportunity to include manufacturing employment.</li> <li>• CNFE is in an accessible location for employment uses, which should be encouraged, although not at the expense of residential development.</li> <li>• A combination of commercial (offices and R&amp;D uses) and residential should be provided in the CNFE area, with the mix being informed by market conditions and successful place-making.</li> <li>• Encouraging a variety of employment space, together with the need for new office and commercial laboratory floorspace are component parts of delivering new employment on new areas of land, as well as consolidating existing employment areas at Cambridge Business Park and St John's Innovation Park.</li> <li>• Employment uses should also include pure offices as well as hybrid buildings and buildings aimed at particular</li> </ul>

	<p>sectors or technologies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flexibility in responding to the market and economy will be a key consideration.</li> <li>• There needs to be greater reference to middle level jobs not just a focus on high skill jobs as it currently reads. This proposed policy seems to focus on high skills jobs, which as of 2013, made up 70% of the jobs in Cambridge - more focus should be made to the middle level jobs which are desperately needed in Cambridge so people can get out of low skill low paid employment. As it stands this policy does not support the development principle as detailed in chapter 7: “Deliver additional flexible employment space to cater for a range of business types and sizes and supporting a wide range of jobs for local income, skills and age groups”.</li> </ul>
Councils’ response	Revised options regarding employment uses are proposed in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation, taking account of the changing circumstances of the area.

## Chapter 9 – Question 21 (Shared Social Space)

**Do you support or object to the proposed approach on shared social space, and why?**

- Respondents – 16
- Support (including qualified) - 13
- Object - 2
- Comment - 1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q21 Shared open space (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for the proposed approach.</li> <li>• Appropriate for the area, anything more would impact significantly on the neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Particular support for green spaces.</li> <li>• Support for a local centre to serve CNFE businesses and residents, which should be of a size to provide a range of services and facilities. This would increase the sustainability of CNFE, reducing the need to travel out of the area for such facilities, while fostering a new mixed-use neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Support, but the viability of such leisure/social facilities</li> </ul>



	<p>may depend on which option/mix of options is selected and the pace of re-development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The concept of shared space is to be encouraged. The new community including businesses should be consulted on what type of shared space they would like.</li> <li>• Will provide valuable on-site facilities.</li> <li>• Support to enable collaboration between tenants and providing a complementary eating/drinking hub for workers, which is not currently available.</li> <li>• Given the potential extent of the AAP area, the focus should be on a well-located local centre, but more localised provision may be needed too.</li> </ul>
Q21 Shared open space (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This should be a destination for the city and wider region, rather than just for workers on site. The area could include facilities such as an ice rink, concert venue and cinema.</li> <li>• Shared social spaces contribute to open innovation, which has been a key attraction of Cambridge to R&amp;D intensive businesses over the past 10 years. It is highly questionable if an atmosphere of social interaction and open innovation could be fostered at a site which is heavily constrained through noise, odour, insects, vibration and HGV traffic.</li> </ul>
Q21 Shared open space (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater potential could be created by increasing residential provision here. The proposed approach focuses on 'the needs of workers in the area', and does not recognise that shops and facilities could play an important role in serving a new residential community.</li> </ul>
Councils' response	<p>Revised options are proposed in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation, including seeking views on the types of facility that are needed to accompany employment uses.</p>

## Chapter 9 – Question 22a (Change of use from office to residential or other uses – Option a)

**Do you support or object to the proposed Option (a) on change of use from office to residential or other purposes, and why?**

- Respondents – 13
- Support (including qualified) - 6
- Object - 3
- Comment - 4

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q22a Change of use - Option a (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for the proposed Option A.</li> <li>• It would be counter-productive to introduce restraints which would result in a loss of flexibility at this stage. Commercial buildings will be constructed for commercial use with an inherently long lifespan for such a use. Alternative uses will not therefore be forthcoming and additional policy restraint is not necessary.</li> <li>• The market will determine what is appropriate over time.</li> <li>• It seems unlikely that there will be any great pressure to achieve non-commercial uses at CNFE.</li> <li>• There is currently a great deal of demand for employment uses and related business uses, and further control is not necessary at this stage.</li> </ul>
Q22a Change of use - Option a (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When an area has been planned at AAP level with facilities to support certain planned uses, increasing residential uses at a later stage when there is no space for required facilities, such as extra green space or school places, results in substandard development.</li> <li>• The AAP is intended to become an employment hub. This option would allow piecemeal housing, leading to isolated areas of housing not compatible with employment uses.</li> <li>• The presence of significant constraints to residential development (primarily existing odour levels) and the objective of maximising employment development, means that it would be highly desirable for increased protective measures to prevent permitted change of use from office to residential or other uses.</li> </ul>
Q22a Change of use - Option a (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change of use from employment to residential use in a mixed-use area could potentially give rise to issues if the property to be changed is in an area where amenity issues may subsequently arise. Removal of prior notification rights is therefore supported.</li> <li>• The employment land should be protected for employment uses. There can be conflicts with some business uses and residential and therefore the master plan will have considered this, allowing change of use may have the effect of pepper potting residential dwellings within established employment areas potentially leading to social isolation.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 22b (Change of use from office to residential or other uses – Option b)

Do you support or object to the proposed Option (b) on change of use from office to residential or other purposes, and why?

- Respondents – 17
- Support (including qualified) - 8
- Object - 6
- Comment - 3

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q22b Change of use – Option b (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment must be coordinated with residential development.</li> <li>• We need a mix of residential and employment opportunities.</li> <li>• When an area has been planned at AAP level with facilities to support certain planned uses, increasing residential uses at a later stage when there is no space for required facilities, such as extra green space or school places, results in substandard development.</li> <li>• Change of use from employment to residential use in a mixed-use area could potentially give rise to issues if the property to be changed is in an area where amenity issues may subsequently arise. Removal of prior notification rights is therefore supported.</li> <li>• Support in order to protect new employment development from conversion to residential.</li> <li>• It is appropriate to prevent piecemeal housing in inappropriate locations.</li> <li>• The site should be business/commercial/hi-tech.</li> <li>• Flexibility to allow change of use to residential without planning permission was introduced to bring redundant commercial property back into beneficial use. Given the demand in Cambridge and that demand will be met by property designed to meet current tenant expectations, this will not apply on CNFE and so there should be a policy to protect new employment development (at least for a reasonable time period).</li> <li>• The presence of significant constraints to residential development (primarily existing odour levels) and the objective of maximising employment development, means that it would be highly desirable for increased protective measures to prevent permitted change of use from office to residential or other uses.</li> </ul>

Q22b Change of use – Option b (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objections to option B.</li> <li>• If there is greater need for residential space than for office/laboratory space, that is what should happen, particularly because more employment space will only create the need for more residential space.</li> <li>• It would be counter-productive to introduce restraints which would result in a loss of flexibility at this stage. Commercial buildings will be constructed for commercial use with an inherently long lifespan for such a use. Alternative uses will not therefore be forthcoming and additional policy restraint is not necessary.</li> <li>• It is not strictly necessary to serve an Article 4 direction.</li> </ul>
--	--

## Chapter 9 – Question 22c (Change of use from office to residential or other uses – Option c)

Do you support or object to the proposed Option (c) on change of use from office to residential or other purposes, and why?

- Respondents – 8
- Support (including qualifying) - 0
- Object - 0
- Comment - 8

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q22c Change of use – Option c (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New employment floor-space is unlikely to be affected by Permitted Development rights in any case.</li> </ul>
Councils' response	For consideration when drafting the AAP.

## Chapter 9 – Question 23a (Cambridge Science Park – Option a)

Do you support or object to the proposed Option (a) for Cambridge Science Park, and why?

- Respondents – 12
- Support (including qualified) - 6

- Object - 4
- Comment - 2

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q23a Cambridge Science Park – Option a (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support Option A. Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy E/1 provides sufficient support for employment development in key sectors. Further policy guidance risks complicating proceedings for developers, potentially hindering the continued successful development of the Science Park.</li> <li>• Cambridge Science Park has adequate policy direction and protection through the Draft Local Plans. Including the Science Park within the AAP would risk delaying decision making over development there.</li> <li>• To include the Cambridge Science Park within the boundary of the AAP risks that the AAP area will be seen as a success delivering increased employment floor-space by virtue of the Science Park's altering state; development which would happen regardless of the AAP being in place or not.</li> <li>• There is no reason to add an unnecessary layer of policy for further development at the CSP; this would not be in conformity to the NPPF.</li> <li>• The plan should not interfere with something that is already very successful.</li> <li>• Demand and commercial opportunity will drive intensification proposals, and additional policy guidance for the Science Park is not necessary in the AAP.</li> </ul>
Q23a Cambridge Science Park – Option a (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The AAP and Science Park areas should be considered together.</li> <li>• Applying policy guidance ensures a cohesive approach over both sites, which are linked in employment use. One site may provide expansion opportunity for businesses on other and should not have added restrictions/leniency.</li> </ul>
Q23a Cambridge Science Park – Option a (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The issues related to the Science Park are not unique and there is no requirement for additional policy guidance for Cambridge Science Park.</li> <li>• Site specific policies may be required to control the type and quality of development on opportunity sites within the AAP area.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 23b (Cambridge Science Park – Option b)

Do you support or object to the proposed Option (b) for Cambridge Science Park, and why?

- Respondents – 14
- Support (including qualified) - 9
- Object - 5
- Comment - 0

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q23b Cambridge Science Park – Option b (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrate Cambridge Science Park with the wider economic area.</li> <li>• The Science Park is to be redeveloped and the whole area should be considered together.</li> <li>• Cambridge Science Park is part of CNFE and should be considered as part of a combined area.</li> <li>• The Science Park has significant potential for future enhancement and connections with the rest of the area and the wider surroundings. To exclude it risks stagnation and uncoordinated future development in the Science Park that could conflict with the CNFE area.</li> <li>• Support in order to protect the Cambridge Science Park from possible conversions and retain its essential character and attractiveness.</li> </ul>
Q23b Cambridge Science Park – Option b (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy E/1 provides sufficient support for employment development in key sectors. Further policy guidance would risk complicating proceedings for developers, potentially hindering the continued successful development of the Science Park.</li> <li>• The intensification of uses within the science park is a current and ongoing dynamic; the need to provide guidance is now. To delay providing guidance by placing it within this AAP would be too late. The Council should seek to address these issues through the Draft Local Plan which could be complemented by Supplementary Planning Guidance, if it is considered necessary at all.</li> <li>• Cambridge Science Park (CSP) as an existing entity is very different to a regeneration development. It is not appropriate to apply bespoke CNFE policies as blanket policies to a wider area.</li> <li>• The plan should not interfere with something that is already very successful.</li> <li>• It is not necessary to include the Cambridge Science Park</li> </ul>

	<p>in the AAP. In light of this, there is no reason why there should be a policy approach for the Science Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge Science Park does not have the same regeneration needs as the CNFE area and is an employment area only, rather than a mixed-use neighbourhood as identified in the proposed CNFE vision. It is not appropriate to share policies between the CNFE area and the Science Park; South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Policy E/1 already provides clear guidance for the development of the Science Park.</li> </ul>
--	--

## Chapter 9 – Question 23c (Cambridge Science Park – Option c)

### Do you support or object to the proposed Option (c) for Cambridge Science Park, and why?

- Respondents – 8
- Support - 0
- Object - 0
- Comment - 8

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q23c Cambridge Science Park – Option c (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The environment of the Science Park’s early phases with its now-mature trees should be treated carefully, so as not to lose the 'Park' concept.</li> <li>• The inclusion of the Science Park could facilitate a more coordinated approach to the use of Section 106 and CIL funding across the area.</li> <li>• If the Science Park is included within the AAP then Option B would be preferred to allow for the intensification of technology and R&amp;D uses.</li> <li>• Inclusion within the AAP area could also help facilitate improvements to the pedestrian environment and connections from existing employment sites to the new railway station. However, the AAP should be responsive to evidence on market demand and viability to provide flexibility to cope with future economic changes.</li> <li>• The Science Park should be independent.</li> </ul>
Councils’ response	Views are sought on a revised AAP boundary in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation which includes the Science Park.

## Chapter 9 – Question 24a (Change of use from industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road – Option a)

Do you support or object to the proposed Option (a) on change of use from industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road, and why?

- Respondents – 12
- Support (including qualified) - 4
- Object - 6
- Comment - 2

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q24a Change of use at Nuffield Road – Option a (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for this option.</li> <li>• Support for this option if there was access from Milton Road.</li> <li>• Industrial land uses are important to the City functionality, and there are no clear agreements to demonstrate that their relocation to within a short distance can be achieved.</li> <li>• The access issues are clearly of concern to local residents and any improvement in this would be welcomed. It is challenging however, given the varied ownership and legal interests on these industrial estates. It seems that either a wholesale change to residential is required or the status quo.</li> </ul>
Q24a Change of use at Nuffield Road – Option a (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given a choice between residential accommodation and more employment, the preference should be for residential accommodation, as more employment just boosts the need for more housing even further.</li> <li>• This site is suitable for residential, accessed from Green End Road.</li> </ul>
Q24a Change of use at Nuffield Road – Option a (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As explained in response to Q.11, Anglian Water would not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. The introduction of residential uses within the 1.5 odour contour line has a high risk of loss of amenity which may also impact on Anglian Water's ability to operate. Other potentially sensitive development such as the local centre and office uses should also be considered against this risk.</li> </ul>



## Chapter 9 – Question 24b (Change of use from industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road – Option b)

Do you support or object to the proposed Option (b) on change of use from industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road, and why?

- Respondents – 10
- Support (including qualified) - 2
- Object - 6
- Comment - 2

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q24b Change of use at Nuffield Road – Option b (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would make for better zoning.</li> </ul>
Q24b Change of use at Nuffield Road – Option b (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site is suitable for residential, accessed from Green End Road.</li> <li>• Industrial land uses are important to the City functionality, and there are no clear agreements to demonstrate that their relocation to within a short distance can be achieved.</li> </ul>
Q24b Change of use at Nuffield Road – Option b (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As explained in response to Q.11, Anglian Water would not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. The introduction of residential uses within the 1.5 odour contour line has a high risk of loss of amenity which may also impact on Anglian Water's ability to operate. Other potentially sensitive development such as the local centre and office uses should also be considered against this risk.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 24c (Change of use from industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road – Option c)

Do you support or object to the proposed Option (c) on change of use from industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road, and why?

- Respondents – 12

- Support (including qualified) - 7
- Object - 4
- Comment – 1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q24c Change of use at Nuffield Road – Option c (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge needs accommodation, especially for key workers, but with access to the accommodation directly from Milton Road. This will reduce traffic in Green End Road and Nuffield Road.</li> <li>• This is a good location for residential accommodation.</li> <li>• This site is suitable for residential, accessed from Green End Road. Residential development here would be good environmentally.</li> <li>• Support this option in order to provide a better environment for residents in the Nuffield road area.</li> </ul>
Q24c Change of use at Nuffield Road – Option c (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Industrial land uses are important to the City functionality, and there are no clear agreements to demonstrate that their relocation to within a short distance can be achieved.</li> <li>• Option B would result in better zoning.</li> </ul>
Q24c Change of use at Nuffield Road – Option c (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As explained in response to Q.11, Anglian Water would not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. The introduction of residential uses within the 1.5 odour contour line has a high risk of loss of amenity which may also impact on Anglian Water's ability to operate. Other potentially sensitive development such as the local centre and office uses should also be considered against this risk.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 24d (Change of use from industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road – Option d)

**Do you support or object to the proposed Option (d) on change of use from industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road, and why?**

- Respondents – 9
- Support - 0
- Object - 0
- Comment - 9

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q24d Change of use at Nuffield Road – Option d (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to consider the impact of additional traffic as part of this development.</li> <li>• Additional housing should be well back from the road and provided with adequate parking facilities and green spaces.</li> <li>• Potential for relocation of uses beyond the AAP boundary should also be considered as this creates a greater opportunity for the area.</li> <li>• A flexible mix may be most appropriate to allow the market to respond but avoid the redevelopment of the site for 100% residential given the opportunity of this site to attract employment generating uses in this location.</li> <li>• The site adjoins the proposed guided busway route and has good accessibility on foot to the new station, therefore it would be logical to locate more intensive employment uses on the site.</li> </ul>
Councils' response to Questions 24a – 24d	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation on the approach to this area.

## Chapter 9 – Question 25 (Balanced and Integrated Communities – Wider Employment Benefits)

**Do you support or object to the proposed approach on wider employment benefits, and why? Please add any other suggestions you have for policies and proposals that could be promoted through the AAP to support local jobs for local people and reduce barriers to employment in the wider area.**

- Respondents – 12
- Support (including qualified) - 9
- Object - 2
- Comment - 1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q25 Wider employment benefits (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is common sense.</li> <li>• Could help be given to employers to aid the setting up of apprenticeships?</li> <li>• Support – and offer apprenticeships.</li> <li>• The policy aims are not consistent with the overall vision of</li> </ul>

	<p>the use classes which will dominate the AAP area; however, if the AAP area refocused its attention to creating a more intense and purposeful industrial hub then the outlined approach is agreeable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would expect this to potentially go beyond current provisions.</li> <li>• The proposed approach is supported. This should also reflect the significant training and apprenticeship opportunities that the employment use here could generate, both during construction and afterwards. Cambridge Regional College will be very accessible from this site by guided bus or cycling along the busway.</li> <li>• Support proposed approach; however, should include reference to apprenticeships to ensure opportunities for all avenues into work and skills development.</li> <li>• Support the aspiration to provide training and employment opportunities for local people if it can realistically be delivered.</li> <li>• The policies regarding local employment are supported, access to employment is a key wider determinant of health and local employment should be encouraged to cater for local residential development.</li> </ul>
Q25 Wider employment benefits (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The AAP cannot be a panacea to resolve Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire employment problems. Whilst local training opportunities, especially apprenticeships, should be encouraged, it is not a role of the planning system to impose such obligations upon developers.</li> <li>• Local Plans should not interfere at this level. It is for the market supported by central Government policy to worry about these issues.</li> </ul>
Q25 Wider employment benefits (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ability to provide training and employment opportunities for local people and local procurement may not always be possible or appropriate for all businesses, particularly those within the R&amp;D sector operating within an international market context and reliant on attracting the best international talent. It is considered that bespoke solutions to maximise economic and employment benefits should be secured as part of individual applications rather than through a generic and inflexible policy approach. This will ensure better outcomes tailored to individual circumstances without stifling innovation.</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation on options regarding integration of surrounding areas.

## Chapter 9 – Question 26a (Hotel and Conferencing Facilities – Option a)

Do you support or object to the proposed option (a) on hotel and conference facilities, and why?

- Respondents – 10
- Support - 0
- Object - 9
- Comment - 1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q26a Hotel & Conferencing facilities – Option a (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for Option C.</li> <li>• Support for 1 or 2 hotels; consider a mixed-used area essential.</li> <li>• Let existing accommodation plans take account of the project.</li> <li>• The development of the new railway station and regeneration of the wider CNFE area will create a demand for a hotel in this location and this should be recognised in the CNFE AAP. The land adjacent to the new station provides a sustainable and easily accessible location for a hotel to serve business users associated with the large number of existing and proposed businesses in the CNFE area. The proposed vision for the CNFE states that the area will embrace modern commercial business needs and ensure that the new area is supported with the right social and community infrastructure. See attached Brookgate submission document, Appendix 2: CNFE Redevelopment Option 2a, including a proposed hotel.</li> <li>• An area of land close to the railway station should be provided with dual use allocation of either residential or hotel. If the market demands are great enough the hotel will be developed. The provision of a conference centre could be integrated into the hotel as an ancillary use.</li> <li>• As covered in response to Q.11 above, Anglian Water would not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. Potentially sensitive development such as a hotel and conference centre and student accommodation within this contour line would be unacceptable due to the risk of odour adversely affecting the occupants of these buildings. Anglian Water would advise caution in considering any such proposal.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 26b (Hotel and Conferencing Facilities – Option b)

Do you support or object to the proposed option (b) on hotel and conference facilities, and why?

- Respondents – 12
- Support (including qualified) - 7
- Object - 3
- Comment - 2

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q26b Hotel & conferencing facilities – Option b (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for 1 or 2 hotels; consider a mixed-used area essential. Support for conference accommodation, as people would more than likely use this hotel instead of central ones, meaning less traffic and easier access for residents of East Anglia.</li> <li>• Important to provide hotel facilities in this development.</li> <li>• Support, however subject to viability conference facilities could also be provided. The development of the new railway station and regeneration of the wider CNFE area will create a demand for a hotel in this location. The land adjacent to the new station provides a sustainable and accessible location for a hotel to serve business users associated with the large number of existing and proposed businesses in the CNFE area. The proposed vision for the CNFE states that the area will embrace modern commercial business needs and ensure that the new area is supported with the right social and community infrastructure. See Brookgate submission document, Appendix 2: CNFE Redevelopment Option 2a, including a proposed hotel.</li> <li>• An area of land close to the railway station should be provided with dual use allocation of either residential or hotel. If the market demands are great enough the hotel will be developed. The provision of a conference centre could be integrated into the hotel as an ancillary use.</li> <li>• A hotel here would support business uses on CNFE and Science Park.</li> <li>• Support for the provision of a hotel and/or conference facilities within the mixed-use development of land around</li> </ul>

	the proposed new railway station, on the basis that this would be a supporting use with the focus remaining on employment and office floor space.
Q26b Hotel & conferencing facilities – Option b (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for Option C.</li> <li>• As covered in response to Q.11 above, Anglian Water would not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. Potentially sensitive development such as a hotel and conference centre and student accommodation within this contour line would be unacceptable due to the risk of odour adversely affecting the occupants of these buildings. Anglian Water would advise caution in considering any such proposal.</li> </ul>
Q26b Hotel & conferencing facilities – Option b (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If a hotel is provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.</li> <li>• Support either option B or C but may depend on whether development of a hotel at the entrance to the Science Park goes ahead. Any provision allocation in the AAP needs to be kept flexible if no demand materialises.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 26c (Hotel and Conferencing Facilities – Option c)

### Do you support or object to the proposed option (c) on hotel and conference facilities, and why?

- Respondents – 12
- Support (including qualified) - 9
- Object - 2
- Comment - 1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q26c Hotel & conferencing facilities – Option c (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essential to have at least one hotel with conference facilities, as it can be hard to get a central location for a conference, plus it would reduce traffic movements in the city centre.</li> <li>• Support, however, the provision of conference facilities should be subject to viability. The new railway station and regeneration of the wider CNFE area will create a demand</li> </ul>

	<p>for a hotel and conference facility. The land adjacent to the new station provides a sustainable and accessible location for a hotel and conference centre to serve business users associated with existing and proposed businesses in the CNFE area. This accords with the proposed CNFE vision which states that the area will embrace modern commercial business needs and ensure that the new area is supported with the right social and community infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An area of land close to the railway station should be provided with dual use allocation of either residential or hotel. If the market demands are great enough the hotel will be developed. The provision of a conference centre could be integrated into the hotel as an ancillary use.</li> <li>• A hotel here would support business uses on CNFE and Science Park.</li> <li>• Provision of a hotel and conference centre close to the station, is supported as part of the mix.</li> <li>• Having both available will be a natural addition to the rail station serving businesses located both here and at the Science Park, allowing their visitors to stay away from the city centre during the business hours, and especially to avoid contributing to traffic in the rush hour.</li> <li>• This would be logical and would enhance the area.</li> </ul>
<p>Q26c Hotel &amp; conferencing facilities – Option c (Object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As covered in response to Q.11 above, Anglian Water would not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. Potentially sensitive development such as a hotel and conference centre and student accommodation within this contour line would be unacceptable due to the risk of odour adversely affecting the occupants of these buildings. Anglian Water would advise caution in considering any such proposal.</li> </ul>
<p>Q26c Hotel &amp; conferencing facilities – Option c (Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If a hotel is provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.</li> <li>• Not so sure about a hotel being too near the station.</li> <li>• A hotel use within any part of the CNFE subject to its siting and relationship to other land uses would be appropriate, and there should be no geographical limitation as to where such facilities could be provided.</li> <li>• Allowance could be made within the AAP for this use, but flexibility should be maintained. The location of the hotel/conference facilities do not need to be specified at this stage.</li> <li>• There could well be scope and demand for a hotel within the CNFE area. It is not clear however why this would</li> </ul>



	<p>need to be situated "around the new railway station" and there could be perfectly sound reasons why it should be located more centrally within the CNFE area and not to one side by the station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a currently proposed hotel and conference facility on the Science Park in addition to several other hotels within close proximity at Orchard Park, Impington and Quy. If there is sufficient market demand, such proposals should be considered.</li> <li>• If a hotel is provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.</li> </ul>
--	---

**Chapter 9 – Question26d (Hotel and Conferencing Facilities – Option d)**

**Do you support or object to the proposed option (d) on hotel and conference facilities, and why?**

- Respondents – 9
- Support (including qualified) - 1
- Object - 0
- Comment - 8

<b>Question</b>	<b>Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014</b>
<p>Q26d Hotel &amp; conferencing facilities - Option d (Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not so sure about a hotel being too near the station.</li> <li>• A hotel use within any part of the CNFE subject to its siting and relationship to other land uses would be appropriate, and there should be no geographical limitation as to where such facilities could be provided.</li> <li>• Allowance could be made within the AAP for this use, but flexibility should be maintained. The location of the hotel/conference facilities do not need to be specified at this stage.</li> <li>• There could well be scope and demand for a hotel within the CNFE area. It is not clear, however why this would need to be situated "around the new railway station" and there could be perfectly sound reasons why it should be located more centrally within the CNFE area and not to one side by the station.</li> <li>• There is a currently proposed hotel and conference facility on the Science Park in addition to several other hotels</li> </ul>

	<p>within close proximity at Orchard Park, Impington and Quy. If there is sufficient market demand, such proposals should be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If a hotel is provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.</li> </ul>
Councils' response to Questions 26a – 26d	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation on options regarding facilities that should be included in the area given the new vision for the area.

## Chapter 9 – Question 27 (Housing – Housing Mix)

### Do you support or object to the proposed approach on housing mix, and why?

- Respondents – 13
- Support (including qualified) - 11
- Object - 1
- Comment - 1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q27 Housing mix (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad support for the proposed approach.</li> <li>• A highly mixed development would be most suitable.</li> <li>• A mix of high-rise and a new area of low-rise on the south side of the railway tracks would be the ideal situation.</li> <li>• There should be mainly affordable housing, or inexpensive let properties.</li> <li>• Could a small percentage be cooperative housing with a mixture of personal and shared living space?</li> <li>• Would like to see 40% affordable housing.</li> <li>• A sustainable mix of dwelling types will result in a range of family units.</li> <li>• The type and size of affordable housing should be informed by the City Council's Housing Policy.</li> <li>• If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.</li> <li>• The need to ensure a balanced housing mix is supported.</li> </ul>

	A mix of house types and tenures can help community cohesion and help maintain a healthy development.
Q27 Housing mix (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be an explicit reference to the Private Rented Sector (PRS). The significant increase in demand for PRS needs to be accounted for and its provision actively encouraged within the AAP.</li> <li>• Constraints on the CNFE site must be recognised and a realistic housing mix provided. PRS will play an important role in achieving this outcome.</li> </ul>
Q27 Housing mix (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Somewhat indifferent as to whether there is a need for housing at CNFE, and whether it should be pursued.</li> <li>• Housing should not be pursued at a level exceeding that indicated in the current version of the AAP.</li> <li>• If there is to be housing flexibility of tenure should be accepted including affordable housing.</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding housing mix in the area given the new vision for the area.

## Chapter 9 – Question 28 (Housing - Affordable Housing Requirement)

**Do you support or object to the proposed use of Cambridge City Council's affordable housing requirements for the whole of the CNFE area, and why?**

- Respondents – 14
- Support (including qualified) - 8
- Object - 2
- Comment - 4

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q28 Affordable housing (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad support for proposed approach.</li> <li>• Or even increase the amount to 50% affordable or more.</li> <li>• Support subject to detailed viability testing to ensure delivery across a significant timeframe, and to meet the vision and objectives.</li> <li>• CNFE should be treated the same as any other development.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This approach supports a more balanced community as well as housing located by employment use.</li> </ul>
Q28 Affordable housing (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preference for a mixture of high-quality council housing and student housing rather than affordable housing. To make developments attractive to developers it is important to allow them to make profits on high quality buildings.</li> <li>• Let the market function policy free.</li> </ul>
Q28 Affordable housing (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for proposed approach, subject to viability testing.</li> <li>• The heavy infrastructure costs and brownfield nature of the land with associated remediation costs must be recognised; viability is of key importance.</li> <li>• Support for the City Council's flexible affordable housing requirements, which differentiate between different scales of development; South Cambridgeshire policy is less flexible.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to PRS developments where a different approach may be required, such as discounted market rents or off-site contributions toward affordable housing provision.</li> <li>• If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.</li> <li>• Affordable housing requirements should be subject to viability and development will need to mitigate a range of services such as education and transport.</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding the approach to affordable housing.

## Chapter 9 – Question 29a (Housing - Private Rented Accommodation – Option a)

**Do you support or object to the proposed option (a) on private rented accommodation, and why?**

- Respondents – 7
- Support (including qualified) - 7
- Object - 0
- Comment - 0

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q29a Private rented accommodation – Option a (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support, as long as housing is reasonably priced.</li> <li>• Detailed guidance is not necessary as existing policies aim to deliver quality places to live. In addition, there is significant guidance already published that could be beneficially referenced by the authorities.</li> <li>• If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.</li> <li>• Support - allow the market to deliver private rented accommodation rather than encourage it given the uncertain implications.</li> <li>• There is no evidence to justify selecting Option B.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 29b (Housing - Private Rented Accommodation – Option b)

**Do you support or object to the proposed option (b) on private rented accommodation, and why?**

- Respondents – 7
- Support (including qualified) - 1
- Object - 3
- Comment - 3

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q29b Private rented accommodation – Option b (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing, and affordable housing are at a premium here and houses must not be bought as an investment and kept empty.</li> </ul>
Q29b Private rented accommodation – Option b (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed guidance is not necessary as existing policies aim to deliver quality places to live. In addition, there is significant guidance already published that could be beneficially referenced by the authorities.</li> </ul>
Q29b Private rented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It will be important to ensure that properties in this area are not bought as investments and either left empty or rented</li> </ul>

accommodation – Option b (Comment)	<p>out to commuters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.</li> </ul>
--	---

## Chapter 9 – Question 29c (Housing - Private Rented Accommodation – Option c)

Do you support or object to the proposed option (c) on private rented accommodation, and why?

- Respondents – 7
- Support - 0
- Object - 0
- Comment - 7

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q29c Private rented accommodation – Option c (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inexpensive accommodation needs to be provided. Does this option mean there could be council houses? If so, option B could be a very good option.</li> <li>• It is essential there is affordable housing only - ideally with council housing included.</li> <li>• PRS schemes can create quality places to live if they have a clear brief, good design, delivery and collaborative working to. Many authorities are developing PRS design guides to assist developers. The authorities may wish to produce PRS design guidance in association with the developer as part of the AAP.</li> <li>• If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads, and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.</li> <li>• Allow a flexible approach.</li> <li>• Private market housing could play a greater role in delivering future housing needs in the Cambridge area, but it is important to allow the market to deliver this form of housing in response to demand. The range of planning policies allow for both the mix and the environmental conditions to be managed through the planning application process without additional polices in the AAP.</li> </ul>

Councils' response	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding the approach to private rented sector housing, taking account of changes to government policy.

## Chapter 9 – Question 30a (Housing - Student Housing – Option a)

**Do you support or object to the proposed option (a) on student housing, and why?**

- Respondents – 11
- Support (including qualified) - 3
- Object - 8
- Comment - 0

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q30a Student housing – Option a (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support especially as the need for student accommodation in the area has yet to be made.</li> <li>• Limited obvious demand for this use because there are no educational institutions nearby, however the option is supported with evidence of need.</li> </ul>
Q30a Student housing – Option a (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location too far from Universities and associated facilities.</li> <li>• Market demand for student accommodation and therefore should be permitted/accommodated. Failure to do so would be contrary to the NPPF</li> <li>• Object, use should be integrated.</li> </ul>
Q30a Student housing – Option a (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.</li> <li>• No more than 20% (Option b)</li> <li>• Anglian Water does not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line.</li> <li>• This location could also leave students isolated as there are limited facilities available unless there is significant provision on site within the AAP area.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 30b (Housing - Student Housing – Option b)

Do you support or object to the proposed option (b) on student housing, and why?

- Respondents – 8
- Support (including qualified) - 4
- Object - 3
- Comment - 1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q30b Student housing - Option b (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Sensible option, but it is difficult to justify a limit and enforce.</li><li>• Student accommodation supported as a complimentary use to employment, research and development; any proposals for should be complimentary with large proposals refused.</li></ul>
Q30b Student housing - Option b (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Limit is an inflexible approach which might fail to meet market need and hinder redevelopment.</li><li>• Support Option A.</li></ul>
Q30b Student housing - Option b (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.</li></ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 30c (Housing - Student Housing – Option c)

Do you support or object to the proposed option (c) on student housing, and why?

- Respondents – 5
- Support (including qualified) - 3
- Object - 1
- Comment - 1



Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q30c Student housing – Option c (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Let the market decide.</li> <li>• Would maintain a flexible approach.</li> <li>• Policy requirement for student accommodation proposals to explain how benefits will outweigh possible negative impacts.</li> <li>• Mitigation is a sensible safeguard which will not result in unnecessary restrictions and ensure this type of use forms part of a balanced community.</li> </ul>
Q30c Student housing – Option c (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object (1)</li> </ul>
Q30c Student housing – Option c (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 9d (Housing – Student - Housing – Option d)

**Do you support or object to the proposed option (d) on student housing, and why?**

- Respondents – 5
- Support: 0
- Object - 4
- Comment - 1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q9d Student housing – Option d (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unnecessary restrictions resulting in lost flexibility towards the evolution of CNFE</li> <li>• Support for Option A</li> </ul>
Q9d Student housing – Option d (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.</li> </ul>

--	--

## Chapter 9 – Question 30e (Housing - Student Housing – Option e)

Do you support or object to the proposed option (d) on student housing, and why?

- Respondents – 8
- Support - 0
- Object - 0
- Comment - 8

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q30e Student Housing – Option e (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.</li> <li>• Flexibility is required at this stage.</li> <li>• Rationale for student accommodation is not clear when it is typically provided in more central locations in Cambridge.</li> <li>• CNFE should be employment focussed allowing other complimentary uses to improve the area’s sustainability.</li> <li>• Student accommodation should be integrated to avoid concentration in one area.</li> </ul>
Councils’ response	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding the approach to private rented sector housing, taking account of evidence prepared to support the Cambridge Local Plan.

## Chapter 9 – Question 31 (Services & Facilities - Provision of services and facilities)

Do you support or object to the proposed approach on provision of services and facilities, and why? Please also add any other suggestions for provisions of services and facilities.

- Respondents – 12
- Support (including qualified) - 9
- Object - 0

- Comment – 3

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q31 Provision of services & facilities (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regulation needed to ensure SME provide a wide range of services.</li> <li>• Early provision of schools and health centres where the accommodation is provided.</li> <li>• Supportive of this policy, especially regarding co-location of services for community, retail and leisure uses.</li> <li>• The proposal on services and facilities are supported.</li> <li>• Education and health services must be provided as there is already one school on Nuffield Road and a doctor's surgery.</li> <li>• Brookgate support the proposed approach. In order for the regeneration of the CNFE area to be successful the required services and facilities must be provided. This will require collaborative strategies between key stakeholders and will be easier to achieve on sites such as CB4, where large areas can be brought forward by relatively few stakeholders, simplifying the planning and engagement process. The delivery of such services and facilities is essential to ensure the creation of a vibrant, mixed use neighbourhood, as set out in the proposed vision.</li> <li>• The Science Park is a good example of this approach working.</li> <li>• Support. Balanced, sustainable community requires such services and facilities as do the employees working locally. It is considered important that these are not too fragmented across the CNFE as that could reduce their viability or contribution to extended opening hours and thus service provision.</li> </ul>
Q31 Provision of services & facilities (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of community facilities need to be allowed for in the original design and built as the development becomes occupied.</li> <li>• Leisure/sporting facilities could be built at the northern and eastern edges of the site (as an acoustic barrier to the A14 and railway).</li> <li>• The proposed approach to the delivery of supporting services is supported in principle. However, the location of facilities must have regard to other development existing or proposed in the locality, so that potential amenity issues arising for example from proximity to the Water Recycling Centre, waste management uses, and the railheads are avoided and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.</li> <li>• Community facilities should be provided early in the development of the residential component of the</li> </ul>

	development.
Councils' Response	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding services and facilities that would be needed to support the Cambridge Northern Fringe, taking into account the revised vision for the area.

## Chapter 9 – Question 32 (Services & Facilities - New Local Centre)

**Do you support or object to the proposed approach for the new local centre, and why?**

- Respondents – 15
- Support (including qualified) - 10
- Object - 1
- Comment - 4

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q32 New local centre (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensible but should not forget SMEs.</li> <li>• Residential flats will ensure the area is not dead in the evenings.</li> <li>• Provided it is tastefully done.</li> <li>• Where there is residential development there must also be local shops and community facilities, including a doctor's surgery.</li> <li>• Brookgate agree that a new local centre is essential to the creation of a vibrant, mixed use neighbourhood as set out in the proposed CNFE vision. It will act as both a focal point and a social hub for the CNFE area. There should be flexibility regarding its location along the Boulevard, positioning it around the station would ensure a highly accessible and sustainable location. It should include new retail provision to meet local needs and complement nearby centres as set out in objective 4 of the proposed development objectives. Employment and residential uses could be provided on upper floors.</li> <li>• Providing sufficient services for immediate needs of community near station most suitable location to ensure maximum use.</li> <li>• Residential flats will ensure the area is not dead in the evenings.</li> <li>• The Crown Estate support the approach set out for the new local centre and welcome the proposals to include retail</li> </ul>

	<p>and other uses within this location. These new uses should be located in one area (as part of the local centre) so as not to dilute the existing office and employment functions of the CNFE area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The provision of such facilities together is likely to be more sustainable and viable.</li> </ul>
Q32 New local centre (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new local centre should be created to support the needs of a local community; however, it is not possible to make any informed decision on quantum, uses or location until the deliverability of the AAP area is further advanced.</li> </ul>
Q32 New local centre (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed new local centre in Options 2-4 is supported in principle. However, it is noted that it is proposed that this include a residential element and other elements which will be used by people, and in Option 2 the local centre appears to lie partially within the odour zone which is not suitable for such a use. The location of the local centre must have regard to other development existing or proposed in the locality, so that potential amenity issues arising for example from proximity to the Water Recycling Centre, waste management uses, and the railheads are avoided and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.</li> <li>• At this stage the approach is too rigid and could need adaptation if more residential is included. Thus, location and form needs to be less specific.</li> <li>• Turnstone consider that any uses proposed on the CNFE site should be totally complementary to employment uses. Retail facilities of an appropriate scale would be an acceptable use, subject to commercial viability</li> </ul>
Councils' Response	<p>Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding the approach to district and local centres that are needed in the area taking into account the revised vision for the Cambridge Northern Fringe.</p>

## Chapter 9 – Question 33 (Services & Facilities - Open Space Standards)

**Do you support or object to the proposed approach on open space standards, and why?**

- Respondents – 19
- Support (including qualified) - 12
- Object - 1

- Comment - 6

<b>Question</b>	<b>Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014</b>
Q33 Open space standards (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open spaces will make the area more pleasant to work and live in.</li> <li>• Encouragement of wildlife should be a default requirement, with a particular focus on providing habitat for birds, hedgehogs and bees.</li> <li>• Appropriate in the wider context.</li> <li>• Open space should be maximised.</li> <li>• Open space vital for health, relaxation and environmental enhancement - reflects existing standards elsewhere there parity providing sufficient space.</li> <li>• We support the application of the relevant open space standards but wish also to emphasise that the development must be integrated into the wider landscape through the improvement and development of green infrastructure beyond the currently identified site boundary. This should include the creation of a strategic accessible landscape/green space area along the River Cam Corridor and linking Milton Country Park (akin to developments to the south and west of Cambridge).</li> <li>• Support. Open space is very important in high density schemes and can also help to reduce the impact of tall buildings.</li> </ul>
Q33 Open space standards (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support provision of open space in particular, which is not addressed in Option 1. Support a higher level than shown in any of the Options, given the huge benefits that open space provides to well-being and how crowded Cambridge is.</li> </ul>
Q33 Open space standards (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brookgate agree that the re-development of the CNFE area presents a range of opportunities to enhance the existing green infrastructure. There should however remain flexibility to allow the off-site provision of certain open space typologies such as playing fields.</li> <li>• The standards need to be defined in the context of the proposals and the wider context beyond the AAP area as promoted through enhanced connections to a variety of amenity spaces in the wider area.</li> <li>• On the proviso that the emerging Open Space Standards, as set out in Policy 68 and Appendix I of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 (proposed submission) only apply to residential development, Turnstone does not object to the approach that has been suggested. It must be clear, however, that the Open Space Standards should only</li> </ul>

	<p>apply to residential developments, and that questions of the appropriate quantum of open space related to commercial developments should be negotiated on a case by case basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The approach to the provision of open space is supported in principle. However, regard needs to be paid to amenity issues which may arise from other uses in the CNFE area, such as the Water Recycling Centre, waste management uses and railheads which could give rise to dust, noise and odour. Open space needs to be located in a position where such matters will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated; otherwise the areas will not be capable of being used and enjoyed for the purpose designed.</li> <li>• The policy to require open space is supported, as the action plan area is located in both Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire the local plan with the greater requirement for open space should be followed to ensure enough provision is made.</li> <li>• Access to open space is a key wider determinant of health.</li> </ul>
Councils' Response	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding the approach to opens space taking into account the revised vision for the site.

## Chapter 9 – Question 34 (Transport – Key transport and movement principles)

**Do you support or object to the proposed key transport and movement principles, and why? Please add any other suggestions you have for key transport and movement principles to improve and promote sustainable travel in the area.**

- Respondents – 24
- Support (including qualified) - 13
- Object - 3
- Comment - 8

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q34 Key transport & movement principles (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New bus routes running through the area</li> <li>• New bus stops half way down the new Cowley Road</li> <li>• Old Cowley Road pedestrianized</li> <li>• River taxi, car parking the guided bus, cycling and taxis.</li> <li>• More crossings of the railway and river to assist in traffic</li> </ul>

flow.

- focus on walking, public and cycles - car parking creates too much dead space
- A pedestrian/cycle path should be provided, linking the Jane Coston Bridge with the Station.
- Good bus links must be provided for those who are unable to walk or cycle to work.
- Promotion of non-car and active modes of travel, delivering a highly accessible development.
- Need to recognise that CNFE will generate additional vehicle trips.
- A key principle needs to include 'enhance the Milton Road corridor to ensure that traffic can move efficiently in appropriate locations'.
- Cambridgeshire CC Transport Strategy (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire) and associated strategic transport modelling significantly underestimates development opportunities.
- The TSCSC recommendations (and proposed City Deal schemes) don't adequately
- address existing highway network constraints or consider measures required to unlock the full potential of CNFE.
- Radical solutions are likely to be required to enable appropriate road based access to the sites.
- Strongly support the focus on making transport safer and more sustainable.
- Opportunity to create safe and attractive routes for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Permeability (for these users) is very important to making the area attractive.
- All criteria necessary to ensure sustainability.
- Need recognition that some staff and visitors to current and future uses will make journeys by car.
- The absence of any information about traffic and junction layout is a considerable omission as it is impossible to assess the relative impacts of the options on existing developments within the AAP area.
- Support the proposed key transport and movement principles and welcome the focus on sustainable transport.
- Focus on public and active transport.
- Filtered permeability (full access for sustainable modes, no through routes for motor vehicles) needed throughout to create an attractive environment for cycling and walking.
- Bus gates to provide efficient bus routes.
- Off-site junctions must consider cyclists and walkers avoiding indirect, multi-stage crossings for these users.
- Avoid current Cowley Road design that disadvantage active modes in preference to private motor traffic.
- Open up parallel Network Rail route as a high quality cycle



	<p>and walking provision to resolve this issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport and improvements to infrastructure need to consider the whole CNFE AAP area so that any improvements needed reflect the future needs of the whole area and not individual land ownerships.</li> <li>• Incremental improvements by various land owners based on demand and phasing related only to that land ownership should be resisted as that may lead to greater disruption over the period in which the CNFE is developed, both to those with the CNFE area and outside as offsite improvements are likely to be required.</li> <li>• RLW Estates generally support the transport and movement principles.</li> <li>• Specific reference should be made to the new station and other gateways to the site (such as Milton Road and the Jane Costen Bridge - both as a key element of the sustainable transport infrastructure serving the area, and in terms of its contribution to the role which CNFE should play in fulfilling the wider growth strategy for the Cambridge area.</li> <li>• The approach on transport is broadly supported particularly the approach on walking and cycling.</li> </ul>
<p>Q34 Key transport &amp; movement principles (Object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to maximise the potential for sustainable links between CNFE and existing and planned communities.</li> <li>• Suggested wording is as follows: "To ensure sustainable transport links are made with existing and new communities, including Waterbeach New Town"</li> <li>• Doubtful that the site can fulfil its development potential without the provision of direct access from the A14.</li> <li>• Need to investigate this option.</li> <li>• The transport modelling of the wider development area and mitigation strategies/new road infrastructure will be crucial in the development of the AAP. Until this modelling data is available and understood, there is no benefit in developing the AAP.</li> <li>• The Crown Estates do not support the proposals to allow public access through CBP.</li> </ul>
<p>Q34 Key transport &amp; movement principles (Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to the new railway station would be significantly improved.</li> <li>• Turn Network Rail's disused private access road from Milton Road to Chesterton sidings along the north side of Cambridge Business Park into a public footpath and cycleway - more pleasant than the foot/cycle path planned for Cowley Road. Would enable the Crown Estate to install side entrances on the North side of the Cambridge Business Park to shorten the walk between offices on the Cambridge Business Park and the new railway station and</li> </ul>

	<p>encourage travel to the Cambridge Business Park by train.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Turning the current railway sidings along the north side of the Business Park in to a cycle / pedestrian route would be more pleasant and convenient than the proposed route for Cowley Road up to the boundary of the current sidings. This would also allow for entrances to be installed on the north side of Cambridge Business Park, allowing easier access for commuters.</li> <li>• Policy must also consider the needs of those who are unable to cycle or walk to work.</li> <li>• Cycling is not a solution for everyone, especially older members of the community and the needs of all must be considered.</li> <li>• Where cars are not an option good regular all day and evening public transport must be provided.</li> <li>• Need to provide bus transport to the station for local residents</li> <li>• Cyclists should be considered too and allowed a traffic free approach where the interaction with LGVs/buses is eliminated to improve safety.</li> <li>• Need to emphasise the significant role that could be played by the new railway station and the Guided Bus, both of which clearly have scope to help meet the objective to minimise journeys to the site by private car</li> <li>• All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their interrelationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly the case for those that propose higher levels of development which might require significant transport intervention to ensure that transport impacts are not severe. This applies to both the local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway) and also the strategic road (i.e.: Highways Agency) and rail (i.e.: Network Rail) networks.</li> <li>• The CNFE is a mixed use area with a variety of uses existing and proposed through the AAP. There will be a wide variety of modes of transport ranging from pedestrian and cyclist to heavy commercial vehicles (HCVs) accessing the B2, B8 and Sui Generis areas. It is important to have some degree of separation between HCVs and other users. This is in part encompassed by the objective relating to safety, but the need to separate and avoid conflict between the less compatible transport modes such as HCVs and pedestrian / cyclists could be made more explicit in the transport and movement principles.</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding the approach to transport. The issues have been

	informed by new evidence in the form of the Ely to Cambridge Transport Study.
--	---

## Chapter 9 – Question 35 a (Transport – Modal share target - Option a)

Do you support or object to the proposed Option a on modal share target, and why?

- Respondents – 11
- Support (including qualified) - 2
- Object - 5
- Comment - 4

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q35a Modal share target – Option a (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orbital bus routes also for local residents</li> <li>• Support the setting of a modal share target for the CNFE. The 24% car trip target should be applied to trips that have an origin and destination within Cambridge City only, recognising that short urban trips have the highest propensity to be undertaken on foot, by bicycle or public transport.</li> <li>• This may be challenging to deliver given the potential employment levels created here and the regional draw to such employment. It is considered that a target is required but this needs to be realistic and challenging.</li> </ul>
Q35a Modal share target – Option a (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The modal share target set for of 24% car trips by 2031 is an aspirational target, it is not clear how this will be obtained or monitored, it should also be noted that there is an obvious funding gap in the Councils transport infrastructure plans.</li> <li>• Paragraph 154 of the NPPF advises that Councils should be aspirational but realistic. Due to transportation infrastructure funding gaps it is doubtful if this target is realistic.</li> <li>• Matching the modal share target is not ambitious enough. It should be possible to do much better than in other areas of Cambridge. When working within the constraints of an existing road network, improvements for pedestrians and cyclists in particular are difficult to achieve. In developing a new area there is no reason to repeat those mistakes, and a much better modal share should be achieved.</li> <li>• The absence of any information about traffic generation means it is impossible to assess if this target is achievable.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support option C</li> </ul>
Q35a Modal share target – Option a (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orbital bus, with new rail/river crossing to Wadloes Road</li> <li>• Pedestrianised existing Cowley Road, with traffic rerouted on a new road adjacent to the sewage works</li> <li>• Pedestrianised area around the new square (as featured on map)</li> <li>• Buses running until midnight with stops on the new Cowley Road (B on map)</li> <li>• Bus routes from the north (A10/Waterbeach/Milton) should be routed via the new station to improve connectivity via public transport and buses should run every day and up to midnight, to encourage people to use the bus.</li> <li>• All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their interrelationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme, in particular proposals requiring significant transport intervention for both local, strategic and rail networks.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 35 b (Transport – Modal share target - Option b)

Do you support or object to the proposed Option b on modal share target, and why?

- Respondents – 13
- Support (including qualified) - 8
- Object - 4
- Comment - 1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q35b Modal share target – Option b (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orbital bus, with new rail/river crossing to Wadloes Road</li> <li>• Pedestrianise existing Cowley Road, with traffic rerouted on a new road adjacent to the sewage works</li> <li>• Pedestrianised area around the new square (as featured on map)</li> <li>• Buses running until midnight with stops on the new Cowley Road (B on map)</li> <li>• Show we can be innovative and leading for new infrastructure.</li> <li>• Make the area an example of what can be achieved. Cambridge is already a tech and academic hub; and in the next few years will, hopefully, become a model cycling city.</li> </ul>

	<p>Let's merge those three together and show the country what is possible. Silicon Valley-meets-Copenhagen, if you will.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rail, bus and cycle links make this an ideal opportunity to maximise travel by train, bus and cycling instead of by car.</li> <li>• Modal share targets need to be ambitious but realistic and achievable. The Cambridgeshire County Council Cambridge Sub Regional Model (CSRМ) should be utilised to undertake further transport modelling work for the CNFE to develop appropriate modal share targets for the CNFE. Once further modelling work has been undertaken it will be possible to identify whether tougher modal share targets can be achieved at the CNFE.</li> <li>• It should be possible to do much better than in other areas of Cambridge. When working within the constraints of an existing road network, improvements for pedestrians and cyclists in particular are difficult to achieve. In developing a new area there is no reason to repeat those mistakes, and a much better modal share should be achieved.</li> <li>• The absence of any information about traffic generation means it is impossible to assess if this target is achievable.</li> <li>• Subject to viability; recognise the need to minimise car journeys and exploit the enhanced transport infrastructure.</li> <li>• Strongly support Option B</li> <li>• Go beyond the target set for the city and make the area an exemplar scheme.</li> <li>• This development is an ideal opportunity to have aspirational transport goals.</li> <li>• The Guided Busway, a new rail link and the local cycle network provide excellent connections by public and active transport.</li> <li>• Every effort should be made to minimise private motor vehicle use at this location.</li> </ul>
<p>Q35b Modal share target – Option b (Object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies that attempt to force people into doing things they don't want to will both be unpopular and cause trouble - see, for example, the parking problems in Orchard Park resulting from insufficient provision of parking spaces.</li> <li>• To set an unrealistic target for modal shift at a time when there is an obvious funding gap in the Councils transport infrastructure plans would not be compliant with paragraph 154 of the NPPF</li> <li>• Support option C</li> </ul>
<p>Q35b Modal share target – Option b (Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their interrelationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme, in particular</li> </ul>

	proposals requiring significant transport intervention for both local, strategic and rail networks.
--	---

## Chapter 9 – Question 35 c (Transport – Modal share target - Option c)

**Do you support or object to the proposed Option c on modal share target, and why?**

- Respondents – 6
- Support (including qualified) - 3
- Object - 2
- Comment - 1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q35c Modal share target – Option c (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is inappropriate to set such targets in policy before the precise mix of uses is known and understood.</li> <li>• The absence of any information about traffic generation means it is impossible to assess if this target is achievable.</li> <li>• I don't think a local plan such as this should get itself involved in such matters and not constrain any particular form of transport.</li> </ul>
Q35c Modal share target – Option c (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support using this opportunity to minimise car usage.</li> <li>• Realistic and achievable targets should be set in order to determine the likely transport impact of the CNFE and to what extent travel planning and transport improvements are able to mitigate the impact. Modal share targets should be produced to inform the development of a package of phased transport measures required to achieve the targets.</li> </ul>
Q35c Modal share target – Option c (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their interrelationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme, in particular proposals requiring significant transport intervention for both local, strategic and rail networks.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 35 d (Transport – Modal share target - Option d)

Do you support or object to the proposed Option d on modal share target, and why?

- Respondents – 8
- Support - 0
- Object - 0
- Comment - 8

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q35d Modal share target – Option d (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be a footpath (and possibly cycle path as well) from the new station to Green End Road, to encourage local people to leave cars at home.</li> <li>• Buses should stop along Milton Road to collect local people who want to use the station etc. At present many buses travel along Milton Road, but few stop.</li> <li>• Perhaps buses travelling along Milton Road could also serve the station via Cowley Road.</li> <li>• I would like to be able, for example, to get on a bus at Union Lane to take me to the new station.</li> <li>• The 24% car trip target by 2031 only focuses on car trips within Cambridge. Therefore further assessment work is required to identify realistic CNFE site wide car modal share targets and targets for individual land uses. The CNFE modal share targets need to be linked to a package of phased transport measures that are required to achieve the modal share targets.</li> <li>• Whilst the benefits of an overly prescriptive approach to mode share within the area are questionable it is clear there is strong potential for the CNFE Area to become an exemplar sustainable community and destination. To ensure this goal is fulfilled, sustainable transport links to existing and new communities, including Waterbeach New Town, need to be emphasized.</li> <li>• Good pedestrian/cycle links are required for all the surrounding areas such as Milton via Jane Coston Bridge, Chesterton via the sidings triangle, and Abbey and Fen Ditton via the planned Chisholm Trail river bridge. Bus shuttles should be considered for all the surrounding areas with departure/arrival times properly matched with rail services. Through bus services such as the green P&amp;R service or number 9 should call at the station with Citi 2 terminus.</li> <li>• It is very difficult, at this early stage in the evolution of</li> </ul>

	<p>CNFE, to say with certainty that modal shift percentages can and will be achieved. It is certainly a worthwhile objective to ensure that modal share targets that are set for the whole of Cambridge are met on the site, and there is room for optimism that this can be achieved at CNFE. This will however be an exacting target, and Turnstone do not consider that it would yet be appropriate to seek to go beyond the target of 24% set for the City as a whole.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not possible to set a precise target at present given the uncertainty at this stages in the process as regards the mix of land uses in the scheme. However RLW Estates object to no mode share target being set as this would almost certainly undermine the transport and movement principles.</li> <li>• All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their interrelationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme, in particular proposals requiring significant transport intervention for both local, strategic and rail networks.</li> </ul>
Councils' response to Question 35a – 35d	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding the approach to transport. The issues have been informed by new evidence in the form of the Ely to Cambridge Transport Study. This includes a revised approach to mode share, proposing use of a highway 'trip budget' .

## Chapter 9 – Question 36a (Transport – Vehicular access and road layout - Option a)

### Do you support or object to the proposed Option a for Cowley Road, and why?

- Respondents – 10
- Support - 2
- Object - 6
- Comment - 2

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q36a Vehicular access & road layout - Option a (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimise car usage and maximise use of rail, bus and cycling.</li> <li>• Do not build any additional roads.</li> <li>• Retain existing Cowley Road as the main access road for all modes of transport.</li> <li>• Need to re-route HGV movements on a dedicated route to the north of Cowley Road and provide a more pedestrian</li> </ul>



	<p>and cycle friendly main access through the AAP area along Cowley Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The whole of the 'corridor' between the disused NR access road, the First Public Drain and the existing Cowley Road should be used to create a wide tree-lined boulevard delivering a high quality walking and cycling route as well as appropriate vehicle access to CNFE.</li> </ul>
<p>Q36a Vehicular access &amp; road layout - Option a (Object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrianise existing Cowley Road</li> <li>• New boulevard to the north, adjacent to the sewage works</li> <li>• HGV banned from turning right towards the station</li> <li>• By retain Cowley Road as the only entrance / exit into the AAP site, future development opportunities would be restricted especially those associated with industrial / waste / minerals uses which is what this AAP should focus its attention on developing</li> <li>• Option A would be a disaster. Need to improve pedestrian and cycling access to the new station. The road is too narrow and totally unsuitable for these users to share it with general traffic.</li> <li>• The absence of any information about traffic generation means it is impossible to assess the impacts of this option. Increased traffic, including heavy goods traffic will impact upon existing businesses and may prejudice safety of pedestrians and cyclists.</li> <li>• There will be an increasing number of users and a wide variety of modes of transport using this area, ranging from pedestrian and cyclists going to the offices and the station, to HCVs. The redevelopment of the area provides an opportunity to improve conditions. This includes improved separation between HCVs and other users, given the significant levels of demand likely to be generated by the AAP proposals, but also to minimise the impact of such traffic on other land uses through minimisation of noise and vibration of vehicles</li> </ul>
<p>Q36a Vehicular access &amp; road layout - Option a (Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain Cowley Road as the main site access but Milton Road corridor must cater for sustainable modes of travel to allow reliable journey times from new and existing communities.</li> <li>• No objection to separating the heavy industrial traffic from pedestrians and cyclists.</li> <li>• No objection in principle to the creation of a new access road along the southern boundary of the WRC. However, land ownership details will need to be clarified.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 36b (Transport – Vehicular access and road layout - Option b)

Do you support or object to the proposed Option b for Cowley Road, and why?

- Respondents – 14
- Support - 5
- Object - 4
- Comment - 5

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q36b Vehicular access & road layout – Option b (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the area from increased congestion, there must be a focus on encouraging people to use sustainable modes of transport.</li> <li>• Need to make the routes safe and easy to use for cyclists and pedestrians, improving the journey times and experience for everyone.</li> <li>• A second vehicular access is a reasonable compromise. However, it must consider active modes at a design stage; efficient access, priority over side roads, dedicated space. Also there should be no through routes between the two vehicular accesses, to prevent rat running and create a safe attractive space for active modes. Filtered permeability and bus gates should be used to enable active and public modes have full access to the site.</li> <li>• Option B is supported above Option A, but less than Option C.</li> <li>• Cowley Road access would also be greatly improved by opening up the old Network Rail access track as a high quality off road cycle and walking connection.</li> <li>• Priority for cyclists and pedestrians will become increasingly important</li> <li>• Would segregate station and cycling/walking traffic from main employment route. However, the absence of any information about traffic generation means it is impossible to assess the impacts of this option. Increased traffic, including heavy goods traffic will impact upon existing businesses and may prejudice safety of pedestrians and cyclists.</li> </ul>
Q36b Vehicular access & road layout – Option b (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimise car usage and maximise use of rail, bus and cycling.</li> <li>• Do not build any additional roads.</li> <li>• Object to proposal to restrict private car movements on Cowley Road. A Quality Bus corridor is being constructed south of Cowley Road as an extension of the existing CGB. This route should be open to all public transport vehicles</li> </ul>

	<p>both guided and un-guided. The CGB route is sufficient to provide reliable and fast public transport services to the new railway station and the AAP area. High quality cycle facilities can be provided parallel to the existing Cowley Road by utilising the disused Network Rail site access road, without needing to restrict vehicle movements on Cowley Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No details about funding necessary before a large quantum of development can take place. This would prioritise sustainable modes of transport suitable for the AAP site if this included a large amount of residential and office uses. Doubtful that those uses can be delivered.</li> </ul>
<p>Q36b Vehicular access &amp; road layout – Option b (Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the focus on walking, cycling and public transport. But to make a route truly attractive for these users, pedestrians should not be forced to share pavement with cyclists and cyclists should have a route separate from the road. There is no reason why this cannot be achieved and it is unclear whether even option B would do this, as Cowley Road will still be narrow even if most of its traffic is removed. What is really needed is a new route away from the road.</li> <li>• The improvements to Cowley Road are supported but sustainable modes of travel along the Milton Road corridor must be catered for to allow reliable journey times from new and existing communities. Any new junction arrangements with Milton Road must be shown to deliver benefits to all but with reference to the hierarchy of users.</li> <li>• There will be an increasing number of users and a wide variety of modes of transport using this area, ranging from pedestrian and cyclists going to the offices and the station, to HCVs accessing the B2, B8 and Sui Generis areas. It is important to have separation between HCVs and other users, not least to ensure the safety of those moving in and through the area.</li> <li>• Priority for cyclists and pedestrians will become increasingly important.</li> <li>• We understand the importance of seeking to separate the heavy industrial traffic from pedestrians and cyclists and have no objection in principle to the creation of a new access road along the southern boundary of the WRC. However, the detail of land ownership will need to be explored as some of this appears to be on land in the ownership of Anglian Water.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 36c (Transport – Vehicular access and road layout - Option c)

Do you support or object to the proposed Option c for Cowley Road, and why?

- Respondents – 14
- Support - 8
- Object - 1
- Comment - 5

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q36c Vehicular access & road layout – Option c (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keeping heavy traffic away from any residential development is highly desirable.</li> <li>• HGV route will be needed</li> <li>• Option C is supported above Option A and Option B</li> <li>• Support the provision of a new Heavy Goods Vehicle access parallel and to the north of Cowley Road for industrial, minerals and waste activities only. This vehicle access strategy will significantly reduce heavy good vehicle movements from Cowley Road, allowing the flexibility to create a safer walking and cycling environment for CNFE residents and employees along the Cowley Road corridor.</li> <li>• Support in principle. The creation of a dedicated HGV access to support the existing industries on site is considered to be a positive step in developing the AAP site for an industrial hub. However, there remains substantial concern about the funding and deliverability of such a solution.</li> <li>• The absence of any information about traffic generation means it is impossible to assess the impacts of this option.</li> <li>• Cowley Road should be prioritised for the station, office and any residential traffic. Turnstone agrees that it would be sensible for any heavy goods vehicle (HGV) access to be provided parallel and to the north of Cowley Road, for industrial, minerals and waste activities only. This should not pre-determine that heavy industrial or - for instance - minerals/aggregates uses will be a permanent feature at CNFE, but it would make considerable sense to have appropriate contingencies in terms of access in place right from the very outset.</li> <li>• The provision of a new HGV access to the area would be a major benefit for all industrial, minerals and waste activities taking place in the area. A route separating HGV traffic from traffic accessing the station, office and residential areas would be a major improvement in terms of Health and Safety. It would also reduce congestion and improve the ease and efficiency of access for all concerned.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We understand the importance of seeking to separate the heavy industrial traffic from pedestrians and cyclists and have no objection in principle to the creation of a new access road along the southern boundary of the WRC. However, the detail of land ownership will need to be explored as some of this appears to be on land in the ownership of Anglian Water.</li> </ul>
Q36c Vehicular access & road layout – Option c (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It would encourage developments which lead to more lorries going to the site.</li> </ul>
Q36c Vehicular access & road layout – Option c (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All aggregate lorries should access the site via westbound on-off slips from the A14 and not go onto Milton Road at all.</li> <li>Access solutions that look to segregate heavy vehicle traffic from more vulnerable users are supported but designs and movement strategies must ensure that the future wholesale redevelopment of the area is acknowledged.</li> <li>HGV route will be needed.</li> <li>There will be an increasing number of users and a wide variety of modes of transport using this area, ranging from pedestrian and cyclists going to the offices and the station, to HCVs accessing the B2, B8 and Sui Generis areas. It is important to have separation between HCVs and other users, not least to ensure the safety of those moving in and through the area.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 36d (Transport – Vehicular access and road layout - Option d)

### Do you support or object to the proposed Option d for Cowley Road, and why?

- Respondents – 19
- Support (including qualified) - 2
- Object - 1
- Comment - 16

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q36d Vehicular access & road layout – Option d (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nearside lane of Milton Road southbound from the interchange should be a Cowley Road only filter lane.</li> <li>A route for aggregate lorries serving the A14 improvements</li> </ul>

	<p>to come off the A14 westbound directly (left-off, left-on) to fill up at ground level from the aggregate depot, would be a great improvement, so that this activity did not affect the development of the area or traffic on Milton Road. If a left-turn-off left-turn-on route is made west of the railway then it should continue beside the A14 to join with Cowley Road as a dedicated access for heavy lorries headed towards Cambridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cyclists and pedestrians need to be catered for on each and every access road. Should the plan opt for a second access road the Campaign recommends that no through routes for motor vehicles are created between them, preventing the temptation for drivers to rat-run through the development to beat traffic on Milton Road. Flexibility and convenience of routes for active modes must be as good, indeed better, than that available for motorised vehicles. Providing this filtered permeability is crucial for central areas to be attractive for cycling and walking.</li> </ul>
Q36d Vehicular access & road layout – Option d (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan does not seem terribly joined up about road access. The whole question of linkages to the A14 from Fen Road could be readily added into this mix, unsnarling major traffic issues.</li> </ul>
Q36d Vehicular access & road layout – Option d (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A route for aggregate lorries serving the A14 improvements to come off the A14 westbound directly (left-off, left-on) to fill up at ground level from the aggregate depot, would be a great improvement, so that this activity did not affect the development of the area or traffic on Milton Road.</li> <li>• Strategic traffic modelling work is required to identify the highway capacity improvements required on the Milton Road corridor and access to the site. Priority needs to be given in the City Deal to funding transport schemes that improve the accessibility of the CNFE site.</li> <li>• Area-wide travel planning should be given greater importance in reducing existing vehicular travel demand by extending the existing Travel Plan Plus scheme. The County Council also needs to undertake further assessment work to understand the impact of the new railway station on the potential for modal shift from car to rail trips in the local area.</li> <li>• Concentrate major highway improvements in the interface where Cowley Road meets Milton Road - to perpetuate a situation of the whole CNFE area being accessed through a single stretch of road wedged between the Innovation Park and the TV building is simply going to exacerbate existing problems.</li> <li>• The quantum of development envisaged through the AAP should be reduced to reflect that which is sustainable in the next five years. This needs to take account of the delivery times for the railway station, Guided busway interchange and the Milton Road A10 / A14 access upgrades.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Need to widen Milton Road to two lanes southbound, between the Science Park junction and the busway. Congestion approaching the Science Park is already a serious problem, particularly as it often stretches back to the A14. This problem can only become worse if the area is developed, even if the focus is on sustainable transport.</li><li>• Vehicle access into and out of the CNFE Plan area remains a significant problem. A major new interchange is required for vehicle traffic, with the existing network of footpath and cycleways creating links to the surrounding area. If provision is not materially increased, existing problems will be exacerbated, dissuading landowners from looking at alternative uses and discouraging investors from bringing forward development proposals.</li><li>• Insufficient detail to comment at this stage.</li><li>• Cyclists should be considered too and allowed a traffic free approach where the interaction with LGVs/buses is eliminated. This is the chance to prevent the distressing and needless deaths one sees so often in London and the cities.</li><li>• Bus priority measures are being explored along Milton Road and this is supported in principle. The potential to intelligently use carriageway space in the vicinity of the Science Park should also be explored to respond to changes in tidal demand.</li><li>• We understand the importance of seeking to separate the heavy industrial traffic from pedestrians and cyclists and have no objection in principle to the creation of a new access road along the southern boundary of the WRC. However, the detail of land ownership will need to be explored as some of this appears to be on land in the ownership of Anglian Water.</li><li>• In addition to the vehicular options proposed through the CNFE AAP, in order to relieve traffic congestion around the existing A14/Milton Road junction, TTP Consulting have considered whether an additional access from the A14 to the station could be included within the AAP and delivered as part of the redevelopment. Request consideration of this option to address existing and future transport, highways and access issues.</li><li>• Option dependents upon the final option chosen for CNFE, its context of the whole site and not individual land ownerships or phasing. Separation of cyclists and pedestrians from vehicles should be an aim.</li><li>• All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their interrelationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme, in particular</li></ul>
--	---

	<p>proposals requiring significant transport intervention for both local, strategic and rail networks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding the approach to transport. The issues have been informed by new evidence in the form of the Ely to Cambridge Transport Study. Further work is also being undertaken to inform the draft AAP.</li> </ul>
Councils' response to Questions 36a – 36d	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding the approach to transport. The issues have been informed by new evidence in the form of the Ely to Cambridge Transport Study. Further work is also being undertaken to inform the draft AAP.

## Chapter 9 – Question 37a (Transport – Parking at transport interchange - Option a)

**Do you support or object to the proposed Option a for parking at the proposed new rail/bus transport interchange, and why?**

- Respondents – 7
- Support (including qualified) - 1
- Object - 5
- Comment - 1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q37a Parking at transport interchange – Option a (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low-level car parking facilities</li> </ul>
Q37a Parking at transport interchange – Option a (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to the current proposed surface car parking layout. The consented layout fails to make best use of the site. It would be difficult to extend or to construct a multi-storey structure on the footprint given the site's shape and proximity to the Bramblefields reserve.</li> <li>• Better location for a surface car park is adjacent to the existing main railway line, north of new station building. A conventional rectangular footprint could be used, being more efficient in terms of the number of spaces and providing flexibility to convert to a multi-storey car park if sufficient future demand arises.</li> <li>• Short-sighted option: Justification for capacity not provided</li> <li>• CNFE Area should maximise developable land in and around the comprehensive transport networks that exist.</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support option B</li> </ul>
Q37a Parking at transport interchange – Option a (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final proposal should inform car parking provision which has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 37b (Transport – Parking at transport interchange - Option b)

**Do you support or object to the proposed Option b for parking at the proposed new rail/bus transport interchange, and why?**

- Respondents – 14
- Support (including qualified) - 12
- Object - 0
- Comment - 2

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q37b Parking at transport interchange – Option b (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes better use of the land and not everyone can walk or cycle to the station. Would there be appropriate public transport when the late trains arrive from London?</li> <li>• Support a multi-storey car park. Witness the pressure on parking at the main station. Not everyone can walk or cycle.</li> <li>• Support the location of a surface car park that makes best use of the overall site. It is recommended that the surface car park is constructed adjacent to the existing main railway line to the north of the new station building. The surface car park could be laid out in a conventional rectangular footprint which is more efficient in terms of the number of spaces and provides flexibility to convert to a multi-storey car park if there is sufficient future demand.</li> <li>• Final proposal should inform car parking provision which has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network.</li> <li>• Important to make best use of the available space</li> <li>• Flexible option with more realistic longer term solution although no details of capacity given</li> <li>• The efficient use of land is supported in this key Cambridge</li> </ul>

	<p>North location where strong sustainable transport links are already in place and will be enhanced between existing and new communities, including Waterbeach New Town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will ensure more people have the ability to use the station</li> <li>• Maximises land use, potentially enables a wider range of land uses and should enable more residential development away from the odour footprint.</li> </ul>
Q37b Parking at transport interchange – Option b (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final proposal should inform car parking provision which has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network.</li> <li>• Should consider a multi-storey car park. Cambridge North could, and possibly should be, a new city centre, so we will need considerably more parking than is currently proposed in the future.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 37c (Transport – Parking at transport interchange - Option c)

**Do you support or object to the proposed Option c for parking at the proposed new rail/bus transport interchange, and why?**

- Respondents – 5
- Support - 0
- Object - 0
- Comment - 5

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q37c Parking at transport interchange – Option c (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The car parking at the Station should be for station users only. The car park should not be operated as a 'park and ride' site for the CGB.</li> <li>• Final proposal should inform car parking provision which has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network.</li> <li>• Adequate provision should be made to preclude overspill parking elsewhere in the area.</li> <li>• The key priority as regards car parking is to ensure that it is provided to a standard and in a way which supports the</li> </ul>

	overall strategy for CNFE. Therefore, proper provision needs to be made both for appropriate car parking, but also for public realm befitting of one of the main entrances to CNFE.
Councils' response to Questions 37a – 37c	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding the approach to transport. The issues have been informed by new evidence in the form of the Ely to Cambridge Transport Study. Further work is also being undertaken to inform the draft AAP.

## Chapter 9 – Question 38a (Transport – Car Parking standards - Option a)

**Do you support or object to the proposed Option a for car parking standards, and why?**

- Respondents – 7
- Support (including qualified) - 4
- Object - 1
- Comment - 2

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q38a Car parking standards – Option a (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking standards should not be more onerous than in the rest of the city especially given the location on the edge of the settlement.</li> <li>• This is the least worst Option</li> <li>• Should include CCC adopted car parking standards and cycle parking standards.</li> <li>• The Crown Estates are planning to improve the amount of cycle parking provision and quality at CBP, and hope to deliver</li> <li>• on this initiative within 2015, again this is part of their Sustainability Action Plan.</li> </ul>
Q38a Car parking standards – Option a (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The car parking restrictions in appendix L8 of the referenced documents are far too tight - see what has happened about car parking in Orchard Park</li> </ul>
Q38a Car parking standards – Option a (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brookgate support the use of car parking standards across the whole area that are more restrictive than the car parking standards policy set by the Cambridge City Council car parking standards, to reflect the highly sustainable location. The current policy however forms a useful starting point in discussions over car parking levels.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network.</li> <li>• More detailed consideration of parking numbers and approach to parking provision, will be required including detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, potential for shared use of parking across different land uses and impacts of traffic on networks.</li> </ul>
--	--

## Chapter 9 – Question 38b (Transport – Car Parking standards - Option b)

Do you support or object to the proposed Option b for car parking standards, and why?

- Respondents – 10
- Support (including qualified) - 6
- Object - 3
- Comment - 1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q38b Car parking standards – Option b (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the future cars should not be the primary mode of transport.</li> <li>• Support more restrictive car parking standards across the whole area to reflect the highly sustainable location. Transport modelling work will assist in determining the appropriate levels of car parking taking into account the site accessibility and proposed land-uses. It should be recognised that car parking levels particularly for commercial development should not be set too low as it may make development unattractive to potential tenants, particularly given the high car parking levels consented on adjacent established commercial development sites. The under-provision of car parking could also lead to off-site overspill parking.</li> <li>• Consideration to be given to this to reflect sustainability of location</li> <li>• Restricting car parking standards across the whole area will reflect the area’s highly sustainable location.</li> <li>• Enabling active and public transport must be the focus for this development. Restrictions on private motor use are part of achieving this mode shift.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensible approach to maximise more sustainable forms of transport as well as encouraging employers to support more sustainable forms of transport for travel to work.</li> </ul>
Q38b Car parking standards – Option b (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Even tighter restriction for residential accommodation would be ridiculous (see answer to 38a). However, there is a need to ensure that parking intended for residents and their visitors isn't usurped by station and business users. Therefore such parking should not be "on-street" but within the confines of each property, in order to avoid having to pay for a "residents' parking scheme".</li> <li>• Encourages on-street parking, competition for spaces and does not reduce car usage, just displaces it.</li> <li>• This is the worst option.</li> </ul>
Q38b Car parking standards – Option b (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network.</li> <li>• More detailed consideration of parking numbers and approach to parking provision, will be required including detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, potential for shared use of parking across different land uses and impacts of traffic on networks</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 38c (Transport – Car Parking standards - Option c)

**Do you support or object to the proposed Option c for car parking standards, and why?**

- Respondents – 6
- Support (including qualified) - 1
- Object - 3
- Comment - 2

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q38c Car parking standards – Option c (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support only providing displacement of station area parking is carefully controlled to prevent problems elsewhere.</li> </ul>
Q38c Car parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As experience in the rest of Cambridge has shown, if you</li> </ul>

standards – Option c (Object)	<p>stop people parking in one place or charge for it they will just move to parking somewhere nearby (even, it seems, on double yellow lines). Therefore, you have no option but to either provide entirely adequate car parking facilities for those who want to park, or to provide car parking facilities on individual properties that are owned by the residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brookgate object to a 'tiered' approach to car parking standards based on the proximity to the station. The success of the whole AAP will in part be based on linking the benefits of the new station and the extension of the CGB with the whole AAP site through a variety of sustainable transport measures including encouraging walking, train/cycle, shuttle buses and other innovative solutions which will allow the whole allocation (and the wider area) to shift from car dominated transport to other modes.</li> <li>• This is the second worst Option.</li> </ul>
Q38c Car parking standards – Option c (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More focus on public transport</li> <li>• Car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network.</li> <li>• More detailed consideration of parking numbers and approach to parking provision, will be required including detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, potential for shared use of parking across different land uses and impacts of traffic on networks.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 38d (Transport – Car Parking standards - Comments)

### Do you have other comments on car parking standards?

- Respondents – 9
- Support (including qualified) - 1
- Object - 0
- Comment - 8

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q38d Car parking standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is entirely appropriate for the Plan to acknowledge that car parking in and around a new CNFE area will be an important part of any new development. This is particularly</li> </ul>

(Support)	<p>the case where existing employment areas have established patterns of movement and car parking which seek to meet the needs of users. We acknowledge that owners and tenants of existing buildings will perhaps need a more stringent car parking management system in place to ensure that there is no abuse of the spaces within their control.</p>
Q38d Car parking standards (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network.</li> <li>• More detailed consideration of parking numbers and approach to parking provision, will be required including detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, potential for shared use of parking across different land uses and impacts of traffic on networks</li> <li>• A balanced approach is required recognising the accessibility of the site by non-car modes but also the need to provide appropriate levels of operational car parking. Further modelling work should be undertaken to inform the car parking standards for each of the land uses proposed on the CNFE site.</li> <li>• It is important that any new developments which do come forward do not compound existing parking problems. Landowners such as St John's College along with their tenants may well need a more stringent car parking management system to ensure proper controlled parking in the instance where new significant development is coming forward.</li> <li>• All the options fail to consider pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users, including disabled on buses, by placing a Multi-storey carpark right next to the station. This replicates the horrendous conditions at Cambridge railway station where vehicles pick up and deposit people just a couple of metres from the front door, creating a fume-filled and dangerous approach, frequently gridlocked and preventing buses from completing a turning round a small roundabout. This delays the buses from arriving at their stops, delays the public travelling on them and makes it the poor relation.</li> <li>• Consideration to be given to reflect sustainability of location</li> <li>• No preference on the three options but it is relevant that car use can be further discouraged by ensuring sustainable links are secured to existing and planned communities, including Waterbeach New Town. A relationship between accessibility and parking provision is a sensible and pragmatic approach. Any adopted parking standards need to consider the volume of vehicles that this could in turn</li> </ul>

	<p>generate and the implications for traffic and transport along the important Milton Road corridor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Turnstone agrees that appropriate levels of car parking must be planned for as part of the CNFE development. However, parking associated with the railway station must not, under any circumstances, interfere with the need to create a proper entrance/arrival point to CNFE, and therefore parking should not be delivered for cars at the expense of high quality provision for bicycles, bus interchange and public realm.</li> <li>• Crown Estate do not support a restriction in car parking standards or further cycle parking spaces.</li> </ul>
Councils' response to Questions 38a – 38d	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding the approach to transport, and in particular car parking. The issues have been informed by new evidence in the form of the Ely to Cambridge Transport Study. Further work is also being undertaken to inform the draft AAP.

## Chapter 9 – Question 39a (Transport – Cycle Parking standards - Option a)

### Do you support or object to the proposed Option a for cycle parking standards, and why?

- Respondents – 4
- Support (including qualified) - 2
- Object - 1
- Comment - 1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q39a Cycle parking standards – Option a (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The standards have been successfully used on the CB1 development, a similar highly sustainable transport hub.</li> <li>• The Crown Estate support Option A for the CNFE AAP to include CCC adopted car parking standards and cycle parking standards. The Crown Estate are planning to improve the amount of cycle parking provision and quality at CBP, and hope to deliver on this initiative within 2015, again this is part of their Sustainability Action Plan.</li> </ul>
Q39a Cycle parking standards – Option a (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainable location given existing and new cycleway links, therefore adequate provision needed which is likely to exceed local plan standards.</li> </ul>
Q39a Cycle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic</li> </ul>



parking standards – Option a (Comment)	<p>generation. Need to balance operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More detailed consideration of parking numbers and approach to parking provision, will be required including detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, potential for shared use of parking across different land uses and impacts of traffic on networks.</li> </ul>
--	---

## Chapter 9 – Question 39b (Transport – Cycle Parking standards - Option b)

### Do you support or object to the proposed Option b for cycle parking standards, and why?

- Respondents – 12
- Support (including qualified) - 10
- Object - 1
- Comment - 1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q39b Cycle parking standards – Option b (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The more available cycle parking there is the more attractive and convenient this area will be for cycling to &amp; from CNFE.</li> <li>• Providing even greater amounts of cycle parking that are expected to be used seems an appropriate way to encourage people to use cycles. If you are hoping that some workers will arrive by train and then cycle to locations on the Science Park, then you need to provide sufficient secure cycle storage to enable people to leave their cycles at the station overnight and at weekends.</li> <li>• A higher standard of cycle parking will be needed and it would be absurd to create a pleasant cycling environment but not require there to be enough spaces for all potential users.</li> <li>• New cycleways will encourage more cycling and therefore higher level of provision likely.</li> <li>• Consideration to be given to higher standard to reflect sustainability of location.</li> <li>• This would be more likely to maximise the potential for employees and visitors to travel by bike, for example between Waterbeach New Town and the CNFE Area.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Campaign supports Option B: higher cycle parking standard across the whole area to reflect the highly sustainable location. High-quality, easily accessible and available cycle parking throughout the site is entirely appropriate for enabling high cycling use at all destinations - employment, residential and the station. The Campaign also recommends secure, covered cycle parking in residential areas as these reduce theft and deterioration of residents' bikes.</li> </ul>
Q39b Cycle parking standards – Option b (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brookgate object to higher cycle parking standards as the current standards are sufficient to deal with the likely demand for cycle parking in areas with good cycle infrastructure and connectivity.</li> </ul>
Q39b Cycle parking standards – Option b (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network.</li> <li>More detailed consideration of parking numbers and approach to parking provision, will be required including detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, potential for shared use of parking across different land uses and impacts of traffic on networks.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 39c (Transport – Cycle Parking standards - Option c)

### Do you support or object to the proposed Option c for cycle parking standards, and why?

- Respondents – 8
- Support (including qualified) - 5
- Object - 2
- Comment - 1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q39c Cycle parking standards – Option c (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I would also like to see cycle lockers as an option in the station cycle parking areas.</li> <li>To encourage cycling, it will be essential to have sufficient, safe, well-lit, adequately roofed cycle parking</li> <li>We would also like to see cycle lockers as an option in the station cycle parking areas.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The station will inevitably be used for commuting and encouraging travel to the station by cycle should be supported and provided for. The Guided Busway links will also encourage the use of cycling from possibly further than may otherwise be the case.</li> </ul>
Q39c Cycle parking standards – Option c (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brookgate object to a 'tiered' approach to cycle parking standards based on the proximity to the station. The success of the whole AAP will in part be based on linking the benefits of the new station and extension of the CGB with the whole AAP site through a variety of sustainable transport measures including encouraging walking, train/cycle, shuttle buses and other innovative solutions which will allow the whole allocation (and the wider area) shift from car dominated transport to other modes.</li> <li>New cycleways will encourage more cycling and therefore higher level of provision likely.</li> </ul>
Q39c Cycle parking standards – Option c (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ability to park a cycle in a safe, secure, and convenient location is a key aspect of encouraging and supporting travel by bike. Cycle parking provision at least in line with standards will be required. However, furthermore detailed analysis will be needed on cycle mode share and targets to determine an appropriate level that maximises cycle access to the area. This is likely to confirm a level of provision in excess of standards given the high levels of non-car mode split likely to be required</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 39d (Transport – Cycle Parking standards - Option d)

### Do you have other comments on cycle parking standards?

- Respondents – 5
- Support - 0
- Object - 0
- Comment - 5

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q39d Cycle parking standards (Comments)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The City Council have a preference for cycle parking to be provided using Sheffield Stands. Increasingly double stacking racks are being installed and used at rail stations and are widely used new residential and non-residential developments. Double stackers provide added benefits, maximising cycle parking provision and making the most efficient use of limited space. It is suggested that the Cambridge City cycle parking standards are updated to</li> </ul>

	<p>reflect the increased use and popularity of double stackers. The provision of a high proportion of cycle parking using double-stackers would maximise the efficient use of the CNFE site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration to be given to higher standard to reflect sustainability of location</li> <li>• In order to achieve the modal share targets envisaged, high levels of cycle parking provision will be required. As a starting point the standards in the emerging Local Plan (Policy 82 and Appendix L) should be adopted, but Turnstone agrees that there may be scope for higher levels of provision in close proximity to the railway station interchange.</li> <li>• Car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network.</li> <li>• More detailed consideration of parking numbers and approach to parking provision, will be required including detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, potential for shared use of parking across different land uses and impacts of traffic on networks</li> <li>• Object to further cycle parking spaces.</li> </ul>
<p>Councils response to Question 39a – 39d</p>	<p>Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding the approach to transport. The issues have been informed by new evidence in the form of the Ely to Cambridge Transport Study. Further work is also being undertaken to inform the draft AAP. Particular views are sought regarding the approach to cycle parking.</p>

## Chapter 9 – Question 40 (Transport – Movement, severance & permeability)

**What further provision should be made to improve the cycle and pedestrian environment in the Cambridge Northern Fringe East area, and are there any other pedestrian and cycleway linkages that are important, and you wish to be included in the plan?**

- Respondents – 25
- Support (including qualified) - 2
- Object - 1
- Comment - 22

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q40 Movement, severance & permeability (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Off-site connections are crucial for enabling a high cycling and walking mode share. These should have separate provision for each mode - no shared use. Priority over side accesses. Separated from motor traffic. Direct (not multi-stage) protected crossings at off side junctions.</li> <li>• Major connections to consider: Jane Coston bridge; Northern Guideway; Fen Road (through Chesterton Sidings Triangle); Cowley Road (need to ensure Network Rail track is protected from development to use as cycle and pedestrian access to station); Chisholm trail (including bridge).</li> <li>• Suggest that filtered permeability (full access for sustainable modes, no through routes for motor vehicles) is used throughout the development, to create an attractive environment for cycling and walking free from the noise and pollution of through traffic.</li> </ul>
Q40 Movement, severance & permeability (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The North Area (including Science Park) is dis-joined in cycling planning. Cycle routes should also be better joined up to create more safe, segregated cycling. The question of bridges and river crossings in Chesterton should be addressed as part of this plan - people still face a nightmare-ish commute north of the river to these re-generated areas.</li> </ul>
Q40 Movement, severance & permeability (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider pedestrian and cycling infrastructure as two separate priorities, and keep pedestrian/cycle routes separate. In all cycling infrastructure cyclists should be given the same right-of-way as vehicular traffic - new cycle routes should not be broken up by side roads.</li> <li>• Look at the following routes into the area: Milton Road; Green End Road; Fen Road.</li> <li>• Improvement to cycling infrastructure here should be considered as part of the plan, encouraging more people to travel by bike.</li> <li>• Make Network Rail's disused private access road from Milton Road to Chesterton sidings a public footpath and cycleway for travelling to and from the new railway station. This would be more pleasant and convenient than the pedestrian and cycle route currently proposed for Cowley Road.</li> <li>• The Crown Estate could install side entrances on the North side of the Cambridge Business Park to shorten the walk between offices on the Cambridge Business Park and the new railway station and encourage travel to the Cambridge Business Park by train.</li> <li>• There should be a new bridge over the river for cyclists to reach the station directly from the Abbey area. I believe this</li> </ul>

	<p>has already been discussed and I hope approved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cycling along Fen Road should be made safer; I think there are already proposals for this.</li><li>• Access should be available between the newly pedestrianised Cowley Road and the Business Park to avoid the need to walk all the way up to Cowley Road if pedestrians are coming from the south. Initially this could be at the very end of the Business Park, with additional access to the side once the area there gets developed.</li><li>• Provide more connections to the North and East of the area: a cycle tunnel under the A14 near the railway into Milton Country Park, and a level crossing link to Fen Road and onwards to the River Cam via Grassy Corner.</li><li>• Safeguard the old Network Rail (Lafarge) track on the south side of the First Public Drain as a dedicated cycle path to the station.</li><li>• These ideas need careful thought to provide suitable access for everyone. Local consultation would be desirable.</li><li>• Provide a direct route (avoiding all the junctions off Milton Road) from the Jane Coston Bridge to the railway station.</li><li>• CNFE should deliver improvements to the Milton Road corridor and the Jane Coston Bridge corridor, improving cycle access to the CNFE site and improving connections northwards to Milton village.</li><li>• The City Deal should deliver the Chisholm Trail to improve cycle connectivity to the south along with good quality local links into Chesterton.</li><li>• High quality cycle facilities could be provided parallel to the existing Cowley Road by utilising the disused Network Rail site access road to help improve links to Milton Road and the existing Science Park.</li><li>• Links from the Jane Coston bridge are very important, both to the new station and to Milton Road (where the existing path has much scope for improvement).</li><li>• Any considerations for further provision of cycle and pedestrian access in CNFE should take account of both the existing and planned mineral and waste activities in the area and the importance of separation between HCVs and other users.</li><li>• The carpark should be sited a minimum of 100 metres away from the new station in order to improve safety and air quality for pedestrians and cyclists. A covered walkway could be provided, if one is also provided from public transport users - but priority must be given to pedestrians and users of public transport (excludes taxis). Similarly, a taxi rank should not be any closer than 100 metres to allow space for ordinary and guided buses.</li><li>• Support the need to maximise linkages, but there are</li></ul>
--	---

	<p>insufficient details to assess proposals fully at this stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There are economic and environmental benefits in ensuring CNFE has sustainable links not only to existing residential neighbourhoods but also planned new communities. The AAP should set out how CNFE will contribute to securing and/or enhancing cycle links to the proposed Waterbeach New Town. Specifically cycle links along the River Cam, through Milton, between the Jane Coston Cycle Bridge and the CNFE and also along any future bus priority routes - especially along the Chisholm Trail to connect to the future busway links under the A14.</li><li>• Support for proposed attention to cycle improvements linked to Chisholm Trail and Milton Road.</li><li>• Consideration needs to be given to how cycling and walking linkages could be improved to the north of the area, specifically linking to Milton Country Park and the River Cam/Hailing Way.</li><li>• A further pedestrian / cycle tunnel under or bridge over the A14 to the West of the River Cam and East of the existing Coston Cycle Bridge would bring significant benefits.</li><li>• Good pedestrian/cycle links are required for all the surrounding areas such as Milton via Jane Coston Bridge, Chesterton via the sidings triangle, and Abbey/Fen Ditton via the planned Chisholm Trail river bridge.</li><li>• The AAP must recognise existing cycle infrastructure which exists in the area, and must consider the scope that may exist for enhancing this.</li><li>• There are important links to the CNFE area from the north, via the Jane Coston Bridge, and possibly up from the River Cam corridor. Adequate provision must be provided in terms of wide cycle paths, etc, but also these gateways are made as attractive as they possibly can be.</li><li>• Good linkages for pedestrians and cyclists and, potentially, horse riders should be achieved to the eastern boundary of the site linking with the River Cam Corridor (and its special neighbourhood) and Milton Country Park (including proper wide tunnel etc under or bridge over the A14 adjacent to the River Cam).</li><li>• Effective and sympathetic solutions need to be found to link with existing neighbourhood to south of the new Guided Bus Route and the River Cam / Chisholm Cycle Trail.</li><li>• Support for access between the new railway station and existing offices in the AAP, specifically Cambridge Business Park. Potential pedestrian/cycle access options, supported by Business Park occupiers have previously been worked up by Scott Brownrigg and HED and are enclosed for information. We would therefore like to see these options included within the next stage of the AAP.</li><li>• The proposals should not go ahead unless as part of the</li></ul>
--	---

	<p>scheme a cycle footway is provided on Network Rail land alongside Cowley Road. The scheme needs a safe route for cyclists and pedestrians; the Cowley Road footpath as proposed would have the entrances across it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The strategy must focus on connectivity with key destinations lying to the south and north, including accessibility to CNFE itself and as part of the wider corridor, including the link between Waterbeach new town (via Jane Coston Bridge) and the city centre. In addition, the opportunity for linking the Chisholm Trail northwards through CNFE to the Milton Country Park via the rail corridor should also be taken.</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding the approach to transport. The issues have been informed by new evidence in the form of the Ely to Cambridge Transport Study. Further work is also being undertaken to inform the draft AAP. Views are sought on a range of connections that could be enhanced.

## Chapter 9 – Question 41a (Climate change & Environmental quality – Sustainable design & construction & flood risk - Option a)

### Do you support or object to the proposed Option a on sustainable design and construction, and flood risk?

- Respondents – 8
- Support (including qualified) - 3
- Object - 2
- Comment - 3

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q41a Sustainable design & construction & flood risk – Option a (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development should not be more expensive than elsewhere in the City. Should comply with policy which complies with NPPF or other national standards.</li> <li>• Anglian Water support option (a) which proposes that the CNFE area relies upon Local Plan policies related to climate change and sustainable design and construction.</li> </ul>
Q41a Sustainable design & construction & flood risk – Option a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• • Support Option B.</li> </ul>



(Object)	
Q41a Sustainable design & construction & flood risk – Option a (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due to the constant changes in Building Regulations requirements and with regards to sustainability, standards targets are unrealistic at such an early stage of policy formation. The relevant Building Regulations standards will be imposed at the point of delivery on the ground.</li> <li>• Support for Option A. Creating a specific and potentially more onerous policy framework for the CNFE would be strongly objected to by St John's College, assuming that their landholdings would fall within the Plan area.</li> <li>• Rely on Local Plan policies related to climate change and sustainable design and construction.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 41b (Climate change & Environmental quality – Sustainable design & construction & flood risk - Option b)

**Do you support or object to the proposed Option b on sustainable design and construction, and flood risk?**

- Respondents – 14
- Support (including qualified) - 7
- Object - 2
- Comment - 5

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q41b Sustainable design & construction & flooding – Option b (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is the future so let's do it now.</li> <li>• In view of the low-lying nature of this area and the flood map which shows very flood-prone areas just between here and the river, it is essential that SuDS do not discharge water into the ground. There are gravels under the wider area which have been extracted in places, and water runs under the railway and out at ground level on Chesterton Fen in places. As much rainwater as possible to be used on-site.</li> <li>• The AAP does not mention stormwater retention, balancing ponds to achieve greenfield runoff (or sewage farm runoff) rates etc. This must be addressed.</li> <li>• Support the proposal for redevelopment in the vicinity to be above the existing standards identified within the Local Plan policies. SuDS should also consider the improvement of water quality as a key feature.</li> <li>• BREEAM is the standard CNFE should be working to.</li> <li>• Support for proposals to develop policies for renewable and low carbon energy generation and sustainable design</li> </ul>

	<p>and construction. Recommendation that these should be worded to ensure benefits for the natural environment are maximised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support. Given the reputation of the adjoining Science Park and the likely employment uses within CNFE, it is considered that aspiring to high levels of sustainable design should be expected, although this may in itself be driven as much by occupier demand as policy.</li> </ul>
<p>Q41b Sustainable design &amp; construction &amp; flooding – Option b (Object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adds further onerous requirements to costs. Should comply with policy which complies with NPPF or other national standards.</li> <li>• Anglian Water support option (a) which proposes that the CNFE area relies upon Local Plan polices related to climate change and sustainable design and construction.</li> </ul>
<p>Q41b Sustainable design &amp; construction &amp; flooding – Option b (Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that this is a Flood Zone 1 area.</li> <li>• It is vital that rainwater run-off is controlled and contained such that it does not seep through the underlying gravels to flood the residential and industrial properties on Fen Road to the east, which lie at a lower level. The groundwater is already very close to the surface on Fen Road and frequently floods.</li> <li>• Due to the constant changes in Building Regulations requirements and with regards to sustainability, standards targets are unrealistic at such an early stage of policy formation. The relevant Building Regulations standards will be imposed at the point of delivery on the ground.</li> <li>• At present the proposal to develop a bespoke sustainable design and construction policy for CNFE through Option B seeks a minimum BREEAM standard of 'excellent' for all 'new non-residential development' under point (a). As 'new non-residential development' would include future mineral and waste applications, where operations can be designed without the need for a building, question whether a minimum standard of BREEAM excellent is relevant in these circumstances? As such we would recommend that point (a) is reworded to make reference to non-residential built development in the form of offices and industrial units etc. which excludes mineral and waste uses</li> <li>• Support exploration of bespoke policies for CNFE subject to viability.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 41c (Climate change & Environmental quality – Sustainable design & construction & flood risk - Option b)

Do you have other policy option suggestions for sustainable design and construction and flood risk?

- Respondents – 5
- Support - 0
- Object - 0
- Comment - 5

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q41c Sustainable design & construction & flood risk (Comments)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The AAP does not mention stormwater retention, balancing ponds to achieve greenfield runoff (or sewage farm runoff) rates etc. This must be addressed.</li> <li>• Due to the constant changes in Building Regulations requirements and with regards to sustainability, standards targets are unrealistic at such an early stage of policy formation. The relevant Building Regulations standards will be imposed at the point of delivery on the ground.</li> <li>• The AAP should rely on policies in the emerging Cambridge Local Plan 2014 (proposed submission), as these will have been subjected to independent scrutiny by the Local Plan Inspector. There is no basis for more exacting standards being applied in the case of development within the CNFE area.</li> <li>• In view of the low-lying nature of this area and the flood map which shows very flood-prone areas just between here and the river, it is essential that SuDS do not discharge water into the ground. There are gravels under the wider area which have been extracted in places, and water runs under the railway and out at ground level on Chesterton Fen in places. As much rainwater as possible to be used on-site.</li> <li>• The AAP does not mention stormwater retention, balancing ponds to achieve greenfield runoff (or sewage farm runoff) rates etc. This must be addressed.</li> <li>• Anglian Water support option (a) which proposes that the CNFE area relies upon Local Plan polices related to climate change and sustainable design and construction.</li> </ul>
Councils' response to Questions 41a – 41c	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding the approach to sustainability standards and SuDS.

## Chapter 9 – Question 42 (Climate change & Environmental quality – Renewable & low carbon energy generation)

Do you support or object to the proposed approach on renewable and low carbon energy generation, and why? If you have other policy option suggestions for renewable and low carbon energy generation please add your suggestions.

- Respondents – 15
- Support (including qualified) - 8
- Object - 0
- Comment - 7

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q42 Renewable & low carbon energy generation (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It has to be done to protect the future.</li> <li>• It would be irresponsible to ignore energy efficiency and generation with new buildings.</li> <li>• Site wide provision of energy generation gives economies of scale but needs careful consideration re technologies promoted to ensure no adverse impacts. Anaerobic digester proposals must fit with surrounding uses.</li> <li>• These types of schemes need encouragement.</li> <li>• Support for proposals to develop policies for renewable and low carbon energy generation and sustainable design and construction. Recommendation that these should be worded to ensure benefits for the natural environment are maximised.</li> <li>• CNFE may present opportunities for a site wide approach to renewable and low carbon generation. It may be that this is not completely site wide, but it should certainly be considered for substantial areas, for example, combined heat and power plants. While phasing may be challenging in terms of capacity in the early stages, consideration to such provision should be made.</li> <li>• With regard to waste processing facilities, further work in this respect would be supported.</li> </ul>
Q42 Renewable & low carbon energy generation (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some sort of CHP plant may be appropriate. However, a municipal organic waste processing could be a very antisocial neighbour - put these away from residential areas.</li> <li>• Objection to anaerobic digestion facilities (option B) as these can be very smelly. Support for every building having integral solar PV generation tiles, high quality insulation and double glazing.</li> <li>• Developments should be required to meet the current Building Regulations standards at the point of delivering</li> </ul>

	<p>the development. The removal of the requirement to achieve a 10% reduction due to Low or Zero Carbon standards (LZC's)/passive solar design is however welcome. It would be useful to clarify what is meant by suitable LZC's for the area. All technologies should be technically and economically viable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The requirement for new waste management processing facilities to carry out a feasibility study for the potential for anaerobic digestion is onerous and inappropriate. The waste management uses proposed for this area through the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan are a Household Recycling Centre (dealing with bulky household waste items) and a permanent inert waste recycling facility; neither of these facilities would be treating organic municipal waste. The only suitable location for anaerobic digestion would appear to be the Water Recycling Centre where sludge treatment works, involving the importation of sludge from elsewhere, is already in place.</li> <li>• Support approach but object to anaerobic digestion in this location due to potential impacts on quality of new community and amenity.</li> <li>• There is no reason why the AAP should not reference the potential desirability of an area-based approach towards renewables and low carbon energy generation. However, it may be inappropriate to be overly prescriptive on this particular issue</li> </ul>
Council's response	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding the approach to sustainability standards and SUDS.

## Chapter 9 – Question 43 (Climate change & Environmental quality – Health Impact Assessment)

### Do you support or object to the proposed approach on Health Impact Assessments, and why?

- Respondents – 7
- Support (including qualified) - 6
- Object - 1
- Comment - 0

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q43 Health Impact Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensible and an example for the future.</li> <li>• Approach is supported for residential and office/industrial built development; However, prudent to require a Full</li> </ul>

(Support)	<p>Health Impact Assessment for all residential development given the mixed use of the area, especially if residential development is located in proximity to the Water Recycling Centre and/or aggregates railheads and other uses which have the potential to give rise to amenity issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the case of future minerals and waste development on CNFE, where activities may largely be conducted outside of a building and are considered compatible with the existing surrounding minerals and waste uses, this should be acknowledged within the proposed approach. It is therefore recommended that the proposed approach is strengthened in relation to residential development and remains as identified for office type built development, with an acknowledgement that minerals and waste uses are excluded from this requirement.</li> <li>• The requirement of requiring a health impact assessment is supported.</li> <li>• The concept of requiring a Health Impact Assessment accords with the South Cambridgeshire local plan (current and proposed) and with the Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Strategy.</li> <li>• Support - Support. The odour footprint needs to be updated following the recent investment in the Water Recycling Centre so that the information and odour zones are up to date.</li> </ul>
Q43 Health Impact Assessment (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The requirement for a Health Impact Assessment is overly onerous and is not currently required, or proposed to be required, by Cambridge City Council. The CNFE area is a part of Cambridge City and it is not considered necessary to introduce additional requirements for the production of HIA's in support of planning applications. The production of HIA's incurs additional costs/time which will not assist developers to efficiently deliver the necessary projects required to regenerate the CNFE area. Local Plan polices/EIA requirements already result in the provision of sufficient supporting information for planning applications.</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Health issues are addressed in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation.

## Chapter 9 – Question 44 (Climate change & Environmental quality – Alternative policy approaches)

Are there alternative policy approaches or policy options you think we should have considered?

- Respondents – 4

- Support - 0
- Object - 0
- Comment – 4

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q44 Alternative policy approaches (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bramblefields and Jersey Cudwell need to be protected.</li> <li>• A redevelopment Option 2a, as submitted in answer to Q14 of this consultation, should be considered. Option 2a facilitates a significantly greater number of dwellings near the station, increased Offices/R&amp;D provision with associated increase in job creation and an increased amount of new informal open space. The land is utilised more efficiently, with a balanced mix of land uses at densities which make the best use of the highly sustainable location. A hotel is proposed adjacent to the station and overall early delivery remains achievable. The submitted plan provides further detail.</li> </ul>

## Chapter 9 – Question 45 (Development Management policies)

**Are there any other policy areas that need to be specifically addressed in the Area Action Plan rather than relying on the Local Plans?**

- Respondents – 9
- Support - 0
- Object - 0
- Comment - 9

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q45 Development Management policies (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be frequent and reliable bus, cycle and pedestrian access to the new Cambridge North station to encourage all residents of North Cambridge to leave cars at home.</li> <li>• A footpath (plus possibly cycle path) from the station to Green End Road would help many local residents to reach the station on foot (or cycle).</li> <li>• Provision must be made for all Cambridge residents to be able to access the new station by public transport.</li> <li>• Consideration must be given to the Private Rented Sector (PRS) market and the contribution which it can make to the successful regeneration of the CNFE area. The Local Plans do not provide sufficient policy support for the provision of PRS and it is essential that the AAP addresses</li> </ul>

this shortfall. There is an ever-increasing market demand for PRS and it will play a key role in meeting the housing shortfall in Cambridge City and the surrounding area. The CNFE area provides a unique and sustainable opportunity to accommodate PRS schemes and the AAP should reflect this.

- Phasing of development and the need to review the AAP should development not be meeting with market demands.
- Include an Appendix which might list all of the policies in the adopted Local Plan to which regard will need to be had when individual applications are made for development within the CNFE area.
- Best practice design for cycling in new developments is fully outlined in Making Space for Cycling, a national guide which is backed by every national cycling advocacy organisation (see <http://www.makingspaceforcycling.org/>). Support for incorporating the design principles outlined in this document into the planning process for the CNFE AAP.
- Appendix 2 includes 'Cambridge WRC: Comparative Odour Potential Assessment 2014'. This should be removed from the AAP. It is not an appropriate guide to the encroachment risk posed by potential new development as it is based on indicative emissions rates for the type of processes that will be installed. Once the new plant is commissioned and actual emissions can be measured, we will be able to model the odour impact with more certainty. The Odour Dispersion Modelling Report dated August 2012 is the only applicable evidence to inform the AAP on this issue.
- This document does not adequately address the issues of formal open space provision for sport. Depending on the number of residential units proposed, there will be a policy requirement to provide formal recreation space for outdoor sport to local policy standards. On a tight urban site such as this it may not be appropriate to provide such facilities on site, but provision should be made for suitable off-site provision to meet the need generated by the new residents of this area.
- The site must be viewed as one comprehensive scheme, carefully planned and phased, with opportunities taken to maximise the capacity of the site but in a sustainable way. Much of the phasing and works will be market driven as and when demand is available and there needs to flexibility to recognise this, certainly around the timing of various elements and possibly over time of land use allocation. This should, however, reflect a medium to long term view, not short term.
- The transport strategy is a key part of this and this extends beyond the Guided Busway and the railway station, which provide an excellent foundation in this respect. Piecemeal and incremental infrastructure improvement should be



	avoided to bring the whole site forward in a timely and cohesive way
Councils' response	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation on a range of policy options, and this issue will require further consideration when drafting the AAP.

## Chapter 10 – Question 46 (Infrastructure and delivery - Infrastructure)

### Do you support or object to the Councils' views on Infrastructure, and why?

- Respondents – 10
- Support - 2
- Object - 2
- Comment - 6

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q46 Infrastructure (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for this option</li> </ul>
Q46 Infrastructure (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to identify: infrastructure requirements; and viable and appropriately phased funding streams.</li> <li>• More specific approach required, in particular with the consolidation/relocation of the Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW)</li> </ul>
Q46 Infrastructure (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivery of the AAP needs to minimise the upfront infrastructure costs associated with the early phases of the CNFE to improve overall deliverability.</li> <li>• Obligations need to be clearly set out to ensure parity with the site and the city</li> <li>• Consideration of the aggregates railhead should be included in AAP.</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding the approach to infrastructure delivery.

## Chapter 10 – Question 47a (Infrastructure and delivery – Phasing and delivery approach)

### Do you support or object to the proposed Option A on phasing and delivery approach, and why?

- Respondents – 8

- Support (including qualified) - 4
- Object - 2
- Comment - 2

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q47a Phasing & delivery approach – Option A (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for Option A</li> </ul>
Q47a Phasing & delivery approach – Option A (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support Option B</li> <li>• Option A will encourage ad-hoc development with best options for the early phase and less viable options for later phase</li> </ul>
Q47a Phasing & delivery approach – Option A (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Without proper infrastructure in place with new development existing traffic using the area will be affected</li> </ul>

## Chapter 10 – Question 47b (Infrastructure and delivery – Phasing and delivery approach)

**Do you support or object to the proposed Option B on phasing and delivery approach, and why?**

- Respondents – 11
- Support (including qualified) - 3
- Object - 5
- Comment - 3

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q47b Phasing & delivery approach – Option B (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for Option B</li> <li>• Good master-planning needed including ‘participatory master-planning’ and urban design best practice</li> <li>• Need an integrated approach with all upfront design and clear financing agreed</li> </ul>
Q47b Phasing & delivery approach – Option B	<p><b>Option B:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a more drawn out process</li> <li>• Abrogates framework to potential private developer and amendments to AAP.</li> </ul>

(Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• could severely impact on delivery of vision and objectives for the CNFE</li> </ul> <p><b>Masterplan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The requirement of 1st planning application / phase 1 to produce a masterplan for the whole APP is overly onerous, hindering phase 1, deliverability and reducing flexibility.</li> <li>• Required masterplan for the whole area unnecessary</li> <li>• Difficult to understand why a developer of any area of land within the Plan should be made responsible for providing a masterplan for the whole of the area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Phasing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phase1 should demonstrate that it can integrate with future phases of development and policy should be flexible enough to facilitate this.</li> <li>• Phasing plan unnecessary</li> <li>• Unclear where the first phase of development will take place</li> <li>• No information regarding phased approach to the development.</li> <li>• The redevelopment options are not phasing plans</li> </ul> <p><b>Development framework</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development framework should be provided within the AAP, with apportionment of infrastructure requirements identified.</li> <li>• The AAP should provide the principles for a development framework against which a specific phase of redevelopment can come forward as part of its own individual, detailed planning application.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council need to ensure that all of landowners have been fairly and comprehensively consulted.</li> </ul>
Q47b Phasing & delivery approach – Option B (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Without proper infrastructure in place with new development, existing traffic using the area will be affected</li> </ul>
Councils' response to Questions 47a – 47b	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding the approach to phasing.

## Chapter 10 – Question 48 (Infrastructure and delivery – Plan monitoring)

### Do you have any comments on Plan Monitoring?

- Respondents – 7
- Support (including qualified) - 1
- Object - 0
- Comment - 6

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q48 Plan monitoring (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support (1)</li> </ul>
Q48 Plan monitoring (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CNFE within a statutory safeguarding aerodrome height consultation plan; the MOD requests being consulted with any planning applications within this area to ensure no development exceeds 15.2m to ensure tall structures do not disrupt or inhibit air traffic operations on site.</li> <li>• Monitoring needs to be quantifiable and clearly demonstrable if policies are delivering objectives and City's needs. Failure to meet objectives should lead to alternative development options being considered.</li> </ul>
Councils' response	This will be an issue for further consideration when preparing the draft AAP.

## Chapter 10 – Question 49 (Infrastructure and delivery – Other comments)

### Do you have any other comments about the CNFE area and/or Area Action Plan? If you wish to make suggestions, please provide your comments)

- Respondents – 19
- Support - 0
- Object - 1
- Comment - 18

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation 2014
Q49 Other comments (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serious public money needs to be invested.</li> <li>• Inaccessible location</li> <li>• Anglian Water sewage works and railway sidings hampers</li> </ul>

	<p>development potential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Power line would need to be removed.</li> <li>• Relocation of Stagecoach needed.</li> <li>• New station could increase traffic.</li> <li>• Brookgate would have to develop site in a way that would work coherently with potential future development in the area.</li> <li>• Transport links would need to be improved.</li> </ul>
<p>Q49 Other comments (Comment)</p>	<p><b>Facilities/land uses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sewage works should remain</li> <li>• Area between rail line and river should be also be considered</li> <li>• New uses proposed will be incompatible with existing uses which do have more potential</li> <li>• The Household Recycling Centre is not supported.</li> <li>• Previous investigations have failed to find an alternative site for the Wastewater Recycling Centre, further investigation needs to take place.</li> </ul> <p><b>Amenity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over loss of amenity with aggregate lorry unloading/movements</li> <li>• The impact of the proposed transport interchange and the development of residential and commercial properties on neighbouring villages have not been assessed. However, there is a real potential cost to the neighbouring villages in terms of road usage and congestion as the CNFE development proposed will have a significant adverse effect in congestion, pollution and general loss of amenity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local road needed for aggregate lorries supplying A14 improvements</li> <li>• Delivery of essential transport infrastructure is in doubt</li> <li>• Bridge over railway line needed linking Fen Road, improving access to Chesterton and Fen Road level crossing can be removed.</li> <li>• All options lead to increased traffic in Cowley Road.</li> <li>• Public transport accessibility must be central to the site.</li> <li>• The plans need to be extended to include provision for better public transport and roads within a semi-circular radius of 10 miles from west to East adjoining the CNFE site.</li> </ul> <p><b>Phasing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Without early re-development of the area around the new station the re-development of CNFE cannot be achieved</li> <li>• Delivery of new offices and R&amp;D facilities needs to be</li> </ul>

	<p>flexible in order for it to come forward earlier than anticipated</p> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better illustration of the document's objectives needed</li> <li>• Area is blighted by physical severance caused by infrastructure; this fragmentation needs to be overcome</li> <li>• Need to include clear references to the opportunities to link CNFE area with Waterbeach New Town</li> <li>• CNFE redevelopment is highly important for long term growth of Cambridge.</li> </ul> <p><b>Strategy/Delivery</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fragmented ownerships / multitude of occupiers absolutely necessitate that interests are aligned behind common strategy.</li> <li>• Lead developer / development agency essential to coordinate comprehensive masterplan approach and ensure viability.</li> <li>• Clearly both future location / operations of Anglian Water and extensive land holdings of Network Rail are fundamental - impacting development potential.</li> </ul> <p><b>Design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing environmental constraints need to be converted into opportunities.</li> <li>• Including a strong edge to the city in order to buffer the A14.</li> <li>• Site should be achieving sufficient critical mass to relocate WWTW and provide access to, and mutual support for high-quality landscapes around it including the river meadows and Milton Country Park.</li> <li>• A comprehensive plan for a network of streets of appropriate character should ensure that existing bottlenecks on Milton Road do not constrain development.</li> <li>• Critical that area around new railway station is developed - with excellent access, to avoid prejudicing wider regeneration</li> </ul>
Councils' response	Views are sought in the Issues and Options 2019 consultation regarding a range of issues reflecting the revised vision for the area.

## Appendix 2

### North East Cambridge Area Action Plan Issues and Options 2 (2019) Summary of Representations and Responses

#### Document Section

Chapter 1: Introduction

Question 1: Do you agree with changing the name of the plan to the 'North East Cambridge Area Action Plan'?

#### Representations received:

Support: 10 Object: 0 Comment: 6

Total: 16

#### Main issues in representations:

32522, 32670, 33087, 33256, 33602, 33786, 32493, 32507, 32514, 32565, 32826, 32836, 32924, 33326, 33431, 33516

#### Support

- Railfuture East Anglia - Supports a NEC identity with strong, identifiable districts. These should also be 'transit based' and become poly centric.
- A new, simple name is appropriate given the inclusion and integration of the Business Parks and new development proposals, thus avoiding confusion with previous 'fringe' moniker.

#### Object

- None

#### Comment

- [College of St. John, Cambridge](#) - A new continued AAP name will carry a certain weight.
- [U+I Groups PLC/Trinity College, Cambridge](#) - Need a collective term for the area, possibly reflecting its relationship to science / technology / innovation, while acknowledging that sub-areas of the site may emerge.
- Once a new name is suggested it should be continued throughout the AAP process;
- What is the reason for the name change?
- 'Fringe' was catchier.

#### Document Section

Chapter 3: APP boundary

Question 2: Is the proposed boundary the most appropriate one for the APP?

#### Representations received:

Support: 9 Object: 17 Comment: 13

Total: 39

#### Main issues in representations:

33307, 32566, 32812, 33000, 33327, 33355, 33395, 33422, 33466, 33551, 33603, 33760, 33787, 32515, 32521, 32611, 32671, 32834, 32843, 33033, 33257, 33281, 32739, 32827, 32929, 33084, 33090, 33107, 33169, 33178, 33195, 33212, 33229, 33363, 33404, 33477, 33494, 33517, 33568

#### Support

- [Cambridgeshire County Council](#) - Given the transport and infrastructure needs now and, in the future, it is essential to consider maximising the opportunities for the area holistically.
- [College of St. John, Cambridge](#) - Appropriate to widen site to include Science Park given significant change taking place.
- [The Crown Estate](#) - Support the proposed boundary and the inclusion of the Science Park.
- Makes sense to include the Science Park, given the large amount of current development and the associated traffic arising from it.
- Transport access need consideration
- Yes, to allow for zero carbon development and little private vehicle use.
- Yes, as we need to protect Green Belt.
- Allows for a mixed use, integrated development not dependent on a single use.
- Yes, right not to include Gypsy and Traveller sites, but must provide access.

#### Object

- [The Wildlife Trust](#) - Corridor must be included to provide greater scope for local provision of sufficient strategic green infrastructure and biodiversity offsetting.
- [Railfuture East Anglia](#) - The exclusion of Fen Road East and River Cam towpath between the level crossing and the A14 river bridge will prevent access to the riverbank. The G&T site omission is not socially or physically inclusive.
- [Cambridge Past Present & Future](#) – Including the area east of the site, (railway line to the river) recognises potential for wildlife and ecological enhancement. Access to river needed, though railway may constrain.
- Include railway to river, entrance to Kings Hedges Rd, CRC, closure of level crossing and provision of a road over railway to include G+T site inclusion and allow effective train service.
- Why can't the Science Park be included in due course?
- Chesterton Fen has a different character and should therefore not be included.
- Object due to increased traffic.

#### Comment

- [Environment Agency](#) – including Fen road area could provide a mechanism for wider community flood risk benefits though the provision of mitigation measures.



- [Histon Road Residents' Association](#) – Will areas just beyond the boundary also be improved?
- [U&I/St. John's College, Cambridge/Trinity College, Cambridge- Cambridge Regional College \(CRC\)](#) should be included in the AAP, as educational facilities are crucial to future of area as both CRC and site will impact the others. CRC can also be utilised with implementation, such as apprenticeships. CRC cooperation can also inform discussions on transport needs and infrastructure.
- [Ridgeon's Timber & Builders Merchants, Veolia and Turnstone Estates](#) - Relocation opportunities for existing established businesses should be in close proximity.
- Include land east and north of site for access to green infrastructure.
- The neighbouring area east of railway line needs consideration as it is cut off by the level crossing. Extending the area boundary could help share the benefits.
- Two separate projects (CSP, CNF) have significant dependencies, so should not separate.
- Should include other areas like Milton County Park and industrial areas north of A14.

## Document Section

Chapter 4: NEC Area Today

Question 3: In this chapter have we correctly identified the physical characteristics of the North East Cambridge area and its surroundings?

## Representations received:

Support: 3 Object: 4 Comment: 11

Total: 18

## Main issues in representations:

32567, 32813, 32850, 33258, 33552, 33604, 33687, 33761, 33788, 32523, 32829, 32839, 33092, 33364, 33443, 33495, NECIO003, NECIO004

## Support

- Consensus that the main constraints are acknowledged.

## Object

- Traffic and infrastructure constraints need to be identified, given the scale of development and proposed access.
- Secondary schools are wrongly mapped.
- Routing of buses to Cambridge North needs further consideration. Routes other than busway are important.

## Comment

- College of Saint John, Cambridge - No reference is made to the A14 and the elevated nature of that route at the A10 roundabout as it remains an important gateway approach towards the City. The Odour Report that has recently been published does not preclude development subject to technical assessments.
- Ridgeon's Timber & Builders Merchants / Veolia and Turnstone Estates - it would be beneficial for additional information to be provided regarding environmental constraints associated with both businesses' operations e.g. noise, air quality, odour.
- U+I Group PLC – Need to include more information about the broader composition of site areas and environmental constraints such as: employment space and numbers, car parking, mixes of uses, open space, noise air quality, habitats etc. This will inform strategies such as highway trip budget, employment strategy, connectivity and green infrastructure etc.
- Shelford & District Bridleways Group – Equestrian access is currently available at Milton Country Park.
- Trinity College, Cambridge – Should more fully reflect the strategic walking and cycling routes around the Cambridge Science Park, which contribute to a high quality public realm that will attract park usage, such as the loop-road through the central park and the 'plaza' link from the CGB route to the south east of CSP.
- Bus depot is a constraint and needs a suitable relocation.
- Current permeability of walking / cycling is major physical barrier.
- Milton Rd constrained by inadequate public transport.
- Need to ensure new residential areas are not adversely affected by possible noise or poor air quality issues caused by A14.

## Document section

Issue: Existing constraints

Question 4: Have we identified all relevant constraints present on, or affecting, the North East Cambridge Area?

## Representations received

Support: 1 Object: 14 Comment: 16

Total: 31

## Main issues in representations

32568, 32672, 33030, 33094, 33146, 33150, 33325, 33332, 33429, 33451, 33467, 33518, 33553, 33598, 33605, 33789, 32840, 32582, 32622, 32639, 32654, 33179, 33196, 33213, 33304, 33308, 33405, 33478, 33478, 33496, 33702, 33762

## Support

- None

## Object

- Hurst Park Estate Residents' Association / Milton Road Residents Association – Location next to A14, and impact of air quality and noise issues needs further consideration. Consider noise barriers.
- Ridgeon's Timber & Builders Merchants / Veolia and Turnstone Estates - Noise, air quality and odour may pose a significant constraint to development of the surrounding area due to the nature of existing businesses in situ. Relocation opportunities for existing established businesses within the area must be in close proximity.
- Brookgate Land Ltd – object to lack of consultation on Odour assessment of existing Waste Recycling Centre
- Adverse effects of WTC relocation need rigorous considering in terms of alternative site, flood risk, vertical height difference; effects on communities near the new site; effect on the green belt and the environment.
- Constraint of Fen Road railway crossing should be identified.
- Transport capacity is also a constraint, and road traffic could impact on air quality.

## Comment

- Historic England – Welcome townscape and landscape improvements. Should also reference potential impacts to Fen Ditton and Central Cambridge Conservation Areas and wider areas.
- Environment Agency – Flood risk is a key consideration due to climate change. Suitability of relocation sites for the WRC should be picked up through a water cycle strategy. Contamination will also need to be addressed at the implementation stage.
- Natural England - This Development will present a positive unique opportunity to create frameworks that enhance, extend and protect significant green infrastructure in areas such as Bramblefields Local Nature Reserve, the protected hedgerow on the east side of Cowley Road (City Wildlife Site), the First Public Drain wildlife corridor and many other habitats.
- Anglian Water Services - Draft AAP should make clear what odour information is expected to be relied upon in advance of relocation.
- CPRE – WRC should not be located on a greenbelt or Greenfield site. Development should not be detrimental to the surrounding countryside.
- U&I Group Ltd - There is no reference to Archaeology and Heritage. The intention for taller buildings will need to be more widely considered in respect of longer-distant views and townscape issues and implications for Air Safeguarding Zones. Policy should also seek to underground overhead power cables that run across site.

- Railfuture East Anglia – Fen Road Level Crossing constrains North Station services, so should be closed and replaced with a pedestrian / cycleway underpass and an additional road bridge to relieve traffic.
- Trinity College, Cambridge – Constraints require baseline assessments and mitigation proposals to determine appropriate scale.
- Has the location for the WRC been identified? There are many issues that need to be addressed regarding the relocation. E.g. contamination.
- How do proposals fit with existing GCP plans for Milton Road?
- The level crossing is a major constraint as limits traffic flow and train capabilities.
- Transport and connectivity are a social justice constraint and must be made more efficient. Physical constraints must be made explicit and factored in the design, i.e. new A14 junctions, Milton Rd capacity.

### Document section

Chapter 5: Vision and Strategic Objectives

Question 5: Do you agree with the proposed vision for the future of the North East Area Cambridge area? If not, what might you change?

### Representations received

Support: 1 Object: 14 Comment: 16

Total: 31

### Main issues in representations

32568, 32672, 33030, 33094, 33146, 33150, 33325, 33332, 33429, 33451, 33467, 33518, 33553, 33598, 33605, 33789, 32840, 32582, 32622, 32639, 32654, 33179, 33196, 33213, 33304, 33308, 33405, 33478, 33496, 33702, 33762

### Support

- Natural England / The Crown Estate / Railfuture East Anglia / College of Saint John, Cambridge / Ridgeons Timber & Builders Merchants and Turnstone Estates / Brookgate Land Ltd – Supports overarching AAP vision and objectives.
- Veolia and Turnstone Estates – Vision may need modification if Veolia remain on current site.
- U+I Group PLC – General support, with the inclusion of ‘cultural’ in the vision wording.
- Support emphasis on low carbon, living and working close to home, transport improvements, and inclusivity.

### Object

- ‘Everything on your doorstep’ claim misleading as no mention of schools, doctors, chemists, banks.

- More emphasis needed on cycling and public transport.
- No reason the vision cannot state 'zero-carbon' / ecologically / environmentally sensitive.
- 'Inherently walkable / on doorstep' statements too specific / unrealistic. Consider changing to 'highest attainable / striving for...'
- Two distinct areas, so vision impossible to be coherent.
- How can the vision seriously be considered inclusive when it excludes the G+T site?

#### Comment

- Environment Agency – Suggests adding wording that reflects the partnership needed between LPA planning, waste management planning and statutory consultees to deliver site.
- Consider including education / social housing / resisting commuter towns / G+T community within statement.
- Support emphasis on low carbon, transport improvements and inclusivity.

#### Document section

Issue: Overarching objectives

Question 6: Do you agree with the overarching objectives? If not, what might you change?

#### Representations received

Support: 13 Object: 9 Comment: 18

Total: 43

#### Main issues in representations

32518, 32525, 32674, 32831, 32845, 32875, 33034, 33152, 33231, 33263, 33280, 33334, 33520, 32655, 32656, 32740, 32904, 33294, 33295, 33399, 33498, 33599, 32570, 32297, 33086, 33097, 33417, 33171, 33324, 33469, 33555, 33607, 33688, 33704, 33764, 33791, 33849, 33116, 32621, 32638

#### Support

- Cambridgeshire County Council – Mineral railheads enable the objectives to meet the strategic needs of the City explicitly by enabling the continued use of mineral railheads. Uses located near railheads will be priority.
- Natural England – Objective 7 and the focus on an environmentally green infrastructure framework welcome, as will ensure services to scale. Scale should not be constrained to district but benefit the wider area.
- Anglian Water Services – Objective 7: SuDS integration welcomed. Would be helpful to make clear that SuDs is not limited to green spaces as suggested in the text.
- The Crown Estate - Welcomes the shift from employment-led regeneration to intensified mixed use.
- Railfuture East Anglia - Agrees with broad approach.

- Objective 4 particularly supported. [maximising and integrating with public transport, walking and cycling infrastructure]."
- Zero-carbon focus welcomed and critical in contracting and monitoring of the site and not just be 'nice to haves'.
- Support items 3 [walkable with sustainable transport] and 7 [green spaces / biodiversity / SuDS drainage at core]. Distinction needed as walking not the same as cycling.
- Particularly support Objective 18. Density is a concern given economic pressure so development must be spread out.
- Only achievable with high quality design and low car use. Roads should be on periphery to ensure non-car use.

### Object

- The Wildlife Trust – The biodiversity aim in Objective 7 unlikely to be met without the inclusion of a green corridor
- Historic England – No mention of historic environment: conservation areas, listed buildings townscape and/or skyline. Objective 9 needs to add reference to vernacular / buildings / materials etc.
- Creating more jobs would only intensify traffic on A14 and A10 and create noise and pollution. Employment intensification better suited where there is an excess of residential, such as Cambourne.
- Additional objectives should be added to ensure NEC doesn't replicate horrid development in CB1 station.
- Objective needed to prevent overlying homes. We want houses not tenements or blocks of flats.
- The 2050 target for zero carbon is too long to tackle climate emergency. 2030 is more appropriate. Economic growth objectives will only make zero carbon even harder to attain and may even make it worse.
- Objectives just sound like developer talk to allow maximum profit / desktop aspirations doomed to fail.
- The 'strong identity' claim will fail as the site is clearly two distinct places separated by Milton Road.

### Comment

- Woodland Trust – Support objectives 6 and 7. Net gain must create a network of natural greenspace.
- Environment Agency – We would add wording that acknowledges WTC relocation will contribute to mitigation of climate change.
- Ridgeons Timber & Builders Merchants & Turnstone Estates / Veolia and Turnstone Estates – Careful consideration needs to be given to existing established businesses in the local area.
- U+I Group - The addition of the words 'Natural Capital' might benefit Objective 7 further.
- Shelford & District Bridleways Group – Objective 4, 5 and 10 would benefit from including and highlighting equestrian/horse-riding benefits.

- Brookgate Land Limited – Objective 18 should be bolder as it is a large brownfield site with excellent public transport and potential to be highly sustainable.
- Trinity College, Cambridge – Objective 3 needs to be bolder and embrace innovative ways of travelling beyond the motor vehicle. Objective 12 should be broader to allow future economic growth rather than constrain it.
- Hurst Park Estate Residents' Association – Need reassurance on how developers will be prevented from justifying a loss of public space, quality design and build.
- A 'diverse range of quality jobs' is not that if all jobs are cerebral/desk and lab based.
- Need a genuine public-owned and operated area that allows unrestricted movement.
- More sustainable transport options are needed to reduce car dependency aims.
- Need objective that excludes concrete to allow for zero carbon goals.

### Document section

Issue: Indicative concept plan

Question 7: Do you support the overall approach shown in the Indicative Concept Plan? Do you have any comments or suggestions to make?

### Representations received

Support: 10 Object: 6 Comment: 24

Total: 40

### Main issues in representations

32519, 32526, 32675, 32815, 32882, 33232, 33260, 33264, 33521, 33705, 32497, 32741, 33244, 33144, 33361, 33400, 32516, 32571, 32657, 32754, 32999, 33012, 33036, 33089, 33098, 33181, 33198, 33215, 33285, 33310, 33331, 33407, 33470, 33480, 33556, 33569, 33608, 33689, 33765, 33792

### Support

- St Johns College, Cambridge – Supports St Johns Park as an 'opportunity for employment densification' and transport linkages where they are capable of delivery.
- Anglian Water Services Ltd – Supportive of the Concept Plan as long as it aligns with feasibility assessments.
- Railfuture East Anglia - Support overall approach.
- Brookgate Land Ltd – Support residential-led mixed uses but need to stress map is conceptual rather than prescriptive.
- Environment Agency / The Crown Estate – We support the green infrastructure approach and water management network to reduce flood risk through innovative opportunity areas.



- Macro approach works but do not get lost in the detail trying to design things in and out (walkability vs car use).
- Plenty of new green spaces, such as a non-negotiable 'district scale' green space with improved permeability and enhanced opportunity for walking and cycling.
- Roads should be designed on the edges to encourage quicker and easier walking and cycling journeys.

### Object

- Ridgeons Timber & Builders Merchants & Turnstone Estates – Business operations on both industrial estates are not compatible with residential use. Therefore, we do not support residential mixed-use allocations unless Ridgeon's can find a suitable alternative (north east corner of the site a possibility).
- Ignoring the community next door while proposing an integrated community?
- There should be a road bridge over railway north of the station and be capable of taking heavy goods vehicles.
- The 5-minute walk around North Station ignores that it requires walking over the railway line.
- Locate the centre towards the access road, incorporating North Station development to create a 'destination'.
- Concept plan severely lacking in green infrastructure and biodiversity gain. Add the river corridor to increase scope.
- Where is the wonderful high-quality green route from Cambridge North to the Science Park going to be?
- Transport and visual impact will have adverse effects on B1047 and High Ditch Rd in Fen Ditton and Ditton Meadows.
- No scope for further residential development without major change of use from commercial to residential between Seeleys Court and the Science Park.
- Wishful thinking will not make NEC inherently walkable as cars too critical, as are the reality of visitors.
- The concept plan is confusing due to lack of labelling. Needs clarification and further consultation.

### Comment

- Tarmac Ltd – It is important that the rail fed asphalt plant and aggregates depot (adjacent to proposed residential development) is safeguarded under policy CS23 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan Core Strategy.
- Orchard Street Investment Management – Difficult to see how existing companies located in the area (due to transport links and proximity to the City) can be relocated without being prejudicial to their continued success.



- Cambridgeshire County Council – CP needs to be revised as areas designated as opportunities for mixed use and retail development adjoins railheads within the Transport Safeguarding Area and may be prejudicial to their operation.
- U+I Group PLC – Due to lack of supporting studies, map can only be read as indicative. We are unsure this map is optimal. Cambridge Business Park should be shaded as an ‘Opportunity for Employment Intensification’ and CRC included as an ‘Opportunity for Education Intensification’.
- Shelford & District Bridleways Group – CP should include equestrian provision.
- Veolia and Turnstone Estates – Our operations are incompatible with the indicative Concept Plan (noise/air quality etc.). Unless an appropriate relocation site is found, the Concept Plan should be amended to reflect remaining on site. Further studies are integral to this map.
- Trinity College, Cambridge – The mixed-use centre should be located near to where the planned Trinity College ‘hub’. We acknowledge green connections may have to be delivered in a phased manner.
- A native community tree nursery should be started.
- Suggest you include permeability for walking and cycling through the business park with green corridors.

### Document section

Issue: Creating a mixed-use city district

Question 8: Do you agree that outside of the existing business areas, the eastern part of the North East Cambridge AAP area (i.e. the area east of Milton Road) should provide a higher density mixed use residential led area with intensified employment, relocation of existing industrial uses and other supporting uses?

### Representations received

Support: 7 Object: 4 Comment: 6

Total: 17

### Main issues in representations

32816, 32890, 33039, 33265, 33522, 33609, 33706, 32658, 33013, 33099, 33570, 32537, 32790, 33358, 33557, 33766, 33793

### Support

- Cambridgeshire County Council – Support as identified in Ely to Cambridge Transport Study.
- Anglian Water Services Ltd – Support with continued partnership with City Council, SCDC and Cambridgeshire County Council.
- Railfuture and East Anglia / Brookgate Land Ltd / U+I Group Plc – We support this notion to create an intensified, effective area [U+I] subject to a suitable

relocation of WTC [Brookgate] as it increases job and homes efficiency in a sustainable way while attracting ancillary uses to come forward.

- Trinity College, Cambridge – We support mixed use and non-car sustainable transport focus which encourages people to live close to work.
- It makes sense to add more housing where employment and leisure opportunities are.
- Relocating low density industrial uses enables desirability and removes the negatives associated with heavy vehicles.
- The current road and existing mix of uses (e.g. a small cycle shop to a massive bus depot) creates barriers to walking / cycling permeability – from the cycle shop to a bus depot. Let's start again from scratch.

### Object

- Orchard Street Investment Management – Proposed development would displace critical industrial provision already on site and create an overreliance on high tech industries. Cambridge needs to be able to provide a range of jobs for a range of skillsets.
- Cambridge Past, Present and Future – Higher density can only be located in places that have been studied and evidenced, especially in relation to visual harm.
- I do not agree with increasing the number of jobs in Cambridge.
- It should be low density with ample green space and no overlaying of homes (flats/apartments).

### Comment

- Ridgeons Timber & Builders Merchants and Turnstone Estates / Veolia and Turnstone Estates –Existing businesses in the area need consideration as their operation requires possible relocation. No information has been provided on this matter.
- Density, which is driven by profit, should be secondary to design in the neighbourhood. Design should incorporate walkability, equitability and habitable green space.
- Areas close to North Station should be commercial/business. This would encourage station use and limit noise in residential areas as seen in CB1 area.
- A genuine mixed-use development should have ample community and leisure facilities.

### Document section

Issue: Creating a mixed-use city district

Question 9: Should Nuffield Road Industrial Estate be redeveloped for residential mixed-use development?

## Representations received

Support: 5 Object: 3 Comment: 6

Total: 14

## Main issues in representations

32508, 32817, 32848, 32896, 33610, 32804, 33004, 33700, 32528, 33040, 33101, 33558, 33571, 33794

## Support

- Cambridgeshire County Council – Support in principle but are awaiting highway trip budget study evidence so cannot comment further.
- U+I Group PLC – Agree with relocating existing industrial uses depending upon an Industrial Relocation Strategy that justifies viable options. The north-east site area is not a viable option.
- May resolve issues associated with heavy industrial traffic (noise/air quality / general environment) especially for Shirley School pupils and residents. Road redesign / extra provision may relieve pressure.

## Object

- Dencora Trinity LLP – Object to the identification of Trinity Hall Industrial Estate as a residential led mixed-use scheme.
- Jobs need to be inside the city.
- Roads need to be redesigned to relieve traffic and promote inclusivity.
- The recent consolidation of Ridgeons indicates a commercial preference for this site.

## Comment

- Ridgeons Timber & Builders Merchants and Turnstone Estates – Ridgeons would need to be relocated as nature of this business is incompatible with residential. However, is a critical service so relocation is only appropriate with a viable alternative.
- Cambridge Past, Present & Future – Use of brownfield is preferred, but concerns about being able to relocate existing businesses.
- Trinity College, Cambridge – The focus of the area should be on the Science and Technology sector, high quality homes and supporting ancillary uses.
- Need to consider appropriate long-term needs such as online retail growth, rising working from home prevalence and social housing needs.

## Document section

Issue: Creating a mixed-use city district

Question 10: Do you agree that opportunities should be explored to intensify and diversify existing business areas? If so, with what sort of uses?

## Representations received

Support: 5 Object: 1 Comment: 2  
Total: 8

## Main issues in representations

32529, 32676, 32897, 33261, 33611, 33102, 33041, 33795

### Support

- St Johns College, Cambridge – support intensification of employment floor space on St Johns Innovation Park.
- U+I Group PLC – Supported, subject to a robust and equitable Highways Trip Budget apportionment and S106 tariff system in the wider area. We also suggest a policy mechanism to support start-ups and smaller businesses.
- Requires wider and longer public consultation with local community, businesses and policymakers.
- The Nuffield Rd Industrial Estate is rundown and can withstand being built upwards like the Science Park.
- Yes, to more SMEs, retail, recreation & creative interests.

### Object

- None.

### Comment

- Trinity College, Cambridge – Aspiration achievable with significant funding. Policy should allow for flexibility in uses but show how it will add to the AAP objectives.
- Cambridgeshire County Council – Cannot comment as awaiting highway trip budget study transport evidence.

## Document section

Issue: Creating a mixed-use city district

Question 11: Are there any particular land uses that should be accommodated in the North East Cambridge area?

## Representations received:

Support: 3 Object: 1 Comment: 21  
Total: 25

## Main issues in representations:

32755, 32899, 33142, 33701, 32530, 32677, 33042, 33091, 33123, 33131, 33182, 33199, 33217, 33311, 33329, 33365, 33408, 33421, 33474, 33481, 33559, 33572, 33612, 33767, 33796

## Support

- New access Road via Cowley Rd, closing the level crossing on Fen Rd, so more trains can stop at North Cambridge Station.
- Residential, business, recreational, community spaces well-proportioned for foot and cycle traffic.
- High density residential zone with generous large green spaces.

## Object

- Dencora Trinity LLP – Object to Trinity Hall Industrial Estate as a residential mixed-use scheme.

## Comment

- Cambridgeshire County Council – Joint SCDC and City Transport evidence is not yet concluded. Therefore, no comment can be made at this time.
- Barton & District Bridleways Group – Equestrian provision due to lack of safe off-road routes.
- Ridgeons Timber & Buildings Merchants and Turnstone Estates / Veolia and Turnstone Estates – Consideration needs to be given to existing critical and established businesses currently in situ, which require proximity to Cambridge, but are incompatible with residential land use. Relocation options need to be viable and convenient.
- Cambridge Past, Present and Future – Community facilities such as nursery, community hall space, cafes which limits need to go offsite. Although this is already in CSP, Milton Rd constraints may require its replication.
- U+I Group PLC – Scale of development requires a variety of sustainable facilities.
- Trinity College, Cambridge – Policy should allow for flexibility in a wide range of supporting uses, but these will need to evidence on how it will support AAP objectives.
- Green space: District sized. Lots of small neighbourhood parks (early in development not as an afterthought). Generous green corridors/commons (akin to Midsummer / Stourbridge / Ditton / Grantchester) for recreation and mental health. Need to assign these early or won't happen. As much as possible the area between the railway line and the river should be designated as a Riverside Country Park.
- Community space matched to community and wider region, i.e. lecture halls / conference and meeting space / scientific facilities. Café. Space for early settlers to establish sense of identity and community, led by a community worker. Community space led by local needs not developers. Open in evenings.
- Education: Secondary schools (as per County Council's own claims that 18-25 spaces for every 100 homes built). Secondary school omission prohibits community cohesion and increases traffic and pollution. Also new college site.

- Leisure: Sports / Arts spaces / Events / Equestrian and bridleway provision.
- Residential: Dense communal living. Well proportioned.
- Retail: Markets / street trading including small economically viable shop units
- Healthcare: GPs and pharmacy.
- Design/Layout: to facilitate interaction to achieve community cohesion early in development.

### Document section

Issue: District identity

Question 12: What uses, or activities should be included within the North East Cambridge AAP area which will create a district of culture, creativity and interest that will help create successful community where people will choose to live, work and play?

### Representations received:

Support: 4 Object: 0 Comment: 20

Total: 24

### Main issues in representations:

32818, 32820, 32614, 32902, 32837, 33237, 33707, 33359, 32678, 33573, 33124, 33401, 33428, 32531, 33240, 33167, 32756, 33797, 33613, 33166, NECIO003, NECIO004, NECIO005

### Support

- Public area or arena for open air events: markets / culture / cinema. Could be free to encourage inclusion.
- Uses and activities should be 'several per city' such as restaurants and pubs rather than 'one per city' e.g. an ice rink which will increase traffic.
- Community Centre / Sports Centre.
- Plenty of green spaces.
- Uses easily accessible to allow Science Park employees to easily cycle / walk, especially during unusual hours.

### Object

- None.

### Comment

- Brookgate Land Ltd / Trinity College, Cambridge – Uses and activities provided should allow flexibility but uses coming forward should align to the AAP objectives.
- Cambridge Past, Present and Future – Undertake lessons learned study to understand site better.
- Histon Road Residents' Association – Nurseries for Science Park staff.

- U+I Group PLC – Development must provide free / subsidised / opportunities for nearby deprived wards. Meanwhile/worthwhile uses as a stopgap between leases to enable optimising sites for social/economic benefits.
- Community Church / Community centre / Library / Playground / splashpad. Site is ideal for essential and accessible public art.
- Zero-waste focussed shop to enhance 'green' reputation.
- Preference for local business as Cambridge North is dominated by chains and does not promote a vibrant community.
- Concerning lack of plans for a secondary school. How can 'walkability' and 'place making' be objectives without such an integral community-focused facility?
- Road improvements that link to Cambridge North via non-car usage. Unlikely as Milton Road is so large and complex that the site will remain two separate areas.
- Site should include flexible arts/creative indoor and outdoor spaces.
- Cultural spaces should be small or large scale, aiming for local arts/audience or those from further afield.
- Ensure current/ established activities are maintained.

### Document section

Issue: Creating a healthy community

Question 13: Should the AAP require developments in the North East Cambridge AAP area to apply Healthy Town principles?

### Representations received

Support: 1 Object: 11 Comment: 8

Total: 20

### Main issues in representations

32818, 32820, 32614, 32902, 32837, 33237, 33707, 33359, 32678, 33573, 33124, 33401, 33428, 32531, 33240, 33167, 32756, 33797, 33613, 33166, NECIO006

### Support

- Cambridgeshire County Council – Support principles compatible with non-vehicular. Consideration needs to be given to schools to avoid adverse environmental issues.
- Mental health and wellbeing ensured through site design.
- Green spaces / walking space allows for rehabilitation and environmental benefits.
- Create cycle-free pathways where people can walk, meander, connect with nature, exercise.
- Only if motor roads are kept on perimeters of site allowing cyclists and walkers fall permeability.

- A new leisure centre with sports facilities. Current offer is not convenient for CSP employees during lunchtimes.

#### Object

- Low carbon emission and mixture of residential and business the priority.

#### Comment

- Natural England – Strategic level of high-quality green space key to health and wellbeing. Provision should be proportionate to scale and protect designated sites.
- Railfuture East Anglia – Yes and include pleasant / interesting active travel options (cycle and footways) leading and surrounding to North Station.
- U+I Group PLC – Opportunity to deliver a sustainable and healthy community should be informed by a Health Impact and Needs Assessment that considers wider deprivation issues in neighbouring wards.
- Shelford and District Bridleways Group – AAP should include equestrian / Bridleways provision.
- Brookgate Land Limited / Trinity College, Cambridge – Healthy towns principles key but flexibility also needed in policy to allow for change in the future.
- A community building will help deliver a range of health objectives as it can house a range of services.
- The development should incorporate the WELL Community standards into its design to create a healthy community.

#### Document section

Issue: Cambridge Regional College

Question 14: How should the AAP recognise and make best use of the existing and potential new links between the AAP area and the CRC?

#### Representations received

Support: 2 Object: 1 Comment: 5

Total: 8

#### Main issues in representations

32533, 32680, 33777, 33125, 33499, 33524, 33615, 33799

#### Support

- Both CRC and Anglia Ruskin University must input into designing this community.
- Skills development can be harnessed through working with both CRC and ARU.
- CRC will become a cultural hub, so links are sensible.



## Object

- An enhanced pedestrian and cycling corridor are needed between CRC and Innovation / business parks but users going to and from CRC will continue to use existing busway. Any enhancement must be high quality with few junctions.

## Comment

- Railfuture East Anglia - Waymark cycle ways paralleling the busways from North Station to CRC together with a cycle way protected crossing at Milton Road. We suggest Cambridge North as a main transport hub.
- U+I Group PLC - CRC should be included in the AAP to future proof its management and use and allow its skills offer to be harnessed. Its inclusion also permits access to green infrastructure.
- Trinity College, Cambridge – Conversations must include CRC as they are biggest user of transport network and thus are a major stakeholder.
- CRC should be a major partner in developing aspirations to create community identity.
- CRC should be supplemented with a secondary school provision on site.
- There should be a transit system from Cambridge North to CRC.

## Document section

Issue: Building heights and skyline

Question 15: Should clusters of taller buildings around areas of high accessibility including district and local centres and transport stops form part of the design-led approach to this new city district?

## Representations received:

Support: 6 Object: 12 Comment: 14

Total: 32

## Main issues in representations:

32681, 33289, 33525, 33616, 32905, 32510, 33596, 32809, 32590, 32634, 33297, 32585, 32648, 32853, 33006, 32660, 32753, 32838, 33709, 33574, 33452, 32791, 33449, 32832, 33424, 33366, 33148, 33600, 32534, 33366, 33352, 33800

## Support

- Railfuture East Anglia / The Crown Estate – Quality designed, and employment focussed transport hubs are integral to high accessibility at and around North Station. The AAP should define the areas / criteria needed.
- U+I Group PLC – Support densities in areas of greatest accessibility and amenity. Balanced evidence-based studies will meet these requirements.
- Use medium / varied density like Eddington as a guide.

- Design is key. CB1 and Great Northern Rd are not good examples (street canyons / wind tunnels / pollution).

#### Object

- Cambridge Past Present, Future – The proximity to the rural settings of River Cam, Fen Ditton and Green Belt suggest that taller buildings may have an indirect negative impact on the wider area and historic core.
- Brookgate Land Ltd – Support taller highly accessible clusters to create nodal points, landmarks, legibility and density. There would be no light impact on existing buildings and will release pressure from historic core of city while defining NEC as area with striking buildings.
- Hurst Park Estate Residents Association – Although successful in Europe, the failure of CB1 indicates this not achievable in Cambridge as it attracts transient populations and produces adverse microclimates.
- In Cambridge, only CB1 and Hills Road is above 4 storeys and is overpopulated, noisy and an eyesore. Too many short-term lets and no feeling of place.
- Fen Ditton and Ditton Meadows are key areas that are negatively impacted by building heights and transport.
- The skyline is one of the key qualities of the area. Clusters of tall buildings will destroy this and violate river setting. Tall buildings also create an unwelcome aggressive environment and are affected by strong wind. Height should be no higher than 2/4 storeys to avoid urban canyons. Include pitched roof / roof gardens for cooler buildings rather than air conditioning.

#### Comment

- Cambridge Past Present, Future – Too early to determine higher density needs without assessment, especially in relation to visual harm.
- Campaign to Protect Rural England Cambridgeshire and Peterborough – Must not compromise views. Milton Road should not be surrounded by overbearing buildings. Height and scale should reflect employment needs.
- Defence Infrastructure Organisation (M.O.D) – Development impacting upon Cambridge Airport requires MOD assessment (green/brown roofs (birds); solar panels (glare) and wind turbines).
- Histon Road Residents Association – Where will high rise buildings be built and how many storeys?
- Historic England – Lack of evidence-base means no comment can be made on height. Suggest performing Landscape Character and Visual Impact Assessments.
- Trinity College, Cambridge – Support and efficient use of land to allow site to include major transport hubs.
- Height no more than 6/8 floors and no individual or complex multi-storey tall buildings.

- Height of buildings is less important than decreasing walking times and creating vibrant communities and more important than developer profit.
- Proposed development will be size of Ely, yet there is no statement about density limits.

### Document section

Issue: Local movement and connectivity

Question 16: Question 16: Should the AAP include any or a combination of the options below to improve pedestrian and cycling connectivity through the site and to the surrounding area?

A – Create a strong east-west axis to unite Cambridge North Station with Cambridge Science Park across Milton Road. This pedestrian and cycle corridor would be integrated into the wider green infrastructure network to create a pleasant and enjoyable route for people to travel through and around the site. The route could also allow other sustainable forms of transport to connect across Milton Road.

B – Improve north-south movement between the Cowley Road part of the site and Nuffield Road. Through the redevelopment of the Nuffield Road area of NEC, it will be important that new and existing residents have convenient and safe pedestrian and cycle access to the services and facilities that will be provided as part of the wider North East Cambridge area proposals.

C – Upgrade connections to Milton Country Park by both foot and cycle. This would include improving access to the Jane Coston Bridge over the A14, the Waterbeach Greenway project including a new access under the A14 (see Transport Chapter), as well as the existing underpass along the river towpath.

D – Provide another Cambridge Guided Bus stop to serve a new District Centre located to the east side of Milton Road.

E – Increase ease of movement across the sites by opening up opportunities to walk and cycle through areas where this is currently difficult, for example Cambridge Business Park and the Cambridge Science Park improving access to the Kings Hedges and East Chesterton areas as well as the City beyond.

### Representations received:

Support: 16 Object: 1 Comment: 22

Total: 39

### Main issues in representations:

32535, 32615, 32661, 32682, 32734, 32752, 32792, 32810, 32821, 32864, 32906, 33093, 33288, 33526, 33617, 33710, 33446, 32579, 32703, 32742, 33044, 33154, 33172, 33305, 33335, 33425, 33458, 33510, 33560, 33691, 33768, 33801, 33455, NECIO007, NECIO008, NECIO009, NECIO053, NECIO054

## Support

- U+I Group PLC – Yes to option A.
- Veolia and Turnstone Estates – Option A is supported as will not affect Veolia site and operation.
- East/West axis option will connect Trinity Science Park to North Station. Traffic onto the Science Park will only be reduced if rail alternative is made highly attractive.
- U+I Group PLC – Yes to option B.
- U+I Group PLC – C: An underpass will improve connectivity and maximise permeability and green initiatives (Waterbeach Greenway, Chisholm Trail etc.).
- Strongly support C: proposed connections to Milton Country Park and the River Cam.
- U+I Group PLC – Support D in principle but further studies needed to determine appropriateness.
- U+I Group PLC – Will strengthen internalised trips and promote non-car use.
- Strongly support to provide wider pedestrian and cycle site access, especially E. Chesterton and Kings Hedges.
- The Crown Estate – Supports East-West and North-West infrastructure and building integration (Option A and B) and addressing the physical barrier of the railway line.
- Railfuture East Anglia – Yes to A, B, C & D, bearing in mind the importance of North Station as a primary transport hub. E is particularly significant as it directly challenges the current situation in Cambridge Business Park which is effectively a gated and policed inaccessible community.
- Brookgate Land PLC – Supportive of all options that encourage active travel while providing high connectivity. District Centre needs to be within walking distance of North Station to serve commuters.
- Option A or B. Preferred option would be roads linking both Cowley Rd to Nuffield Rd and a bridge over railway to connect traveller site. The level crossing should be removed as it limits potential and capability of North Station, causes traffic and prohibits recreation.
- Particularly A – B - E
- Segregate pedestrian and non-cycle use.
- Bridge over Milton Rd necessary and essential for Station to CRC and Science Park.
- Consider allowing bus tickets to be transferrable between normal buses and Guided busway for convenience.
- Good idea to increase permeability of currently impermeable barriers such as the Business Park & A14.
- Future-proof these non-motor options to guarantee continued success. Cycle congestion exists!

- All interventions are needed to create a strong sense of a non-car friendly place and encouragement of walking / cycling.
- More direction needed on connectivity out of site, rather than intra site.
- Consider raising or lowering Milton Road to create a welcoming crossing. A bridge (owing to high grade) will not work as will deter usage. Milton Rd also needs to be reduced to lower traffic.

### Object

- Milton Rd and Kings Hedges Road cannot cope with additional traffic.
- Need a connection from motorway to both the Science Park and over the river to the Fen Ditton McDonald's roundabout, not simply more houses with no appropriate infrastructure.

### Comment

- Shelford and District Bridleways Group – A: Multi-user access required not just pedestrian and cycle access.
- Veolia and Turnstone Estates – Option A can be achieved without affecting Veolia site and operation.
- Ridgeons Timber and Builders Merchants and Turnstone Estates / Veolia and Turnstone Estates – Support B: coordinated, improved access between Cowley Rd and Nuffield Rd for safe and convenient travel.
- The Wildlife Trust – Option C also justifies boundary extension to include river corridor.
- Natural England – Advocate significantly large green infrastructure and linkages to Milton Park which increases habitat enhancement.
- Using green space and green corridors should be given priority in minimising A14 barrier to connections over Jane Coston Bridge and to Waterbeach.
- Shelford and District Bridleways Group – C: Multi-user access required not just pedestrian and cycle access.
- Shelford and District Bridleways Group – E: Equestrian access required on the inter community links.
- Histon Road Residents Association - Will connectivity infrastructure be in place before residents move in? Is there any coordination between GCP and Milton Rd project? How will residential be connected to Science Park as the guided bus stop is on edge of area?
- Campaign to Protect Rural England Cambridgeshire and Peterborough – Infrastructure and transport links to Waterbeach needs to be funded, planned and delivered coherently and not in a piecemeal fashion.
- Waterbeach Parish Council – Link Waterbeach to site via Greenway links (cycle, bridleway, pedestrians, disabled accessible). Maintain the towpath and segregate tranquil enjoyment from superhighway transport.

- Shelford and District Bridleways Group – Equestrian access identified in para 6.21 as ‘crucial’ yet not included anywhere in project. NCN11 and NCN 51 can provide explicit equestrian access chiefly over Chisholm Bridge.
- Cambridgeshire County Council – No option should be ruled out at this early stage, although connectivity is crucial.
- Use Mere Way as a Busway route under A14 as a short-term solution to avoid congestion. Simplify the road width between junction and Guided Busway crossing.
- Plan roads well on the periphery before development and agree that non-car connectivity options cannot be ignored and built over by developers (as was the case in CB1 and cycleways North Station).
- Open routes across the river to pedestrians, cars, bikes and public transport.
- Yes, to A - C - E.
- The AAP should limit or remove HGV movement on and off the site in vicinity of local schools. Increase possible access points to Rail station.
- Development will increase the number of vehicles on Milton Road and a new access road should be provided to the A14 Fen Ditton junction. This would also connect to Fen Road.
- Enhanced pedestrian and cycling corridor between CRC and Innovation Park required. Such a link should be as high quality as the busway route, with as few junctions as possible.
- Many existing families in the area take children to Shirley School, GP surgery etc, so a connection linking these services would be beneficial.

### Document section

Issue: Crossing the railway line

Question 17: Should we explore delivery of a cycle and pedestrian bridge over the railway line to link into the River Cam towpath?

### Representations received:

Support: 24 Object: 7 Comment: 33

Total: 64

### Main issues in representations:

32536, 32588, 32606, 32616, 32682, 32733, 32743, 32749, 32789, 32811, 32822, 32833, 32907, 33035, 33066, 33230, 33312, 33338, 33367, 33396, 33527, 33618, 33711, 32498, 32609, 32942, 32949, 33239, 33459, 32600, 32608, 32652, 32704, 32736, 32842, 32874, 33045, 33077, 33110, 33129, 33173, 33183, 33200, 33218, 33362, 33409, 33482, 33462, 33493, 33500, 33575, 33696, 33802, NECIO010, NECIO011, NECIO012, NECIO013, NECIO014, NECIO015, NECIO016, NECIO017, NECIO018, NECIO019, NECIO055

### Support

- The Wildlife Trust BCN - Must include the river corridor.

- Railfuture East Anglia – Consider a road bridge with clearly demarcated/separated uses. A new road (north end of Cowley Rd?) could link a rail freight terminal and relieve traffic.
- U+I Group PLC – Welcome subject to funding.
- Brookgate Land Ltd – Support, but already a pedestrian and cycle route to River Cam via Moss Bank and Fen Road.
- Cambridge Past, Present and Future – Support the inclusion of a bridge to better connect area and enhance connectivity and inclusivity.
- Investment into much larger walking/cycling infrastructure is needed.
- As much cycle permeability as possible to discourage car use.
- Could also include a spacious underbridge providing grade separation under the railway, with lots of light & air.
- Should be a river crossing for walking and cycling in vicinity of and adjacent to the A14 Bridge.
- Rather than towpath links, proper connection to roads are needed as well as connections to Waterbeach Greenway.
- A new bridge over the railway line to Fen Road will allow pedestrians and cyclists to avoid the railway crossing. Its location should be in the middle of this part of the site to allow good access to the River Cam.

## Object

- Waterbeach Parish Council - Towpath should remain a tranquil area for leisure. Protect river from overuse.
- No. We have enough cyclists in that area as it is.
- What is needed is closing the Level Crossing [LC] and building a road bridge. This is due to:
  - Traffic which will increase due to development.
  - Already pedestrian and cycle access at North station.
  - Wait time at LC is unacceptable (20 mins) so effectively cuts off communities (Traveller site; Residential Home at 71 Fen Rd; cyclists going to Moss Bank).
  - Closing of LC causes frustration and is blatant discrimination and ghettoization (traffic / emergency and residential access / availability of facilities etc.). This will make the area unsafe and unattractive to residents.
  - LC causes traffic surges on Fen Rd, Water Street and Chesterton (including heavy vehicles).
  - LC causes antisocial driving as vehicles race to miss barriers.
  - Road link should be able to take HGV's; Have a single lane to allow HGV access, prohibit trucks and vans from using LC (if it remains).
  - Safer access over railway.
  - Reduce timetable risk for Rail operations; Can increase train paths; open up possibility for metro style movement.
  - Will act as extension of Chisholm Trail.
  - AAP facilities should be accessible to all (inclusive of Travellers site).
  - AAP employment opportunities should be open for all (inclusive of Travellers site).
- Suggestions for road bridge: across to the Sewage Farm site and Milton Road; North of Fen Road; North of North Station Connecting and continuing



Cowley Rd; Connecting Milton Rd to Fen Rd; From the A14 roundabout to Fen Rd).

#### Comment

- Cambridgeshire County Council – Future plans for rail network line will inform suitability of alternative crossing. Thus, no options should be ruled out at this stage.
- Cllr Hazel Smith – Fen Rd will get ever-more cut off as development progresses. Provide a link road. Access must be funded & safeguarded without exceptions.
- Trinity College, Cambridge – All connectivity is a positive and must be east-west across Milton Rd as a priority.
- Cycling and pedestrian bridge must be suitable for equestrian access.
- People would not use a footpath over the river as it will pass through Gypsy and Traveller camps and people will feel threatened using it. Much better to include east of the railway and regenerate inclusively.
- Far more interested in reducing commercial vehicles using Fen Rd, Water Lane and Green End Rd.
- If a cycle/pedestrian bridge is built, it should be sited to allow for a future road bridge.
- The railway level crossing at Fen Road is currently closed for long periods of time and an alternative road access should be provided. Fen Road is dangerous due to the number of vehicles and vehicle speeds. A new access road onto the A14 or a new road bridge into the NEC AAP site should be provided which could also accommodate public transport and be managed to avoid rat running.
- Unobtrusive lighting on the towpath would make it more useable for cyclists at night, enabling them to avoid Fen Road more.

#### Document section

Issue: Milton Road connectivity

Question 18: Which of the following options would best improve connectivity across Milton Road between Cambridge North Station and Cambridge Science Park?

A - One or more new 'green bridges' for pedestrians and cycles could be provided over Milton Road. The bridges could form part of the proposed green infrastructure strategy for NEC, creating a substantial green/ecological link(s) over the road.

B - Subject to viability and feasibility testing, Milton Road could be 'cut-in' or tunnelled below ground in order to create a pedestrian and cycle friendly environment at street level. This option would allow for significant improvements to the street which would be more pleasurable for people to walk and cycle through.

C - Milton Road could be significantly altered to rebalance the road in a way that reduces the dominance of the road, including rationalising (reducing) the number of junctions between the Guided Busway and the A14 as well as prioritising walking, cycling and public transport users.



D - Connectivity across Milton Road could be improved through other measures. We would welcome any other suggestions that would improve the east-west connectivity through the site.

E - Other ways of improving connections (please specify)

### Representations received:

Support: 11 Object: 2 Comment: 30

Total: 43

### Main issues in representations:

32617, 32662, 32751, 33028, 33078, 33095, 33143, 32499, 32537, 32602, 32684, 32705, 32735, 32793, 32823, 32844, 32878, 32908, 32911, 33046, 33132, 33155, 33174, 33246, 33340, 33528, 33550, 33576, 33619, 33712, 33776, 33803, NECIO020, NECIO021, NECIO022, NECIO023, NECIO024, NECIO025, NECIO026, NECIO027, NECIO028, NECIO056, NECIO057

### Support

- Brookgate Land Limited – Support A in principle but have concerns over viability and cost.
- A green bridge (Option A) could be designed to be an iconic focus point and would be great in conjunction with a roundabout replacing the many traffic lights and is the most appealing way to implement the east/west axis.
- Option A sounds fantastic, but option B more realistic. Good chance to have green space / separate walking and cycling provision on top of underpass.
- C. Currently, there is need to negotiate five locations to cross the road between Science and Business Parks. Anything that reduces dominance of roads and encourages cycling / walking is welcomed.
- E: Consider a transit system from North station to CRC.
- The Milton Road/Cambridge Science Park junction is dangerous and does not encourage people to walk or cycle in this area due to the long wait times to cross, the multi-lane nature of the road and the lack of priority to pedestrians and cyclists. A green bridge could provide a good solution to this that would also have environmental and place benefits.

### Object

- The size of the new community will bring permanent gridlock at end of Milton Road. Make roads better for cars.
- Option B risks concrete nightmare which should be avoided.

### Comment

- U+I Group PLC – Proposal too complicated to give informed response, but prefer Option A as will limit impact on Milton Rd during construction more than option B & C.

- Green Bridge Option A should be located to provide safe pedestrian / cycling access to Jane Costen Bridge, Innovation Centre and proposed residential and businesses to reduce non-car traffic. However, steep grades on the bridge will deter cyclists and affect accessibility.
- Brookgate Land Limited – B expensive with significant engineering challenges.
- B, but only if it is affordable and attractive to use.
- Tunnelling ideal (B) as minimising effect on traffic while creating a space for non-car transport. This should not dominate spaces, as seen in Elizabeth Way roundabout.
- Natural England – Option C could upgrade connections to Milton Country Park. Green bridges, informal space and greater connectivity are also supported.
- Keep in mind purpose of plan: to minimise car use. Do not overbuild to cater for cars. Milton Road should be made smaller / dominance reduced to prioritise sustainable transport.
- Real issue is location and coordination of traffic lights. Reconfiguration is best option.
- Dumping cyclists on a bridge is not the answer. The whole area needs updating, not just east-west connections.
- Sceptical about how much 'public realm' can be improved on Milton Rd as inappropriate for shared space designs.
- Most holistic option subject to design, cost and feasibility.
- Cambridgeshire County Council – No option should be ruled out at this stage. Preference is for D: segregated bus, pedestrian and cycle routes and would allow for better streetscape and public realm.
- Junction of Milton Rd and Cowley Rd needs major improvement for the benefit of cyclists. As does competing traffic up Cowley Rd from North Station towards Innovation Park. A 4-way crossing or roundabout along with a green bridge would be safer for cyclists.
- Connectivity must include equestrian access linked to the busway (E).
- Need a reality check on car use. Transport is essential. Far better to improve public transport affordability, reliability and frequency. Traffic light timings are ridiculous.
- A cycle/foot/bus link should be created adjacent to A14 and over railway and river to connect B1047 and beyond and create movement permeability. Could widen parts of A14 to achieve.
- Remove freight intensive uses from Nuffield Rd to strip adjacent to A14, reducing traffic and creating a noise barrier. Retain and expand light industrial uses.
- St John's College, Cambridge – Is there is a cost and delivery need for a Milton Rd connection between the Science & Innovation Parks? Consider instead a connection between CSP junction into Cowley Rd?

- Cambridge Past, Present and Future – Concern about conflict with other proposals out forward.
- Trinity College, Cambridge – No preferred option as no implications detailed. Milton Rd vehicular access onto CSP should remain and be futureproofed to allow for progressive transport technology.
- Railfuture East Anglia – Support Options A & C.
- Support A and C. Tunnelling under has not worked well at Elizabeth Way: blind corners, unsafe in the dark etc.
- Brookgate Land Limited – Fully support C & D. Significant priority to alter and rationalise junctions on Milton Rd for benefit of non-car uses.
- Other solutions include a traffic underpass under Milton Road, lane and junction improvements and a new road connecting Fen Road to Milton Road to avoid HGV movements in residential areas.
- This junction needs major improvement. It is very hard for cyclists to negotiate from/to Milton Road to/from Cowley Road. Sending traffic from Cambridge North up Cowley Road where it has to compete with traffic from the Innovation Centre is also leads to significant congestion and delays. It needs to be a 4-way crossing or roundabout combined with the proposed green bridge.
- The Guided Busway and associated combined cycle/footpath are already the main thoroughfare for cyclists entering the CSP from Central/East Cambridge as well as from Cambridge North Rail station. However, the traffic management around the Milton Road junction is far from optimal with long waiting times for cyclists/pedestrians for the traffic lights to change. A diagonal fly-over for cyclists (including perhaps for pedestrians) connecting the two Busway Cycle/footpaths would certainly improve access and encourage further commuter-based cycling to CSP.

### Document section

Issue: Development fronting Milton Road

Question 19: Should development within the North East Cambridge area be more visible from Milton Road, and provide a high-quality frontage to help create a new urban character for this area?

### Representations received:

Support: 5 Object: 3 Comment: 3

Total: 11

### Main issues in representations:

32538, 32750, 32913, 33247, 33620, 32663, 32909, 33009, 32685, 32794, 33804

## Support

- St. Johns College, Cambridge – Prominent buildings will create visual viewpoints from Milton Road. St. Johns Innovation Park should be increased to meet this aim.
- U+I Group PLC – As Milton Rd is key route into City, traffic reduction mechanisms may be limited short term.
- Milton Rd needs to be redeveloped into a highly visible continuing community which relies less on commuting. However, if it is not zero carbon then hide it away.
- Cycle paths to be more visible and better lit.
- Use innovative design to reduce dominance of access roads from A14 roundabout to make it feel less like a high-speed road.

## Object

- A visually cluttered urban area counters open space aims. Try and keep a rural feel, retain the area as a 'fringe' site. Plant trees on a grand scale, with progressive reduction of car-use to support sustainable travel options.
- Adding commercial facades onto a five-lane highway is appalling.

## Comment

- Trinity College, Cambridge – Development presents an opportunity to provide a northern gateway entrance into Cambridge. Legibility will also encourage public transport use.
- Wrong question. Development should front walking and cycling network to ensure low car use and minimise motor noise. Milton Rd could be resigned to allow this.

## Document section

Issue: Managing car parking and servicing

Question 20: Do you agree with proposals to include low levels of parking as part of creating a sustainable new city district focusing on non-car transport?

## Representations received:

Support: 15 Object: 5 Comment: 9

Total: 29

## Main issues in representations:

32539, 32586, 32618, 32623, 32640, 32686, 32795, 32860, 32915, 33010, 33047, 33079, 33529, 33621, 33713, 32500, 32511, 32664, 33368, 32824, 32910, 33133, 33248, 33306, 33341, 33426, 33561, 33769, 33805

## Support

- Hurst Park Estate Residents Association/Milton Road Residents Association – Support. However, assumption of low car use does not take into account

visitors/car hire/borrowing/retail. A critical explanation is needed on how it will be enforced. Otherwise parking problems will emerge inappropriately elsewhere.

- Cambridgeshire County Council – Parking policy and internalisation fundamentally impacts a constrained highway network. A suitable mix of uses is appropriate.
- Railfuture East Anglia – Agree.
- U+I Group PLC – Suggest interim parking strategies until full non-parking options can be realised. Parking can then be phased out.
- Brookgate Land Ltd – Sustainable low parking infrastructure options essential and should be consistently applied across whole of NEC land.
- Car use should not be needed, given the proximity to North Station/transport hubs. Suggest one space per residential unit, or area will become another car-dominated commuter suburb of the A14.
- Any parking provided should be underground and will improve look of area. Essential access only.
- The car spaces provided should be chargeable by day and/or hour. Monthly charging will not work as people will just view it as a long-term parking option.

#### Object

- More parking spaces needed. Not everyone cycles.
- Not all visitors to the area have good public transport links to reach the area, especially from the North East.
- Low numbers of parking spaces will cause surrounding area to be swamped with cars.
- Unfeasible given the inadequate public transport.
- This zero-carbon non-car position has not been achieved anywhere else. What makes this place different?

#### Comment

- St. Johns College, Cambridge – Reduction in parking needs to be matched by a proportional provision of public and non-car transport. The college will accept a position to provide no new car parking spaces over the park as a consequence of new development.
- Histon Road Residents' Association - The site will have car-free zones necessitating some parking facilities on the edge of site and underground.
- Ridgeons Timber and Builders Merchants and Turnstone Estates/Veolia and Turnstone Estates – Consideration needed for parking and access needs of commercial uses on site.
- Trinity College, Cambridge – Support more sustainable modes of transport. May need a range of policies to recognise different uses, needs, requirements and transition options to align with viability and delivery realities.

- Underground parking/parking areas/10 minutes walk to car (allowing time to only drop off)/Cycle parking outside door/Clear and direct cycle routes.
- Improve accessibility, reliability and cost of public transport to relieve this issue.

### Document Section

Issue: Managing car parking and servicing

Question 21a: In order to minimise the number of private motor vehicles using Milton Road, should Cambridge Science Park as well as other existing employment areas in this area, have a reduction in car parking provision from current levels?

### Representations received:

Support: 11 Object: 7 Comment: 5

Total: 23

### Main issues in representations:

32540, 32619, 32796, 32861, 32916, 33011, 33049, 33081, 33530, 33622, 33714, 32501, 32512, 32665, 32880, 32947, 33014, 33369, 32603, 32757, 32846, 33342, 33806

### Support

- Cambridge County Council/Brookgate Land Ltd - Evidence suggests car parking at CSP underused and unwelcome North Station environment so little incentive not to drive. If implemented, consideration has to be given to preventing cars parking in streets adjacent to area and providing excellent public transport and walking/cycling provision.
- Railfuture East Anglia – Emphasis on quality public transport.
- U+I Group PLC – Support this initiative to reduce car use.
- Data needed as Science Park users going to/from A14 may be less of a problem than other users.
- Adequate transport options must be offered, such as Park and Ride, Company shuttles and prioritised, segregated and wider cycle paths to prevent car/non car conflict.
- The council has declared a climate emergency and offering car parking will not create the modal shift needed.

### Object

- Orchard Street Investment Management – Given the congestion in the area already, careful cooperative consideration from all stakeholders is needed.
- More parking is needed.
- Reducing parking while offering no appropriate viable alternative (outside of peak times; before transport hub is operating) is dis-incentivising. Not all visitors to the area have good public transport links to reach the area,

especially from the North East. This will result in car swamping in surrounding streets.

#### Comment

- Trinity College, Cambridge – Already reducing car parking at CSP and this will continue. Policy needs to reflect that parking will reduce over time and is a shared ambition to encourage sustainable non-car transport.
- Encourage car sharing, businesses with showers (for cyclists); consider allowing 1 car space per unit only.
- Peak times on Milton Rd are people just passing through, so parking will not address the issue.
- Reducing car spaces means only the rich can afford spaces.
- If parking is a problem, why provide such a big car park at North Station?
- Is the Science Park not currently building a car park?

#### Document Section

Issue: Managing car parking and servicing

Question 21b: Should this be extended to introduce the idea of a reduction with a more equitable distribution of car parking across both parts of the AAP area?

#### Representations received:

Support: 6 Object: 2 Comment: 1

Total: 9

#### Main issues in representations:

32541, 32918, 33050, 33531, 33623, 33715, 32666, 33370, 33807

#### Support

- Cambridgeshire County Council/Railfuture East Anglia/U+I Group PLC/Brookgate Land Limited – Essential to reduce car parking availability and promote a package of sustainable transport measures.
- Low levels of parking throughout. Car parking could be grouped in certain areas with good walking/cycling connections with concessions for those with low mobility.

#### Object

- This proposal will just encourage swamping of displaced cars to park on streets adjacent to area. Reducing parking unfeasible until adequate alternatives available.

## Comment

- Trinity College, Cambridge – CSP is moving towards an approach with fewer car parking spaces in alignment with the non-car ethos of new development. However, please consider policy that reflects a slower transitional period to allow the well-established businesses here with long leases to encourage and adopt initiatives.
- Parking should be 1 space per residential unit.

## Document Section

Issue: Managing car parking and servicing

Question 22: Should the AAP require innovative measures to address management of servicing and deliveries, such as consolidated deliveries and delivery/collection hubs?

## Representations received:

Support: 10 Object: 2 Comment: 4

Total: 16

## Main issues in representations:

32542, 32797, 32920, 32948, 33018, 33052, 33299, 33532, 33624, 33716, 33502, 32667, 32866, 33175, 33343, 33808

## Support

- Cambridgeshire County Council/Brookgate Land Ltd – Innovative measures, such as a centralised refuse collection can help to reduce demand of highway network supported.
- Railfuture East Anglia – Consolidation of deliveries not only for this area, but for Cambridge as a whole. A Rail freight terminal accessed on Cowley Rd extension could facilitate this.
- U+I Group PLC – Area could include a number of hubs. More understanding is needed about needs of residents and businesses to consider fully.
- Consider future proofing for the growth of online shopping.
- Consider cycling logistic firms to make last-mile deliveries within site, wider area using cargo bikes and assigned delivery parking outside of peak hours.
- Trans-shipment hub appropriate given proximity to A14. Allow for a bulk/break/consolidation depot to service local businesses and lessen environmental impact.

## Object

- This is a silly idea.

## Comment

- Trinity College, Cambridge – AAP should allow for innovative solutions as technological advances come forward, rather than be absolute and restrictive.



## Document Section

Issue: Car and other motor vehicle storage

Question 23: Should development within the North East Cambridge area use car barns for the storage of vehicles?

## Representations received:

Support: 11 Object: 3 Comment: 5

Total: 19

## Main issues in representations:

32543, 32587, 32620, 32624, 32641, 32825, 32867, 32912, 32922, 33533, 33717, 32503, 32668, 32758, 32737, 33053, 33344, 33809

## Support

- Hurst Park Estate Residents Association/Milton Road Residents Association – Support, but lack of testing means it may just end up a concrete multi-storey car park in all but name.
- Railfuture East Anglia – Yes.
- Brookgate Land Ltd – Unsure how periphery barn will access Milton Rd. Shuttlebuses from Park and Ride to NEC, cycle and pedestrian links an option.
- Car barn should be flexibly designed to be able to be repurposed in the event of a car-free future.
- Enforced via unavailability of car park spaces on site. Financial incentive not to take car space?
- Reduces pollution and noise while offering a sensible parking alternative to the reality of car use.
- Car parking not the issue. Car use is. Make non-car use & access more attractive to solve.
- Car-clubs could manage use and ownership.

## Object

- Storage magnet for criminals.
- Another drain on scarce free time.
- Better to develop low-cost or free travel via park and ride on far side of A14.

## Comment

- Cambridgeshire County Council – Car barns should only be used to make non-car travel easier and convenient. It is the time of day and level of car use that is the issue, rather than car ownership per se.

- U+I Group PLC – Inevitable demands for some on site parking is needed and should be priced accordingly to the end user. A car barn will form part of a wider package of parking solutions.
- Trinity College, Cambridge – Car Barns should not be a mandatory rule as technology may render it useless in future. Policy should therefore be flexible.
- Yes. An innovative car transport hub (including bus, bike share, car share, car charging) managed through website/phone app has potential to take many cars off streets. Car storage should be easily accessible.

## Document Section

Issue: Green Space Provision

Question 24: Within the North East Cambridge area green space can be provided in a number of forms including the following options. Which of the following would you support?

A – Green space within the site could be predominately provided through the introduction of a large multi-functional district scale green space. Taking inspiration from Parker’s Piece in Cambridge, a new large space will provide flexible space that can be used throughout the year for a wide range of sport, recreation and leisure activities and include a sustainable drainage function. The sustainable drainage element would link into a system developed around the existing First Public Drain and the drainage system in the Science Park. The green space could be further supported by a number of smaller neighbourhood block scale open spaces dispersed across the site.

B – Green spaces within the site could be provided through a series of green spaces of a neighbourhood scale that will be distributed across the residential areas. These green spaces will also be connected to the green infrastructure network to further encourage walking and cycling. Again, these spaces will include a sustainable drainage function and link into the existing First Public Drain and the Science Park drainage system.

C – Enhanced connections and corridors within and beyond the site to improve the biodiversity and ecological value as well as capturing the essential Cambridge character of green fingers extending into urban areas. These corridors could also be focussed around the green space network and sustainable drainage and would reflect the NPPF net environmental gain requirement.

D – Green fingers to unite both sides of Milton Road and capitalise on the existing green networks.

E – Consideration of the site edges – enhancement of the existing structural edge landscape and creating new structural landscape at strategic points within and on the edge of NEC. This would also enhance the setting to the City on this important approach into the City.

F – Creation of enhanced pedestrian and cycle connectivity to Milton Country Park and the River Cam corridor.

### Representations received:

Support: 14 Object: 1 Comment: 42

Total: 57

### Main issues in representations:

32573, 32669, 32687, 32738, 32884, 32925, 32951, 33024, 33105, 33371, 32504, 32544, 32706, 32744, 32759, 32798, 32851, 32914, 33156, 33266, 33290, 33330, 33339, 33453, 33471, 33512, 33534, 33577, 36266, 33692, 33718, 33810, NECIO029, NECIO030, NECIO031, NECIO032, NECIO033, NECIO034, NECIO035, NECIO036, NECIO037, NECIO038, NECIO039, NECIO040, NECIO041, NECIO042, NECIO043, NECIO044, NECIO045, NECIO046, NECIO047, NECIO048, NECIO049, NECIO050, NECIO051, NECIO052, NECIO059

### Support

- A - Big space will allow for events and will bring people together.
- C - Good for both us and wildlife, with input from the Wildlife Trust and complemented by neighbourhood-scale provision.
- Envisage mixed use with fine grain as per B and C. D also appropriate. E should be a conversion of a five-lane highway into a forest of trees.
- Green space provision must be explicit and controlled by council, not developers.
- More green infrastructure and architecture is essential in the city for aesthetics, wellbeing and for buffering carbon and greenhouse gasses. More solar panelled roofs, more tree-lined avenues, green walls.
- A connection to the country park is a no brainer.
- Opportunity to provide links under A14 to Milton Country Park and towards the River Cam for both people and biodiversity.
- In a high-density environment, green space and biodiversity should be provided in innovative ways like green walls and rooftop open spaces.
- A green wall along the A14 would mitigate the impact of the road.
- Community gardens and spaces should be provided to grow food and bring the community together and they should also be provided in places that are accessible to the existing community.

### Object

- They will not be kept maintained like most places.

### Comment

- Brookgate Land Ltd – A may be difficult due to phasing. Smaller scale spaces are more effective in residential schemes.
- A - Large green spaces good, but a green space should be visible wherever you are.

- Brookgate Land Ltd – B, but needs to be appropriately connected.
- B - Smaller green spaces are preferable as they are well used with much potential. Must be safe and welcoming and include natural surveillance design.
- B - Many parks in area and surrounds are looking tired so an update is welcomed, such as play equipment.
- Brookgate Land Ltd – C. Needs to be appropriately connected to broader network.
- Brookgate Land Ltd – D. Requires a review of specific proposals.
- Brookgate Land Ltd – E. Design needs to prevent perceived or actual connectivity. Landscape edges can create buffers which separate.
- Shelford and District Bridleways Group – F. Peripheral routes around green spaces should include equestrian provision. Neglecting multi-user space contravenes Cambridge Rights of Way Improvement Plan.
- Campaign to Protect Rural England – Green spaces/corridors should be arranged to ensure biodiversity and wellbeing of community and not detrimentally affect tranquillity of open countryside. Consider a green fringe between River Cam towpath and the development.
- Trinity College, Cambridge – Green spaces enhance the public realm, provide pleasant areas and sustainable transport, and promote outdoor working.
- Green corridors should be generous. The commons and existing corridors are heavily used throughout the year. No option to provide once construction is complete.
- Green space must include equestrian access. A link to Milton Country Park fantastic. Parking could be in the form of a safe equestrian hitch in the shopping area.
- Environment Agency – Options A, B & C all provide sustainable drainage in green spaces, improve and create habitats and ecology (around First Public Drain, which will also improve water quality as per EU Water Framework Directive), and incorporate SuDS.
- Natural England – A combination of Options A - F are needed to deliver essential greenspace using SANGS standards. Green corridor connection to Milton Country Park, Waterbeach Greenways and Chisholm Trail also essential.
- The Wildlife Trust BCN – Options C & F are essential. We have no preference over A & B.
- Milton Rd should be fronted by trees. Green space that support habitats are preferable to concrete-surrounding parks. Children should have parks on doorstep rather than far-away.
- Anglian Water Services Ltd – No preference for any option, but ask that sustainable drainage systems are integral in design.

- The Crown Estate – Rather than aligning open space with particular uses (amenity for employment / sports fields in schools etc.), consider shared/multi-use spaces that encourage human connectivity and community.
- Railfuture East Anglia – Open spaces must have active and safe travel in mind to work, leisure and cultural events, at all times of the day.
- Cambridge Past, Present and Future – Ensure green connections for wildlife in a variety of locations and sizes with multi-functional uses potential.
- U+I Group PLC – Support both large-scale green space and smaller-scale neighbourhood spaces with connections to green infrastructure. However, a lack of supporting studies and capacity testing means we cannot cite a preference at this stage.
- Brookgate Land Ltd – Support all options in principle.
- Prioritise neighbourhood level schemes connected through walkable and cycle-able green corridors leading to Milton Country Park. Large scale green spaces are not a priority.
- More people friendly environment – trees, flowers, water features, shade shelter, use of renewables.
- Creating a sense of community supported with open space is important for social cohesion and health.
- There are lessons to be learnt from Orchard Park, including preserving mature trees and existing habitats that are already on-site as well as enhancing these where possible.
- There is the opportunity to improve landscaping, including on the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway as well as opening up Cowley Road to provide more green space and leisure facilities, including near Cambridge Regional College which could be supported with other uses like retail.
- The green network should also be used to inform pedestrian movement.
- The area around Moss Bank should be included within the AAP to improve its quality as a green space.
- Milton Country Park is already at capacity and the park's proposed expansion plans should also be within the AAP area to provide a high-quality sports and recreation facility for the region.
- Reconsider opening a footpath from the Bramblefields through to the Guided Busway cycle path?

## Document Section

### Chapter 7: Transport

#### Issue: Non car access

Question 25: As set out in this chapter there are a range of public transport, cycling and walking schemes planned which will improve access to the North East Cambridge area. What other measures should be explored to improve access to this area?

## Representations received:

Support: 15 Object: 2 Comment: 80

Total: 97

## Main issues in representations:

32545, 32576, 32577, 32760, 32932, 33054, 33106, 33168, 33177, 33184, 33194, 33201, 33211, 33219, 33298, 33313, 33313, 33353, 33410, 33432, 33275, 33483, 33509, 33535, 33693, 33719, 33778, 33784, 33811, 33850, 32589, 32610, 32625, 32642, 32781, 32806, 32885, 32979, 33627, 33501, 33698, NECIO053, NECIO054, NECIO055, NECIO056, NECIO057, NECIO058, NECIO059, NECIO060, NECIO061, NECIO062, NECIO063, NECIO064, NECIO065, NECIO066, NECIO067, NECIO068, NECIO069, NECIO070, NECIO071, NECIO072, NECIO073, NECIO074, NECIO075, NECIO076, NECIO077, NECIO078, NECIO079, NECIO080, NECIO081, NECIO082, NECIO083, NECIO084, NECIO085, NECIO086, NECIO087, NECIO088, NECIO089, NECIO090, NECIO091, NECIO092, NECIO093, NECIO094, NECIO095, NECIO096, NECIO097, NECIO098, NECIO099, NECIO100

## Support

- Hurst Park Estate Residents Association/Milton Road Residents Association – Need to avoid management by wishful thinking. Ensure plans are realistic. Needs to be explanation of how features are going to work.
- U&I Group PLC - Generally support the suggested options for improving public transport, cycling and walking accessibility around NEC. It will be important to ensure that consideration is always given to promoting access beyond the AAP boundary.
- Cycling needs to be planned for coherently and considered county-wide.
- Important to protect cycle routes from vehicles and make them safe, accessible and well-lit.
- More buses needed at peak times as cycling sometimes not an option.
- A walking/cycling bridge alongside the A14 bridge to connect Horningsea and Cambridge.
- Close Fen Road level crossing.
- If you want people to use public transport it needs to be accessible and better value for money.

## Object

- Need clarity and an overarching vision.
- Lack of supporting evidence that any of the transport proposals being considered in the AAP are attainable. Ambition is no substitute for evidence.
- Should be new access directly onto A14.

## Comment

- Shelford & District Bridleways Group, Barton & District Bridleways Group – Routes and crossings linking settlements proposed as shared use should

include equestrian. Detailed routes are suggested, linking to green infrastructure strategy.

- Brookgate Land Ltd - A frequent shuttlebus could be provided. Make better use of Milton P&R, including better cycling facilities.
- North Station should be developed as the main hub of train and bus services. Changes should be made to the station and the surrounding area to make it more user friendly and to accommodate extra services.
- Should be more bus routes to the station from different areas.
- Cycle paths need to be of a high quality. Existing Milton Road crossing isn't too bad.
- High quality walking and cycling access from the Milton end of Fen Road to both Chesterton and the NECAAP area, to safely bypass the level crossing.
- Requires a road link over the railway into the new development so existing crossing can be closed.
- Why has the Ely to Cambridge Study identified A10 expansion rather than increased rail frequency as the solution? Cars using new dual carriageway will require parking spaces, so findings a contradictory.
- How will the plans in the AAP fit with the CAM Metro?
- Will cycle paths like those on Milton Rd be able to cope?
- What about all the delivery vehicles?
- Consider those who cannot walk or cycle e.g. small electric vehicles.
- Roads are currently full, so concerned about extra traffic.
- How is school access being addressed? With no school, will children need to be bussed across the city?
- Priority order of - walking, cycling, bus, train. Cars should not be prioritised.
- The existing Guided Busway route provides a high-quality cycling route between CRC and Cambridge North Station, and any new routes going through the site should be of a similar standard. The road junctions close to CRC and the Science Park are dangerous and need to be carefully re-designed.
- Support for a new bridge over Milton Road to enable better cross site movements for pedestrians and cyclists.
- A new connection from NEC to the Shirley School and health centre on Nuffield Road is needed as well as a route through Bramblefields and Cambridge Business Park onto the Guided Busway. Better crossing points for cyclists are needed across the site and wider area.
- Milton Road requires significant improvements to enable better pedestrian and cycling movements across the site. This includes junction improvements and crossing facilities. Milton Road is also already at capacity at peak times and public transport needs to be encouraged to avoid new residents using cars.

- Better permeability throughout this area is desirable for residents and cycle segregation should be provided. This includes better connectivity over the River Cam.
- Improved surface quality and street lighting on the River Cam towpath would enable people to use this route throughout the day and year. Foot and cycle access could be created between the river tow path and Milton through the Country Park to avoid Milton Road.
- Use Mere Way as a busway/cycleway to connect Cambridge Science Park to the Park and Ride.
- Public transport should be subsidised to encourage people to use it and could be funded by demand management. Bus services to the Science Park and CRC should be improved as they are at capacity, whilst CRC buses should be allowed to use the Guided Busway to avoid congestion. Buses should run between Orchard Park and Cambridge North Station and local buses should also connect the site to the local area. Bus interchange facilities are required.
- Consider adding an alternative access point to the Science Park to relieve congestion on the existing accesses and improve signal sequencing to reduce waiting times. An additional lane into the Science Park is required.
- Whilst minimal car use should be encouraged, the needs of elderly people and local businesses needs to be considered.
- Open up other connection points from Fen Road over the railway line for industrial traffic.

## Document Section

### Chapter 7: Transport

Issue: Car usage on North East Cambridge

Question 26: Do you agree that the AAP should be seeking a very low share of journeys to be made by car compared to other more sustainable means like walking, cycling and public transport to and from, and within the area?

### Representations received:

Support: 9 Object: 2 Comment: 29

Total: 40

### Main issues in representations:

32917, 33134, 33234, 33433, 33454, 33502, 33812, 32546, 32592, 32626, 32643, 32688, 32708, 32761, 32780, 32808, 32869, 32886, 32933, 33055, 33157, 33536, 33628, 33720, 32954, 33015

### Support

- Cambridgeshire County Council - There needs to be a step change in car mode share, public transport and non-car access within and outside the area to levels that are more akin to those seen in central London. Sufficient quality in public transport key to this aspiration.



- Natural England - A focus on sustainable, non-car travel including cycling, walking and public transport supported.
- Milton Road Residents Association/Hurst Park Estate Residents' Association - Difficult to see how there can be other than a minimal bus service unless local government has some control over the service. Lighting important to make walking routes safe.
- Brookgate Land Limited - The NEC area as a whole can support a low car parking strategy due to the abundance of other non-car mode options available.
- U+I Group PLC - A greater share of non-car modes of travel supported yet note that the concept will need to be accepted by all landowners/occupiers in the AAP boundary in order for it to be implemented successfully.
- It is already a congested area and it is important we improve traffic issues rather than worsen them.
- More public transport (buses) are needed to enable this.
- Should be done by NOT adding more jobs to Cambridge but redressing the existing imbalance between jobs and residential accommodation.

#### Object

- Orchard Street Investment - Milton Road is already very congested at peak hours. Increasing employment and residential development will negatively impact the wider transport network. Low car journey measures should be made clear and subject to public consultation.
- Provision should be made for car journeys within the area to improve car access to the area east of the railway.

#### Comment

- CPRE – Support but, the towpath along the River Cam should remain predominately an area for pedestrians and those who wish to enjoy the tranquillity of the riverbank and the Fen Rivers Way.
- Support, but what is the evidence it is attainable?
- There should be car pool dedicated parking and sponsorship to discourage ownership.
- More consideration needs to be given to the reality of car use.

#### Document Section

Chapter 7: Transport

Issue: Car usage on North East Cambridge

Question 27: Do you have any comments on the highway 'trip budget' approach, and how we can reduce the need for people to travel to and within the area by car?

#### Representations received:

Support: 17 Object: 2 Comment: 7

Total: 26

### Main issues in representations:

32917, 33134, 33234, 33433, 33454, 33502, 33812, 32546, 32592, 32626, 32643, 32688, 32708, 32761, 32780, 32808, 32869, 32886, 32933, 33055, 33157, 33536, 33628, 33720, 32954, 33015

### Support

- Cambridgeshire County Council/U+I Group PLC – Prefer practical highway 'trip budget' approach rather than the traditional approach to achieve aspirations set out in AAP. However, this approach must be tested to ensure that it is both suitable and realistic, and if implemented, shared and monitored appropriately and managed fairly if/when the trip budget is exceeded.
- Highway trip budget approach supported but best understood as making the best out of an unsustainable development.
- A range of non-car transport modes needed to enable choice and support innovation. For example, increasing capacity on the railway to reduce car dependence and more trains.
- Learn from elsewhere, e.g. free shuttle buses for employees.

### Object

- The traffic from this development is alarming, and each house will own 1 or more cars, with additional visitors.

### Comment

- Brookgate Land Ltd - A highway 'trip budget' approach is considered to be reasonable as long as it is applied to the NEC as a whole, both the existing science parks and the currently undeveloped (or underdeveloped) areas.
- St. John's College, Cambridge – TBA should be applied to existing developments in a sustainable way to encourage a shift to non-car modes. This only achievable with significant investment. A robust and well-funded area-wide Travel Plan should be conducted.
- In principle this is a good idea; however, in practice limiting the number of car parking places will not behave linearly in accordance with people's behaviour.
- Can only be effective where a proper system of public transport is in place.
- Do not add to jobs, but address imbalance with homes.

### Document Section

Chapter 7: Transport

Issue: Car parking

Question 28: Do you agree that car parking associated with new developments should be low, and we should take the opportunity to reduce car parking in existing developments (alongside the other measures to improve access by means other than car)?

## Representations received:

Support: 11 Object: 3 Comment: 8

Total: 22

## Main issues in representations:

32919, 33176, 33287, 33435, 33562, 33814, 32547, 32605, 32689, 32782, 32937, 33025, 33057, 33538, 33630, 33722, 33770, 32710, 33016, 33373, NECIO101, NECIO098

## Support

- Cambridgeshire County Council - Parking policy is directly linked to number of trips generated and put onto the external highway network. Given constraints on the highway network surrounding and through the AAP area, this is fundamental to making the development acceptable in transport terms.
- Veolia/Ridgeons Timber and Builders Merchants and Turnstone Estates - Non-car modes of travel are supported, but also consider business needs for Veolia and car space requirements for deliveries/customers.
- Brookgate Land Ltd - More restrictive car parking standards supported across the whole area to reflect the highly sustainable location. Priority should be given to zero or low parking schemes, electric cars and car clubs as maintaining existing parking levels is not acceptable. Transport modelling work will assist in achieving this.
- There should be energetic promotion of cycling schemes, car clubs and other pay as you go opportunities to change the underlying culture of urban transport.
- Improving non-car access from villages outside Cambridge is vital.
- Parking should be underground, especially in residential developments.

## Object

- Orchard Street Investment - Reduction to existing car parking provision for existing developments, especially those associated with business uses is not supported as car spaces are essential for business operations, especially when public transport is not available.
- This can only be effective where a proper system of public transport is in place. The integration of the AAP with a tramway or CAM is an essential prerequisite.
- Adequate car parking MUST be provided for residents to keep their car next to their home. Failure to do this results in overspill parking to the nearest alternative area.

## Comment

- Site should be made permeable to public transport rather than cars, with more stops to make the area accessible.

- Site should make provision very short-term parking (drop-off) at Cambridge North Station. Ensure route to station is kept clear.
- Transport to be on time and more spaces.

## Document Section

Chapter 7: Transport

Issue: Cycle parking

Question 29: Do you agree that we should require high levels of cycle parking from new developments?

## Representations received:

Support: 18 Object: 1 Comment: 1

Total: 20

## Main issues in representations:

33815, 32548, 32690, 32711, 32763, 32783, 32871, 32887, 32921, 32938, 32956, 33026, 33058, 33082, 33374, 33436, 33537, 33631, 33723, 33250

## Support

- Cambridgeshire County Council/Brookgate Land Ltd – To be sustainable, a significant proportion of trips will need to be undertaken by bike, so connectivity will be critical as will be high levels of cycle parking to make trips as easy and seamless as possible.
- U+I Group PLC - This approach will be supported by the new cycling infrastructure that is planned for Cambridge. Workplaces can provide showers, changing facilities and lockers to encourage staff to cycle into work.
- Railfuture East Anglia – Yes.
- Highly depends on the design, quality and capacity of these cycle parking facilities and routes. Ease and convenience key.
- Set at aspirational levels (e.g. as seen in Netherlands or Denmark).
- 'Enable' not 'require' in wording – people respect choice.

## Object

- St. Johns College, Cambridge - New developments should provide cycle parking but 'high level' is not the correct wording. More relevant to require 'appropriate levels' of cycle parking as significant over provision is not appropriate in every circumstance.

## Comment

- Trinity College, Cambridge - Include percentages of cycle parking suitable for larger cycles such as box bikes, tricycles, and adapted cycles. Not multi-tier systems. Ensure they are appropriately secured.

## Document Section

Chapter 7: Transport

Issue: Cycle parking

Question 30: Should we look at innovative solutions to high volume cycle storage both within private development as well as in public areas?

## Representations received:

Support: 6 Object: 7 Comment: 2

Total: 15

## Main issues in representations:

32549, 32872, 32873, 32923, 33632, 33724, 33816, 32691, 32940, 33059, 33375, 33437, 33539, 32712, 32784

## Support

- Please bear in mind that the current cycle parking solution with two racks on top of each other is not friendly to women and older people. This will inevitably lead people to prefer using their car.

## Object

- Most high-volume cycle parking solutions are not suitable due to design and capabilities. The development should adopt the Cycle Parking Guide SPD from Cambridge City Council or any successor document.

## Comment

- Brookgate Land Ltd – High density requires equally ample cycle parking and should be the norm for commercial and residential developments in the NEC.
- U+I Group PLC – Innovative storage solutions should be explored as part of further capacity testing, master planning and detailed design enabling cycle parking to be integrated appropriately into the public realm. Provision should also be made for dockless bikes so that they are not left in inconsiderate locations.
- Trinity College, Cambridge - Support clustered parking for efficient land use and preventing cluttered sprawl.
- Make it easy for people to store bikes in their homes.

## Document Section

Chapter 7: Transport

Issue: Cycle parking

Question 31: What additional factors should we also be considering to encourage cycle use (e.g. requiring new office buildings to include secure cycle parking, shower facilities and lockers)?

## Representations received:

Support: 6 Object: 1 Comment: 12

Total: 19

### Main issues in representations:

32785, 32877, 33060, 33083, 33100, 33328, 33438, 33633, 33725, 33817, 32713, 32888, 32926, 32943, 32958, 33540, 32692, NECIO102, NECIO103

### Support

- Railfuture East Anglia – Support.
- Offices should provide secure cycle parking, shower facilities and lockers.
- Pool bikes for business use (meetings etc), bike shops and repair places within the area, cargo bikes for business deliveries.
- Facilities for cyclists e.g. drying rooms rather than just lockers.
- Make cycle network easy to use, and prominent, with good interaction with public transport.

### Object

- Lockers attract crime and harbour smells and dirt.
- Not a good use of resources.

### Comment

- Cambridgeshire County Council – Welcomes any planning mechanisms that encourage cycling.
- Brookgate Land Ltd/Trinity College, Cambridge - Convenient and secure cycle parking with showers and lockers welcomed. Charging points for electric bike should also be considered.
- U+I Group PLC - Support convenient, covered, secure cycle storage, showers and lockers at basement/ground floor level or within easy access of lifts capable of transferring bikes between levels. To minimise conflict, consider segregated access for cyclists from pedestrians and vehicles accessing buildings.
- Must be safe, comfortable and attractive with well-defined and connected routes facing residential and business uses. In short, cycling should be an obvious choice.
- This is successful on the biomedical campus and reinforces a cycling culture.
- Homes and offices should be able to store multiple bikes, including those outside the standard design (assistance tricycles / cargo trailers / Child seats etc). These should be easily accessible to all and useable in all weathers. Offices should also provide showers.
- Planners need to review what went wrong with the "secure by design" approach and learn from their mistakes.
- Cycle parking at Cambridge North Station is not secure and more is needed.

## Document Section

Chapter 7: Transport

Issue: Innovative approaches to movement

Question 32: How do we design and plan for a place that makes the best use of current technologies and is also future proofed to respond to changing technologies over time?

## Representations received:

Support: 1 Object: 0 Comment: 12

Total: 13

## Main issues in representations:

32550, 33027, 33061, 33300, 33439, 33541, 33578, 33634, 33698, 33726, 32787, 33818, 32950

## Support

- The area should have excellent access and technological integration so that users find it easy to switch between modes.
- Public transport stops should have the highest quality information about related routes. Buses should be single-ticket and cashless. Buses could also hold bikes.

## Object

- None.

## Comment

- Brookgate Land Ltd - The CGB corridor has the potential for early delivery of a rapid transport, autonomous vehicle shuttle between Cambridge North Station, the Science Park and Cambridge Regional College.
- U+I Group PLC - Options that encompass energy strategies, form and fabric, building services and energy generation and supply welcomed.
- Shelford & District Bridleways Group – Sustainable transport includes horse riding.
- Cambridge Past, Present & Future – Need flexibility to ensure changes in trends to housing needs and size of commercial properties.
- Railfuture East Anglia – Route(s) should be protected for emerging light rail (or other similar technology) networks.
- Cambridgeshire County Council – No comment can be made until all transport evidence is compiled and analysed.
- Trinity College, Cambridge – Flexibility in policy will allow for changes in future. Overly prescriptive policy will stifle innovation.
- Transport is not about fancy technology but offering a safe and convenient space that people want to use. This human-centred approach will enable identification and procurement of best in class future-proof technologies.

- Make technologies 'pay as you go'. Capital equipment should be earning its keep rather than standing idle.
- Design in the possibility for repurposing of infrastructure (at least that infrastructure most subject to significant changes in societal attitudes - most likely transport related infrastructure).

## Document Section

Chapter 7: Transport

Issue: Linking the station to the Science Park

Question 33: What sort of innovative measures could be used to improve links between the Cambridge North Station and destinations like the Science Park?

## Representations received:

Support: 1 Object: 0 Comment: 17

Total: 18

## Main issues in representations:

32693, 32765, 32788, 33062, 33104, 33126, 33376, 33440, 33542, 33635, 33695, 33727, 33781, 33819, 32952, NECIO104, NECIO105, NECIO057

## Support

- Regular and cheap busway links, good cycle hire schemes (with hubs at the station and in the business areas). On-demand transport for those with low mobility.

## Object

- Autonomous vehicles and Uber-like services should be discouraged in order to create an area that more successfully prioritises active travel modes and doesn't create additional conflicts for those on bike or foot.

## Comment

- Brookgate Land Ltd. – Links between Cambridge North Station and CSP could be addressed via a frequent shuttle bus, pedestrian and cycle connectivity across Milton Road and better 'wayfinding' to encourage walking and cycling.
- U+I Group - Unlikely that an at grade crossing can be located to link the Science Park with the station due to capacity constraints on Milton Road. May be overcome with a well-designed overpass and micro mobility solutions to unify connectivity the area.
- Shelford & District Bridleways Group - Obvious linking opportunities are Guided Bus bridleways. Public money should be spent to benefit the widest range of users
- Railfuture East Anglia - Autonomous vehicles running at frequent intervals between North Station and CSP.



- Cambridgeshire County Council – Forthcoming transport evidence will inform our position on this matter.
- Free shuttle/minibus from North Station to CSP that can use busway.
- Long term: move businesses closer to North Station. Short term: safe streets with activity.
- Off-road space between destinations can be used to trial innovations.
- Not just busway; consider trams and CAMS, low cost scooters, autonomous vehicles.
- More very short stay spaces (15 minutes) at North Station.
- Avoid creating bottle necks between Milton Road the Station Area and in particular avoiding the poor design of the approach to Cambridge Central Station.
- Think this would be addressed by the cut-through beneath Milton Road or bridges over Milton Road.
- Bus link is needed crossing site and to wider area, including outside peak times.
- The Guided Busway and associated combined cycle/footpath are already the main thoroughfare for cyclists entering the CSP from Central/East Cambridge as well as from Cambridge North Rail station. However, the traffic management around the Milton Road junction is far from optimal with long waiting times for cyclists/pedestrians for the traffic lights to change. A diagonal fly-over for cyclists (including perhaps for pedestrians) connecting the two Busway Cycle/footpaths would improve access and encourage further commuter-based cycling to CSP.

## Document Section

Chapter 7: Employment

Issue: Types of employment space

Question 34: Are there specific types of employment spaces that we should seek to support in this area?

## Representations received:

Support: 5 Object: 1 Comment: 6

Total: 12

## Main issues in representations:

32578, 33017, 33546, 33636, 33728, 33820, 32593, 32627, 32644, 33282, 33251, NECIO106

## Support

- Hurst Park Residents Association/Milton Road Residents Association - Danger offer will be expensive small shops. Low rents/short leases controlled by council may alleviate.

- The Crown Estate - Supports a wide range of employment uses, including 'hybrid' buildings to foster potential closer integration between uses within sites and across the AAP area as a whole. Flexibility will allow likely changes in working practices, the live - work balance and align with vision for sustainability and innovation.
- Site should include high quality business space for small to medium business in the area.

### Object

- St John's College, Cambridge – The AAP is not the function to determine exact types of employment space as the local authority is limited in position to assess market demand and commercial trends in the same way that landowners' advisors are.

### Comment

- Trinity College, Cambridge – Employment space should be strictly science and technology based to promote a strong identity. Complimentary uses would weaken brand.
- Brookgate Land Ltd - A combination of commercial and residential uses, including offices and R & D uses supported. All being informed by both market conditions and successful place-making.
- U+I Group - The internationally recognised innovative-identity of the science/business parks must be fully harnessed to encourage complementary industries and optimise further employment opportunities. However, policy limitations should not be imposed that unduly restrict any particular use at this stage.
- Orchard Street Investment Management - The current Action Plan area has a good mix of employment spaces including industrial. There is a need to ensure that the promoted uses offer a wide range of employment spaces to ensure that there is long-term flexibility in the future.
- Need more consultation on how jobs will be reconciled with residents. Do not see how this fit can be engineered by the developers.
- The failure to deliver industrial uses on Orchard Park suggest a similar fate could happen to this development, even though there is a distinct need for industrial space within three miles of Cambridge.
- Development should be flexible and allow for people to work close to where they live.

### Document Section

Chapter 7: Employment

Issue: Types of employment space

Question 35: In particular, should the plan require delivery of:

A - a flexible range of unit types and sizes, including for start-ups and Small and Medium Sized Enterprises (SMEs);

B - Specialist uses like commercial laboratory space;

C - hybrid buildings capable of a mix of uses, incorporating offices and manufacturing uses.

D - shared social spaces, for example central hubs, cafes.

E - Others (please specify).

### Representations received:

Support: 4 Object: 0 Comment: 6

Total: 10

### Main issues in representations:

32714, 32852, 33019, 33113, 33729, 33821, 32889, 32953, 33262, 33637

### Support

- St. John's College, Cambridge - The Park in its wider role is seeking to ensure that a range of move on spaces for innovative firms is available.
- A - As a small business we have found that supply of small office space is relatively low.

### Object

- A, B and C: NO. New primary employment should NOT be provided in this area. Instead pure residential and local shopping/amenities are needed to redress the massive current imbalance of employment over residential.

### Comment

- Brookgate Land Ltd - The policy framework should be flexible to allow for such developments. Solutions can be then secured as part of individual applications rather than through a generic and inflexible policy approach.
- U+I Group - Generally support all of the suggested options at this stage, and would seek inclusion of corporate headquarters within category A. These options should equally be applied to proposals for meanwhile/worthwhile uses, in order to optimise economic development benefits and promote innovation at the earlier stages of the development process for NEC.
- Orchard Street Investment Management - Proposal is supported. However, a survey of the existing provision on land should be undertaken to ensure that any future development does not prejudice current businesses.
- Trinity College, Cambridge - Policy should not restrict the market. It should be flexible enough to allow for the science and tech cluster to grow.
- The site should be made an attractive option for significant research infrastructure projects in terms of conference space, lecture/presentation rooms, meeting space etc.
- Employment spaces can encompass provision of community buildings.
- D preferred as this is what is needed to make a residential area a success.

## Document Section

### Chapter 7: Employment

Issue: Approach industrial uses

Question 36: Which of the following approaches should the AAP take to existing industrial uses in the North East Cambridge area?

A - seek to relocate industrial uses away from the North East Cambridge area?

B - seek innovative approaches to supporting uses on site as part of a mixed-use City District?

## Representations received:

Support: 0 Object: 0 Comment: 11

Total: 11

## Main issues in representations:

32551, 32715, 32766, 32955, 33029, 33464, 33563, 33638, 33771, 33780, 33823

## Support

- None.

## Object

- None.

## Comment

- Trinity College, Cambridge – A need to retain a world class science and technology sector dictates that employment space should be strictly in this sector or ancillary to support it.
- Veolia and Turnstone Estates/Ridgeons Timber & Builders Merchants & Turnstone Estates - Existing industrial uses within the area are important to the Cambridge economy. If the uses are to remain in situ, consideration needs to be given to the compatibility with adjoining future uses such as residential.
- U+I Group PLC - This is dependent on Housing Infrastructure Funding to relocate the WTC and implications of potentially relocating existing businesses on mixed use capabilities. Capacity testing and Master planning will need to identify what uses (and how much) will be appropriate.
- Environment Agency - There is no apparent substantive appraisal of the issues, options and impacts of relocating Milton WRC itself. Our advice is very clearly that the impact of relocation is potentially highly significant, and also features cumulative effects with other projects, such as Waterbeach New Town. A SEA/SA should address this.
- Orchard Street Investment Management - This area, including the Science Park can accommodate a variety of complementary business uses and

skillsets. To lose these would alter the character of the area significantly and alienate a large proportion of the local workforce.

- A is vastly better. Industrial uses should be relocated to places where there is already an excess of residential over employment provision, in order to reduce need to travel and HGV traffic. Some uses (the bus depot) may need to remain to enable smooth running of city.
- Integrate industries, keeping the employment near the residential areas to make walking and cycling to work much more possible. Moving work out of the city encourages people to drive to them!

## Document Section

Chapter 7: Employment

Issue: Approach industrial uses

Question 37: Are there particular uses that should be retained in the area or moved elsewhere?

## Representations received:

Support: 0 Object: 6 Comment: 10

Total: 16

## Main issues in representations:

32552, 32957, 33377, 33564, 33639, 33772, 33822, 33186, 33203, 33221, 33315, 33412, 33485, NECIO107, NECIO108, NECIO109

## Support

- None.

## Object

- Specifically, do not wish to have existing business sites pushed out of the area, as their location allows them to thrive.

## Comment

- Trinity College, Cambridge – To strengthen and retain the strong innovative identity, uses should remain with the science and technology sector with ancillary uses only as a support function.
- U+I Group - See response to question 36. The AAP should set out the strategy for determining the needs of individual businesses (and whether there is an operational imperative to be closely related to Cambridge, and how the relocation of existing industrial uses can be appropriately implemented).
- Veolia and Turnstone Estates/Ridgeons Timber & Builders Merchants & Turnstone Estates – Our business location is integral to its operation. If the industrial uses are to remain in situ, careful consideration does need to be given to the compatibility with adjoining uses such as residential.
- Railway sidings should be retained for future needs.

- Any sites with heavy industrial traffic should be moved elsewhere.
- Smaller businesses with less need for use of motor traffic should stay or be moved next to the A14, facilitated by a new road connecting Milton Road to the A14 junction.
- The bus depot may need to stay but should be redesigned (and the buses should be low-carbon, cleaner models).
- If industrial uses remain on the site create a new access directly to Milton Road and remove access for HGV traffic away from Green End Road/ Nuffield Road. This will improve pedestrian safety and reduce HGV journey times.

## Document Section

Chapter 9: Housing

Issue: Housing mix

Question 38: Should the AAP require a mix of dwelling sizes and in particular, some family sized housing?

## Representations received:

Support: 8 Object: 1 Comment: 11

Total: 20

## Main issues in representations:

32594, 32628, 32645, 32694, 32767, 32927, 33119, 33579, 33640, 33824, 32553, 32575, 32854, 32959, 33108, 33378, 33730, 32716, NECIO110, NECIO111

## Support

- Trinity College, Cambridge – **Support** this approach.
- Brookgate Land Ltd – A mix of dwelling sizes including purpose built private rented sector housing supported to enable amount and variety of land to come forward as per government objectives to meet diverse needs.
- Crime Prevention Design Team Cambridgeshire – Ask to be part of project advising on designing out crime in regard to all types of housing, especially affordable and key worker accommodation.
- A mix of sizes and family units is essential to achieve a balanced stable community. Affordable family housing is in short supply in the area, as are local employment opportunities. A mix will rebalance.

## Object

- Provision of a mix of dwelling sizes is appropriate but limited to a maximum of one family overlying each area of ground, i.e. NOT multi storey blocks of flats.

## Comment

- U+I Group PLC – Due to density and resident base, traditional approaches to housing in Cambridge are unlikely to be appropriate. A much wider market

but smaller housing is needed. Demand, market trend and viability will direct final policy.

- Cambridge Past, Present & Future - Flexibility needed in policy to ensure changes in trends to housing and size of commercial properties can be accommodated.
- Milton Road Residents' Association and Hurst Park Estate Residents' Association – Scale is underplayed in the proposals and the resulting mix will produce a range of issues that need to be addressed prior to development.
- Housing provision should be matched to existing and future employees as live-and-work area aspirations have significant weight. Small, cheap, properties may be attractive to, and provide an affordable option for some workers in the area.
- Cambridge has plenty of flats. Family sized housing is essential!
- Intensification will prevent sprawl.
- The AAP should provide a mix of housing types and tenures over the site, and the provision of outdoor space.

## Document Section

Chapter 9: Housing

Issue: Housing mix

Question 39: Should the AAP seek provision for housing for essential local workers and/or specific housing provided by employers (i.e. tethered accommodation outside of any affordable housing contribution)?

## Representations received:

Support: 9 Object: 0 Comment: 3

Total: 12

## Main issues in representations:

33165, 33580, 33825, 32554, 32574, 32717, 32928, 32961, 33109, 33379, 33641, 33252

## Support

- Trinity College, Cambridge – Living and working in one place is supported but unclear at this stage if this should be tethered.
- U+I Group PLC – Due to density and resident base, traditional approaches to housing in Cambridge are unlikely to be appropriate. A much wider market but smaller housing is needed. Demand, market trend and viability will direct final policy.
- Crime Prevention Design Team Cambridgeshire – Ask to be part of project advising on designing out crime in regard to all types of housing, especially affordable and key worker accommodation.

- Absolutely vital and should be adhered to and enforced. Will encourage low levels of car ownership / use and commuting. No side deals for substitution with student accommodation etc.

#### Object

- St. John's College, Cambridge - It would be extremely difficult to deliver this. A housing developer would resist restrictions on occupancy as it would affect viability and ability to sell on the open market.

#### Comment

- Cambridge Past, Present & Future - New developments should be required to ensure a percentage of residential units is made available to keyworkers. These include primary (office staff) and ancillary (cleaners, etc.). This also prevents long commutes and affordability issues.

#### Document Section

Chapter 9: Housing

Issue: Affordable housing

Question 40: Should the AAP require 40% of housing to be affordable, including a mix of affordable housing tenures, subject to viability?

#### Representations received:

Support: 11 Object: 2 Comment: 9

Total: 22

#### Main issues in representations:

33135, 33351, 33513, 33547, 33642, 33731, 33785, 33826, 33851, 32555, 32595, 32629, 32646, 32718, 32855, 32930, 32960, 32962, 33111, 33380, 32891, 33581

#### Support

- Trinity College Cambridge- Matter for landowner and Council, but broadly supported as will ultimately reduce congestion.
- Milton Road Residents' Association / Hurst Park Estate Residents' Association – Need genuinely affordable housing, not based on the official definition.
- Absolutely vital and should be adhered to and enforced. No side deals for substitution with student housing/developers etc. Delete 'subject to viability' as can be argued.
- Affordable housing is key to the socio-economically inclusive vision.

#### Object

- Cambridge, Past, Present & Future – An increase from 40% to 50% of affordable units more appropriate, including a wider mix of tenancy options



and sizes of units. This must be confirmed before construction as uncertainty of budgets and costings allow 'viability' to be argued.

- Support the overall principle but danger of creating a deprived 'affordability zone'. Affordability should be spread out evenly.

#### Comment

- Brookgate Land Ltd – Subject to viability testing, the 40% requirement should be applied to the NEC AAP as a whole. Consideration should however be given to certain developments where a different approach may be required, such as discounted market rents, off-site contributions toward affordable housing provision etc. The details of this must be set out in the Section 106.
- U+I Group – Affordable mixed-tenure homes will address the chronic shortfall of affordable housing in South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City and create balanced communities. However, policy must be flexible to meet viability challenges.
- There is far too much detail presented here and no overarching vision that takes us through to 2050. Please put one simple document forward for consultation that expresses How North East Cambridge sets new standards for social/affordable housing schemes.
- Truly affordable housing, with adequate infrastructure for health, schools, shops.
- Only support proposal if there is a higher proportion of social/council rent level and affordable (this definition needs re-defining at a national level) housing to ease the local housing waiting list.

#### Document Section

Chapter 9: Housing

Issue: Affordable housing

Question 41: Should an element of the affordable housing provision be targeted at essential local workers?

#### Representations received:

Support: 8 Object: 0 Comment: 4

Total: 12

#### Main issues in representations:

33136, 33301, 33582, 33827, 32556, 32719, 32856, 32963, 33112, 33381, 33643, NECIO112

#### Support

- Trinity College, Cambridge – Success of NEC aspiration will be greater if people do live and work in the locality. Whether this needs to be allocated key worker housing is not yet clear.

- U+I Group - Generally support this suggestion, but require a more detailed understanding of housing and employment need/demand in the area before commenting on keyworker policy.
- Absolutely vital and should be adhered to and enforced. No side deals for substitution with student let/developer 'viability' etc.
- An important part of making the area socially equitable.
- The site should provide a variety of tenures to increase affordability particularly for key workers.

#### Object

- None.

#### Comment

- Cambridge, Past, Present & Future - Affordable keyworker homes will address the chronic shortfall of affordable housing in South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City and create balanced communities. However, policy must be flexible to meet viability challenges.
- Who will live there? Will the places be affordable to shop staff and cleaners, or will they only be affordable to software engineers at the Science Park?
- Support this proposal in principle, but only if there is a higher proportion of keyworker provision. We do not need another London 'commuter community' where people contribute nothing to the local economy and block accommodation from those in need locally.

#### Document Section

Chapter 9: Housing

Issue: Custom build housing

Question 42: Should the AAP require a proportion of development to provide custom build opportunities?

#### Representations received:

Support: 2 Object: 1 Comment: 3

Total: 6

#### Main issues in representations:

32557, 33583, 33644, 32857, 32964, 32695

#### Support

- Yes, this would support the innovative aims of the area, but there should be effective monitoring of the designs (e.g. new houses should be low, ideally zero carbon).
- Yes. Individuals are much better able to provide variety and interest than are large scale developers.

## Object

- No - this will result in a hodgepodge and a lack of design cohesion. It's too small a space for this. Need design integrity not more chaos.

## Comment

- U+I Group PLC - Generally support this suggestion, but greater understanding of demand, need and viability is required. Marmalade Lane should be used as a template.
- Cambridge, Past, Present & Future - This could provide an exciting dynamic within a new community.

## Document Section

Chapter 9: Housing

Issue: Houses in multiple occupation (HMO)

Question 43: Should the AAP allow a proportion of purpose built HMOs and include policy controls on the clustering of HMOs?

## Representations received:

Support: 2 Object: 3 Comment: 0

Total: 5

## Main issues in representations:

32858, 33645, 32768, 32932, 33382

## Support

- U+I Group – These shared/co-living housing opportunities can help improve variety and access to more affordable, good quality accommodation and typically incorporates shared services and facilities so can benefit both younger and older aged groups. However, again a greater understanding of demand, need and viability is required.
- This is essential to a diverse community.

## Object

- Think well designed studio flats would be better. HMOs are horrible for everyone; those who live in them as well as the rest of the area. More detail needed.
- Building large enough to be HMOs would be much better as family houses, of which there is an extreme shortage in this area.

## Comment

- None.

## Document Section

### Chapter 9: Housing

Issue: Houses in multiple occupation (HMO)

Question 44: Should the AAP include PRS as a potential housing option as part of a wider housing mix across the North East Cambridge?

## Representations received:

Support: 2 Object: 3 Comment: 3

Total: 8

## Main issues in representations:

32859, 33383, 33828, 33646, 33732, 32558, 32696, 32720

## Support

- Trinity College, Cambridge - PRS has the ability to provide secure, high quality long-term rental properties giving choice to people living within walking distance of Cambridge Science Park.
- Brookgate Land Ltd - PRS provides a means of widening housing choice for tenants, particularly those who may be renting long term, and also to deliver much needed housing within a faster timescale.
- U+I Group – This suggestion typically lends itself to earlier delivery, can be part of an affordable housing mix and may suit the needs of the adjoining employment base. Similar to HMO's, PRS development needs to be well-managed to integrate successfully. A greater understanding of demand, need and viability is required.

## Object

- It is not a good idea for an estate to be owned by one rich company/individual and rented out to people.
- PRS should be discouraged otherwise this will just drive up house prices and make it unaffordable. Of course, developers would like PRS to increase profits.

## Comment

- Recommend involving a local housing association.
- It would be disappointing to find the benefits of the area accruing to buy to let investors outside the area.

## Document Section

### Chapter 9: Housing

Issue: Houses in multiple occupation (HMO)

Question 45: If PRS is to be supported, what specific policy requirements should we consider putting in place to manage its provision and to ensure it contributes towards creating a mixed and sustainable community?

### Representations received:

Support: 0 Object: 0 Comment: 3

Total: 3

### Main issues in representations:

33384, 33647, 33733

#### Support

- None.

#### Object

- None.

#### Comment

- Brookgate Land Ltd – Keen to work with the Council to develop a PRS scheme at NEC AAP.
- U+I Group - Suggest that this needs to be considered in greater detail, including need and demand, management of facilities, services, and amenities. All should be well defined and required.
- Recommend involving a local housing association.

### Document Section

Chapter 9: Housing

Issue: Houses in multiple occupation (HMO)

Question 46: Should PRS provide an affordable housing contribution?

### Representations received:

Support: 0 Object: 0 Comment: 3

Total: 3

### Main issues in representations:

33385, 33648, 33734

#### Support

- None.

#### Object

- None.

#### Comment

- Brookgate Land Ltd - Consideration should be given to where a different approach to PRS may be required, such as discounted market rents or off-site contributions toward affordable housing provision.

- U+I Group PLC - Subject to viability, policy requirements will need to reflect the distinct economics of this tenure, such as acknowledging that a form of Discounted Market Rent is applicable. This can be managed by a non-Registered Provider and enables tenure blind blocks to be delivered by PRS operators.
- Recommend involving a local housing association.

## Document Section

Chapter 9: Housing

Question 47: What 'clawback' mechanisms should be included to secure the value of the affordable housing to meet local needs if the homes are converted to another tenure?

## Representations received:

Support: 0 Object: 0 Comment: 2

Total: 2

## Main issues in representations:

33649, 33745

## Support

- None.

## Object

- None.

## Comment

- Brookgate Land Ltd - Mechanisms should be used on multi-phased developments only where market conditions may change over the life of the project. Shorter build out programmes should not automatically be subject to claw back arrangements as they affect funding streams.
- U+I Group - Typically a profit-sharing mechanism up to an agreed cap (cap to be reflective of the affordable housing contribution possible for open market sale units).

## Document Section

Chapter 9: Housing

Question 48: What would be a suitable period to require the retention of private rented homes in that tenure and what compensation mechanisms are needed if such homes are sold into a different tenure before the end of the period?

## Representations received:

Support: 0 Object: 0 Comment: 2

Total: 2

**Main issues in representations:**  
33650, 33736

**Support**

- None.

**Object**

- None.

**Comment**

- Brookgate Land Ltd - A suitable period would be a maximum of 10 years. No compensation.
- U+I Group - We would suggest a period of 15 years with clawback. This period is proposed in the London Plan and is generally accepted by institutional investors.

**Document Section**

Chapter 9: Housing

Question 49: What type of management strategy is necessary to ensure high standards of ongoing management of PRS premises is achieved?

**Representations received:**

Support: 0 Object: 1 Comment: 2

Total: 3

**Main issues in representations:**  
33651, 33737, 32721

**Support**

- None.

**Object**

- Cannot imagine any successful strategy that will keep vast property ownership under control.

**Comment**

- Brookgate Land Ltd – As the landlord is a professional investor and management will be through a professional management company, tenants can enjoy long term stability and the benefits of a high quality and professionally managed property since the homes are purpose-built for renting.

- U+I Group PLC - Consider this should be agreed with each operator and should be brief and relevant to planning matters. This could ensure all prospective tenants are offered the option of a three-year tenancy.

## Document Section

### Chapter 9: Housing

Issue: Other forms of specialist housing, including for older people, students and travellers.

Question 50: Should the area provide for other forms of specialist housing, either on-site or through seeking contributions for off-site provision?

### Representations received:

Support: 9 Object: 1 Comment: 4

Total: 14

### Main issues in representations:

32722, 33235, 33337, 33829, 33114, 33187, 33204, 33222, 33316, 33413, 33486  
33652, 32769, NECIO113

### Support

- Trinity College, Cambridge - A deeper review is needed for what housing is required to support the local community and the current and future employees of CSP.
- U+I Group PLC – A greater understanding of demand, need and viability is required, such as a comprehensive analysis of the demographic portrait of Cambridge and its surrounding environs over the next 25 years.
- Provision should be made for travellers within the site. Travellers settled within housing require good access to their existing community. This necessitates a road link.
- Site should provide affordable student housing.

### Object

- There is more need for family housing than 1-2 bed flats.

### Comment

- Whether or not east of the Railway line is formally included in the NEC AAP, it needs mains sewage.
- Traveller accommodation would destroy any attractiveness the area might have; it is already uncomfortably close to the Fen Road area.
- Please look at the Dutch and Norwegian models for residential development, which prioritise walking and cycling over motor vehicles.
- Specialist housing for older people. Student accommodation is not appropriate for this area.



## Document Section

Chapter 9: Housing

Issue: Quality and accessibility of housing

Question 51: Should the AAP apply the national internal residential space standards?

## Representations received:

Support: 5 Object: 1 Comment: 2

Total: 8

## Main issues in representations:

33653, 33738, 32723, 32772, 32863, 32892, 33386, 33584

## Support

- As a minimum. Houses are getting far too small.
- The highest/best local and national standards should be applied with no compromises on the largest possible internal space, best direct access to private amenity space and highest standards of accessibility.

## Object

- Cambridge Past, Present and Future - Minimum is not optimum, space requirements should enable quality of life.

## Comment

- U+I Group PLC - There may be some formats where exceptions may be appropriate and smaller shared spaces are preferable (co-living formats including student and young professional accommodation, housing for 'downsizers' etc.). Expect clear requirements around the nature and quality of these spaces and encourage pilot testing.
- Brookgate Land Limited – Although space standards are optional, we are committed to a PRS scheme that would be designed, constructed and managed to a high-quality standard.

## Document Section

Chapter 9: Housing

Issue: Quality and accessibility of housing

Question 52: Should the AAP develop space standards for new purpose built HMOs?

## Representations received:

Support: 3 Object: 0 Comment: 1

Total: 4

### Main issues in representations:

33654, 32770, 32724, 32894

#### Support

- Yes. If you don't, "business" needs will provide what is cheapest to build.

#### Object

- None.

#### Comment

- U+I Group PLC - All new housing should meet the Technical Housing Standards and offer adequate shared spaces to provide all homes (not just HMOs) that are fully future-proofed. Specifically developed space standards for new purpose-built HMOs may prove unnecessary or irrelevant if HMOs within the AAP are not delivered through a purpose-built type.

### Document Section

Chapter 9: Housing

Issue: Quality and accessibility of housing

Question 53: Should the AAP apply External Space Standards, and expect all dwellings to have direct access to an area of private amenity space?

### Representations received:

Support: 6 Object: 1 Comment: 2

Total: 9

### Main issues in representations:

32862, 33387, 33739, 32725, 32771, 32893, 33655, 33585

#### Support

- U+I Group PLC - We support this principle, but question whether it is realistic given the breadth and range of development envisaged. Instead, we propose a flexible approach where convenient access is given to public amenity spaces such as roof gardens and balconies as well as elements such as private gardens.
- This is absolutely essential for an area to remain attractive in the long term and for the well-being of all.
- Housing should be of a good design and build standard.

#### Object

- Cambridge Past, Present and Future - Minimum is not optimum, space requirements should enable quality of life.

## Comment

- Brookgate Land Limited – A high standard is expected throughout. External space standards could apply where the viability of development is not compromised.
- The highest/best local and national standards should be applied, so that no compromises are made away from the largest possible internal space, best direct access to private amenity space, and highest standards of accessibility.

## Document Section

Chapter 9: Housing

Issue: Quality and accessibility of housing

Question 54: Should the AAP apply the Cambridge Local Plan accessibility standards?

## Representations received:

Support: 3 Object: 1 Comment: 1

Total: 5

## Main issues in representations:

33740, 32895, 33388, 33656, 33586

## Support

- U+I Group PLC - Generally support this suggestion in principle. It is important that the Cambridge Local Plan accessibility standards offers flexibility on how these standards are achieved and allow for progressive future proofing. The current Local Plan space standards (M4(2) & M4(3)) may have an adverse impact on our scheme.

## Object

- Cambridge Past, Present and Future - Minimum is not optimum, space requirements should enable quality of life.

## Comment

- Brookgate Land Limited - All dwellings should be designed, constructed and managed to a high-quality standard. External space standards could apply where the viability of development is not compromised.
- The highest/best local and national standards should be applied, so that no compromises are made away from the largest possible internal space, best direct access to private amenity space, and highest standards of accessibility.

## Document Section

Chapter 10: Retail, Leisure & Community

Issue: Retail and leisure

Question 55: Do you agree with the range of considerations that the AAP will need to have regard to in planning for new retail and town centre provision in the North East Cambridge area? Are there other important factors we should be considering?

## Representations received:

Support: 7 Object: 0 Comment: 15

Total: 22

## Main issues in representations:

33048, 33389, 33504, 33657, 33830, 32697, 32726, 32773, 33115, 33127, 33543, 33741, NECIO115, NECIO116, NECIO117, NECIO118, NECIO119, NECIO120, NECIO121, NECIO122, NECIO123, NECIO125

## Support

- Railfuture East Anglia- Agree. Such developments should be located around the transport hubs.
- Brookgate Land Limited - This essential aspiration will require collaborative strategies between key stakeholders and will be easier to achieve on sites such as Phase 1b, where large areas can be brought forward by relatively few stakeholders, simplifying the planning and engagement process.
- Range seems good - let's focus on local businesses. Emphasis on green credentials such as zero carbon.

## Object

- None.

## Comment

- U+I Group PLC – This new 'Quarter' will require district and local centres to help support and sustain it. Non-residential uses will help create vitality and vibrancy to NEC.
- Trinity College, Cambridge - It is fundamental that there is a range of supporting facilities to create a place; a neighbourhood where people can enjoy living and working.
- NEC should not be "another indistinguishable generic local centre or shopping parade". It could be a good alternative to the City Centre for some independent retail provision with little/no national chains. This would inevitably generate people movements in offers such as leisure and entertainment as internalised trips would be higher.
- Cambridge North Station and immediate vicinity should provide a wide range of retail outlets and community (hub) facilities.
- At and in the vicinity of Cambridge Regional College increase the provision of retail and food (restaurants) outlets.
- Keen to see a wide range of shops, retail and food outlets (food carts, market area and cafe / restaurants) Waitrose/M&S, Boots, WH Smith, Sainsbury's near the train station. Some units should be available for independent local businesses. Bike repairs/hire shop. This is an opportunity to attract retailers that can't find space in central Cambridge to be based here Urban outfitters, Muji, Whole foods and Leon should be approached and encouraged to move in. Offer a discount or attractive package to entice quality and high-end

retailers. Make this area a destination for shoppers. Ikea click and collect, Amazon lockers and most importantly include a mural/public art and seating (see Granary Square London for ideas)

## Document Section

Chapter 10: Retail, Leisure & Community

Issue: Retail and leisure

Question 56: Should the Councils be proposing a more multi-dimensional interpretation of the role of a town centre or high street for the North East Cambridge area, where retail is a key but not solely dominant element?

## Representations received:

Support: 3 Object: 0 Comment: 10

Total: 13

## Main issues in representations:

32777, 33505, 33831, 32965, 33544, 33658, NECIO124, NECIO125, NECIO126, NECIO127, NECIO120, NECIO122, NECIO123

## Support

- Railfuture East Anglia – Support this element.
- U+I Group PLC – Support seeking innovative, creative and flexible solutions across the site when considering how a District or Local Centre is planned and delivered. Longer term trends (national, regional and local) relating to retail and leisure uses will need consideration.
- Retail should be a part but integrated well with other uses, particularly community centres and a library. The area should feel unique with independent shops and businesses not just a collection of coffee chains or express supermarkets.

## Object

- None.

## Comment

- Trinity College, Cambridge - There should be a flexible policy basis to allow for the best solution to be provided at that time and not unduly restrict innovation.
- Mix of retail and community facilities.
- Need child-friendly facilities, include indoors.
- Doubtful economic viability of commercial outlets that is reliant on 'internalised trip-making'.
- North East Cambridge should provide a wide range of local services and facilities including high street retail and food stores. They should be located close to existing residential areas where local residents can also benefit from these facilities. These could potentially be located along the Guided Busway which is a through corridor that existing buildings turn their back on.

- There should be a mix of high street chain stores and independent retailers, with a careful control on some uses such as takeaways. There is also the opportunity for click and collect facilities and public art.
- Development should be a more urban, mixed use development pattern rather than suburban style inward looking developments.
- More shops near to the college. The existing one is too small.
- Cambridge North Station shamefully inadequate at present. Needs proper facilities for passengers, especially more than a Costa coffee counter.
- Encouraging shops, cafes etc to this area would bring more of a community spirit to the area. There is nowhere to socialise in this area.

## Document Section

Chapter 10: Retail, Leisure & Community

Issue: Community facilities

Question 57: What community facilities are particularly needed in the North East Cambridge area?

## Representations received:

Support: 5 Object: 3 Comment: 46

Total: 55

## Main issues in representations:

32564, 32774, 32778, 32868, 32934, 33051, 33121, 33128, 33137, 33139, 33188, 33206, 33223, 33236, 33238, 33242, 33302, 33317, 33349, 33350, 33354, 33357, 33390, 33403, 33414, 33420, 33427, 33442, 33447, 33476, 33487, 33511, 33548, 33597, 33659, 33742, 33832, 32596, 32635, 32649, 32966, 32967, 33444, 33515, NECIO128, NECIO129, NECIO130, NECIO131, NECIO132, NECIO133, NECIO134, NECIO135, NECIO054, NECIO123, NECIO124

## Support

- Milton Road Residents' Association/Hurst Park Estate Residents' Association – We would like a community centre as impressive as the one at Eddington. We oppose hotels due to lack of architectural quality.
- Meeting spaces such as a good local library, some cafes and community meeting points (the area is very short of these and lots of pubs have also closed in recent years), a sports facility (indoor and outdoor) and a place for cultural events.
- The North East Cambridge area should include a church.
- There should also be places to eat (including all times of day and week).
- Provision for young people (a youth centre or community centre with a youth program, outdoor places to be which may overlap with sports facilities e.g. football field or basketball court).

## Object

- A more detailed education plan is needed, including provision of a secondary school. A site for this school should be identified at an early stage.
- This development needs nurseries, schools, health centres, shopping centres, Care Homes, a small hospital with A&E, ambulance stations, police station, library, pubs, clubs, restaurants, parking facilities, parks, community centres, and many other facilities to make it a thriving and self-sustaining development not just flats and houses that will all depend on Cambridge City Centre or Milton Village and surroundings.

## Comment

- Brookgate Land Ltd - A range of community uses should come forward to create a vibrant, mixed use neighbourhood.
- U+I Group PLC - In terms of fringe community as well as the community itself where there are higher levels of deprivation, facilities will need to take account of affordability issues for those on no/low incomes. Provision will need to be informed by the NEC Community Facilities Audit. Provision of facilities should offer flexibility and multi-functional spaces.
- ESFA (Department of Education)/Histon Road Residents' Association - The forthcoming development of the site and anticipated growth requires close consideration of essential and specialised educational provision. These should allow for flexibility and be underscored with robust evidence. Funding through Section 106, CIL and other developer contribution mechanisms.
- Existing schools have no capacity and associated traffic will cause gridlock.
- Barton & District Bridleways Group - Would like to add our support for equestrian inclusion in the NEC AAP. Adequate health infrastructure (surgeries, doctors etc).
- Pooling facilities such as launderettes. This supports low-carbon living and helps support those who may not have access.
- Cambridge needs more performing venues to meet the needs of the many community theatre groups in the city and surrounding areas. A main theatre, smaller studio spaces, rehearsals rooms, workshops and a café/bar would be appropriate.
- Need a faith community space as provision in the plan is poor and this would meet the social inclusion and diversity aims.
- Use the Trumpington/Eddington models for community facilities.
- Keen that provided 'fit for purpose' community facilities accessible to all. The reality is that in a number of previous new developments this has been poorly planned and failed to provide what it could.
- Overall design/layout needs to facilitate interaction if a sense of community is to be achieved. Provide some structured activities/space and leave space

opportunities for first arriving residents to create their own and contribute to the identity of the place. Get a community worker in early on to help with this.

- Doing so will save problems developing later. Development should be led by community's needs and interests, not the developers.
- Evening economy needs considering.
- Need for parent and child friendly facilities within walking distance. Indoors and outdoors to provide year-round options. Integrated with local shops. Attached to a child-friendly cafe. Playgrounds.
- Facilities such as a community centre, a well-being hub, a secondary school and sport facilities are required within NEC. Consideration should also be given to the proposals for a Marina on the River Cam close to the site.
- Public realm considerations include benches and litter bins.
- Existing residents require improved pedestrian/cycling routes linking with Shirley School, GP surgery and other services.
- Encouraging shops, cafes etc to this area would bring more of a community spirit to the area. There is nowhere to socialise in this area.
- For the many people, local services such as food shops, doctor's surgery, primary and secondary schools, chemist etc would be necessary.

## Document Section

Chapter 10: Retail, Leisure & Community

Issue: Open space

Question 58: It is recognised that maximising the development potential of the North East Cambridge area may require a different approach to meeting the sport and open space needs of the new community. How might this be achieved?

## Representations received:

Support: 2 Object: 1 Comment: 7

Total: 10

## Main issues in representations:

32746, 33159, 33423, 33660, 33743, 33779, 33783, 32969, 33346, 32727

## Support

- Sport England - Support the flexible approach being advocated with regard to meeting sport and open space requirements, though formal sports facilities will need to be provided for.
- One option would be better links to CRCs sports centre and the open space at Milton Country Park.
- Some areas could be mixed use e.g. basketball hoops which also doubles as a place for music or art.
- Space with fountains and benches, performing artists and an area where children play football.



## Object

- Traditional open space provision is absolutely essential. The density proposed will be unattractive and worsen over time.

## Comment

- The Wildlife Trust BCN - Provision of green roofs, green walls and urban habitats to attract and retain wildlife while also green a dense urban quarter.
- Natural England - A development of this scale should provide open space provision including biodiversity enhancement, landscape, drainage, flood management and health and wellbeing in accordance with SANGS guidelines.
- Histon Road Residents' Association - There are few green spaces. Could there be land bought to create parkland running down to the river?
- U+I Group PLC – Solutions should be comprehensive and provide provision in and beyond the AAP boundary, facilitating greater access opportunities by walking and cycling.
- Brookgate Land Limited - A collaborative effort to produce a broad network (both within and outside of area) of connected green and open spaces which are accessible to all residents and workers in the district should be facilitated.
- Green corridor/space should form a barrier to minimise the A14, so green corridors should link with the Jane Costen Bridge and the wider area.
- Far too much detail presented here and no overarching vision that takes us through to 2050. Where exactly is the open space to be located?

## Document Section

Chapter 10: Retail, Leisure & Community

Issue: Open space

Question 59: Should open space provision within the North East Cambridge area prioritise quality and functionality over quantity?

## Representations received:

Support: 6 Object: 1 Comment: 4

Total: 11

## Main issues in representations:

32745, 32936, 33391, 33661, 32559, 32799, 32970, 33117, 33347, 33744, 32728

## Support

- Sport England - We support a flexible approach to the issue of quality over quantity, as it is essential that any new facilities are provided with good quality facilities, and there may be scope to enhance existing facilities that will meet the needs of the new residents.
- Brookgate Land Limited - The open space provision should be as efficient as possible and provide access to all residents and workers, and the spaces should be programmed at a district-wide level. Provisions of open space should be evaluated across the district and not on a parcel-by-parcel basis.
- Yes, quality and functionality much more important than quantity.

- Safe, attractive urban open space is vital. If badly designed, everyday street life then it becomes full of litter and attract criminal activity, deterring people even further.
- Design of buildings could also contribute to feeling of open space.

#### Object

- No. Quantity of open green space is absolutely essential.

#### Comment

- The Wildlife Trust BCN - Needs to be matched by off-site provision. Alternatively, inclusion of the river corridor within the AAP would mean that quantity would not have to be compromised.
- U+I Group PLC - Support both large and small-scale space with ample connections. However, a lack of supporting studies and capacity testing means we cannot cite a preference at this stage.
- Open space should prioritize biodiversity and habitat over everything else.
- Adequate quantity is essential, see Riverside Park.

#### Document Section

Chapter 10: Retail, Leisure & Community

Issue: Open space

Question 60: Should open space provision within the North East Cambridge area seek to provide for the widest variety of everyday structured and unstructured recreational opportunities, including walking, jogging, picnics formal and informal play, causal sports, games, dog walking and youth recreation?

#### Representations received:

Support: 10 Object: 0 Comment: 3

Total: 13

#### Main issues in representations:

32572, 33001, 33158, 32775, 32968, 32971, 33348, 33662, 33745, NECIO136, NECIO137, NECIO138, NECIO139

#### Support

- Sport England – Sport England supports the emphasis given to informal recreation. Our report 'Active Design' will provide a framework for maximising opportunities and should be referenced when creating the AAP final policy.
- U+I Group PLC - It will be important to ensure that all spaces within the site are fully optimised, and creative/innovative solutions should be considered to allow for flexible/multi-functional uses.
- Brookgate Land Limited - The open space provision should provide a wide variety of recreational opportunities, but it should not over provide inside the district, nor should it replicate recreational provisions easily accessed outside the district for the sake of variety.
- Green parks, tennis courts, splashpad, playgrounds.

- All should be supported, and also enclosed play areas for younger children.
- Eddington is starting to be a good example of this.
- The area should have provision for games fields and formal play for children of various age groups and the creation of new recreational areas.

#### Object

- None.

#### Comment

- Nuffield Rd Allotment Society - Recognise our site is becoming increasingly commercially valuable, which is creating anxiety on site. Assurance that our site is safe from development would be helpful.
- Woodland Trust - Natural greenspace, including woodland, should be included where possible. Woodland provides a range of benefits for local communities, including being cheaper to manage than many other forms of urban greenspace.
- Natural England - We support this principle in accordance with SANGS to provide biodiversity net gain and meet people's informal recreation, physical and mental health needs.

#### Document Section

Chapter 10: Retail, Leisure & Community

Issue: Open space

Question 61: Where specific uses are required to provide of open space as part of the development, should the AAP allow for these to be met through multiple shared use (for example, school playing fields and playing pitches for the general public)?

#### Representations received:

Support: 3 Object: 0 Comment: 2

Total: 5

#### Main issues in representations:

32747, 32870, 32972, 33663, 33746

#### Support

- U+I Group PLC - It will be important to ensure that all spaces within the site are fully optimised and creative innovative solutions should be considered to allow for flexible/multi-functional uses.
- Brookgate Land Limited - Yes, as appropriate.
- Seems like a good idea to maximise potential: school pitch during the day, other uses at the weekend.

#### Object

- None.

## Comment

- The Wildlife Trust BCN – Biodiversity can be integrated into a variety of multi-uses. There will be a need for green infrastructure provision and biodiversity offsetting off site. Including the river corridor would bring it "on-site" and increase options for providing a larger range of amenity.

## Document Section

Chapter 11: Climate change and sustainability

Issue: Carbon reduction standards for residential development

Question 62: Within this overall approach, in particular, which option do you prefer in relation to carbon reduction standards for residential development?

A - a 19% improvement on 2013 Building Regulations (the current Cambridge Local Plan standard); or

B - a requirement for carbon emissions to be reduced by a further 10% through the use of on-site renewable energy (the current South Cambridgeshire Local Plan standard); or

C - a 19% improvement on 2013 Building Regulations plus an additional 10% reduction through the use of on-site renewable energy (combining the current standards in the Local Plans); or

D - consider a higher standard and develop further evidence alongside the new joint Local Plan.

## Representations received:

Support: 6 Object: 2 Comment: 4

Total: 12

## Main issues in representations:

32560, 32939, 33140, 33587, 32604, 32650, 32898, 32974, 33664, 32597, 32636, NECIO140

## Support

- Milton Road Residents Association/Hurst Park Estate Residents' Association - A carbon reduction of 19% on current regulations is too lacking in ambition and too open to being gamed. Should be aiming at the Passivhaus standards of being almost completely insulated. After all these houses will, hopefully, still be standing in 2050 when the aspiration is for zero emissions.
- U+I Group PLC - At this stage support Option D. This is a complex area of policy setting due to the current grid decarbonisation and emerging guidance from different bodies such as the UKGBC task force, and the GLA London Plan. We therefore request development aims to be exemplar while also drawing on the most up to date emerging evidence.
- Prefer C and D.
- Option D is essential to meet the city and county's carbon targets (which should be accelerated to be met before 2050 anyway). Option A and B do not go far or fast enough.
- An air quality strategy for this area should consider innovative options to mitigate air pollution.

## Object

- None.

## Comment

- Cambridge Past, Present & Future - Prefer Option D.
- D - Planning should explicitly recognise the "Climate Emergency" and set the highest standards in sustainability and carbon emissions in developments and ensure all new housing developments are "Zero Carbon Homes". Anything that is not zero carbon will need to be retrofitted/rebuilt.
- Consider enforcing a rule to include heat exchange pumps to heat properties.
- Support at least Option C, and possibly D - all new builds should be "Net Zero Carbon" homes.

## Document Section

Chapter 11: Climate change and sustainability

Issue: Sustainable design and construction standards

Question 63: Do you support the approach to sustainable design and construction standards suggested for the AAP?

## Representations received:

Support: 9 Object: 1 Comment: 6

Total: 16

## Main issues in representations:

32729, 33253, 33456, 33465, 33747, 33833, 32598, 32637, 32651, 32900, 32975, 33160, 33267, 33665, 32561, NECIO141

## Support

- Hurst Park Estate Residents' Association/Milton Road Residents Association - Objectives need to have specific metrics which can be measured and enforced so that developers cannot exploit standards for profit (i.e. sheds as homes).
- Natural England and Anglian Water Services Ltd - Support proposals to contribute towards mitigating and adapting to climate change, including the application of sustainable design and construction standards.
- U+I Group PLC - While water recycling can be an important part of reducing water consumption, if used inappropriately it can be unsustainable. Therefore would expect to apply the highest levels of water recycling (as required by the maximum BREEAM credits for water efficiency), including an understanding of maintenance and carbon efficiency.
- Yes, high standards for sustainable design and construction are essential.
- Residential development should be built to the highest standards and supported with a local energy network. Minimum standards should be avoided.

## Object

- All good, but go beyond BREEAM excellent.
- Support many of these, but object to the idea that green roofs can be substituted for on the ground green space, and I object to the idea that most roofs should be flat. Pitched roofs, though more expensive, are far longer-lasting, much less leak-prone, and much more visually attractive.

## Comment

- St Johns College, Cambridge - Would support the minimum requirement for achievement of BREEAM 'excellent'. However, it is important that these matters are not mandatory within the AAP as there may well be particular design reasons for certain options not needing to be applied.
- Campaign to Protect Rural England Cambridgeshire and Peterborough - Climate change and water stress need to be fully considered to ensure that the proposed development is sustainable, viable and "future proof". Particular concerns from local bodies on the possible adverse effects of over extraction of the River Cam.
- Environment Agency - Consider there should be greater emphasis in this section on the importance of taking a site wide approach to integrated water management from the outset to reduce risk, rather than developers retrofitting water as an afterthought.
- Brookgate Land Limited - Yes, but the AAP needs to remain flexible in terms of any specific policy requirements in order to be able to respond to change.
- Trinity College, Cambridge - Propose policy framework allows for bespoke solutions to allow occupier or development needs to be taken into account.

## Document Section

Chapter 11: Climate change and sustainability

Issue: Reviewing sustainability standards in the future

Question 64: Do you support the proposal for the AAP to be clear that review mechanisms should to be built into any planning permissions in order to reflect changes in policy regarding sustainable design and construction standards in local and national policy? What other mechanisms could be used?

## Representations received:

Support: 4 Object: 1 Comment: 1

Total: 6

## Main issues in representations:

33834, 32562, 32976, 33268, 33666, 33748

## Support

- Anglian Water Services Ltd – Policies in the AAP should be drafted to be sufficiently flexible to allow for any future changes in national standards for sustainable design and construction standards.

- U+I Group PLC – Important to recognise that it may be necessary to reappraise the policy requirements so that the most up to date and relevant standards are applied where necessary, reasonable and practicable. Propose following guidance from charities and NGOs.
- Absolutely essential with a contract of accountability for any developer.
- Policy may change quickly in this area and this needs to be incorporated.

#### Object

- Trinity College, Cambridge/Brookgate Land Limited - Any advancing sustainable agenda should be clearly set against clear and transparent policy milestones.

#### Comment

- None.

#### Document Section

Chapter 11: Climate change and sustainability

Issue: Site wide approaches to sustainable design and construction

Question 65: Do you support the plan requiring delivery of site wide approaches to issues such as energy and water, as well as the use of BREEAM Communities International Technical Standard at the master planning stage?

#### Representations received:

Support: 5 Object: 0 Comment: 3

Total: 8

#### Main issues in representations:

32764, 33472, 33835, 33032, 33037, 33269, 33667, 33749

#### Support

- Cambridge Water - Support the inclusion in planning permissions of the BREEAM community's technical standards, and welcome engagement with the master planner to set design standards for the development.
- Anglian Water Services Ltd - A site wide approach to the application of construction standards is supported.
- U+I Group PLC - Infrastructure necessary for decentralised energy and water (including BREEAM) should be explored early on in consultation with relevant parties with a range of technologies and approaches to ensure the approach with the lowest carbon overall can be identified and supported.
- Brookgate Land Limited - Such matters can often be difficult to provide in practice for many technical or feasibility reasons; however, there should be an aspirational policy agenda around sustainability.

#### Object

- None.



## Comment

- Environment Agency - There is enormous scope for exemplar standards of water use and re-use along with SUDS where they do not present a risk to controlled waters as Anglian Water are landowners. Remedial works to contamination will need full investigation and should be a planning condition.
- Trinity College, Cambridge - Such matters can often be difficult to provide in practice for many technical or feasibility reasons. Policy therefore should be flexible to cater for individual developments and occupier requirements.
- Aim for as much renewable energy use as possible e.g. solar, wind, use of energy absorbing /converting pavements to collect energy from pedestrian footfall.

## Document Section

Chapter 11: Climate change and sustainability

Issue: Site wide approaches to sustainable design and construction

Question 66: Are there additional issues we should consider in developing the approach to deliver an exemplar development?

## Representations received:

Support: 0 Object: 0 Comment: 5

Total: 5

## Main issues in representations:

33038, 33270, 33473, 33668, 33848

## Support

- None.

## Object

- None.

## Comment

- Cambridge Water - Would welcome similar engagement to our involvement in Eddington for this development.
- Anglian Water Services Ltd - There is scope to maximise the potential for water recycling, stormwater and rainwater harvesting measures as part of the design of this development.
- Environment Agency - Integrated Water Management to tie together SUDS, GI and water use/re-use in an integrated way on site with innovative management techniques that break the usual barriers to these happening on the ground.
- U+I Group PLC - Consideration should be given to the embodied impacts of buildings and infrastructure installed opportunities to support the circular economy and embracing and supporting innovative smart-tech and infra-tech initiatives where feasible and viable to do so.



- U+I Group PLC - There are a range of options that encompass energy strategies, form and fabric, building services and energy generation and supply.

## Document Section

Chapter 11: Climate change and sustainability

Issue: Biodiversity

Question 67: What approach should the AAP take to ensure delivery of a net gain in biodiversity?

## Representations received:

Support: 1 Object: 0 Comment: 6

Total: 7

## Main issues in representations:

32748, 32941, 32998, 33392, 33448, 33588, 33670, 33161, 32563, NECIO142, NECIO143, NECIO050, NECIO051, NECIO052

## Support

- Natural England – SuDs will help enhance long term gains for specified species as well as providing a sense of place, as well as exceeding the requirements of the NPPG and Defra’s 25 Year Environment Plan. Tools such as Ecological surveys, Impact Risk Zone guidance and groups such as Natural England should be included from outset to complement, extend and connect existing habitats.
- Mature trees should be retained as they provide multi benefits.
- Existing semi-mature Silver Birch woodland and other deciduous trees/scrub on the site should be retained and enhanced.
- Re-introduction of wildflowers along the route of the Guided Busway would deliver a net gain in biodiversity and improve appearance of the area for visitors arriving by public transport.

## Object

- Creating new space for biodiversity is important but should not be used to judge positively any biodiversity destruction.
- Net gain is not a great concept. Do not use biodiversity offset as a measure. If any biodiversity is lost this must be fully transparent and responsibility for it taken.

## Comment

- The Wildlife Trust - 20% net gain in biodiversity using a recognised biodiversity accounting tool should be required. Inclusion of the river corridor would increase scope to provide more of the biodiversity offsetting requirement local to the new residents, as well as support strategic green

infrastructure provision. Urban wildlife features such as green roofs and walls, planting schemes, and building nest sites should be provided.

- Woodland Trust - Welcome the mention of trees, but would like to see the plan recognise the full range of benefits that they provide and to make a commitment to expansion of tree canopy covers.
- Cambridge Hedgehogs - Would like to meet with councillors to discuss ways in which hedgehog populations can be protected and enhanced during this development work.
- Cambridge Past, Present & Future - If it is not possible to produce a net gain for biodiversity and ecology within the development site framework, then alternative sites adjacent could be considered, especially for any mitigation. The Natural Cambridgeshire Local Nature Partnership has created a toolkit to assist developers in this.
- U+I Group PLC - The on-going uses of land indicates that it will have limited biodiversity value. It will be necessary to carry out site specific investigations on the potential suitability of habitat for protected species, and to consider mitigation. More clarity is needed. Consider increasing the amount of tree canopy cover in NEC.
- Plant and maintain trees, hedges, ditches, habitats.
- Try getting advice from the Wildlife Trust and RSPB.
- Do not let the developers tell you it's all too much hassle and too expensive as they will try to wriggle out of this.
- Go to Eddington for methods. Appoint an ecology chief for the area from the start.
- A green corridor from Waterbeach to Cowley Road is important.

## Document Section

Issue: Smart technology

Question 68: Should the AAP require developments in the area to integrate SMART technologies from the outset?

## Representations received:

Support: 2 Object: 0 Comment: 2

Total: 4

## Main issues in representations:

33836, 33669, 33750

## Support

- Trinity College, Cambridge/Brookgate Land Ltd - As a place founded on the Science and Technology sector, there should be an embracement of Smart Technologies.

## Object

- None.

## Comment

- U+I Group PLC - Important to consider preparation of a digital strategy for NEC, to seek optimum speeds for broadband/fibre, opportunities to integrate SMART technology in homes, businesses and other development.

## Document Section

Issue: Waste collection

Question 69: Should the AAP require the use of an underground waste system where it is viable?

## Representations received:

Support: 5 Object: 0 Comment: 4

Total: 9

## Main issues in representations:

33393, 33589, 33751, 33837, 32800, 32977, 33118, 33671, NECIO144

## Support

- U+I Group PLC – Rather than committing to any specific type of solution at this stage, it will be necessary to understand whether innovative systems used on other sites, (e.g. North West Cambridge), can be applied here.
- Good idea, particularly to avoid the scourge of wheelie bins being scattered all over footways. Consider providing waste collection points to minimise street clutter.
- Household waste systems to be similar to Eddington.

## Object

- None.

## Comment

- Cambridge Past, Present & Future – Before committing to any particular system, a full appraisal of facilities used at Eddington should take place.
- Trinity College, Cambridge/Brookgate Land Limited - This would be difficult to retrospectively fit to CSP, but would be more viable for new large scale development.
- Refer to Eddington for methods.

## Document Section

Chapter 12: Implementation and delivery

Issue: Phasing and relocations

Question 70: Do you agree that the AAP should prioritise land that can feasibly be developed early? Are there any risks associated with this proposed approach?

## Representations received:

Support:2 Object: 8 Comment: 3

Total: 13

#### Main issues in representations:

33020, 33672, 33838, 33254, 33752, 32944, 33189, 33205, 33224, 33318, 33415, 33488, 33590

#### Support

- St. John's College, Cambridge - It is critical that development should not be prevented in coming forward whilst the AAP is being prepared.
- Brookgate Land Limited - Land that Brookgate Land Limited control can be developed early without prejudicing the outcome of the AAP process or the achievement of the comprehensive vision for the area as a whole.

#### Object

- Will end up with isolated dwellings with none of the infrastructure needed (junction improvements, car barns, wildlife habitat, green spaces etc) so end up with a car-dominated slum before the entire place is complete. Once people move to a place and drive as first choice, they then don't change their habits later.

#### Comment

- Orchard Street Investment Management - None of the sites can be prioritised without the essential relocation of the WTC.
- U+I Group - Where landowners/developers can explain how development can be carried out in a coordinated/comprehensive manner in an equitable way using planning mechanisms (S106 etc.). We also support temporary/meanwhile uses to optimise economic and social benefits in the local area.
- Trinity College, Cambridge – Early development will support momentum in the long-term delivery of the whole AAP area and continue to provide confidence in its delivery. Early delivery of infrastructure is also supported.
- Cambridge Past, Present & Future – Only if managed by a project officer.

#### Document Section

Chapter 12: Implementation and delivery

Issue: Phasing and relocations

Question 71: Should the AAP include a relocation strategy in preference to leaving this to the market to resolve?

#### Representations received:

Support:10 Object: 0 Comment: 4

Total: 14

#### Main issues in representations:

33271, 33460, 33565, 33673, 32776, 33021, 33190, 33207, 33225, 33319, 33416, 33489, 33591, 33773

## Support

- Orchard Street Investment Management – The AAP relies on the relocation of the WTC and therefore cannot be delivered in accordance with the Masterplan without its relocation.
- Relocation within the area should be investigated in order to allow close integration with existing communities.

## Object

- None.

## Comment

- Anglian Water Services Ltd - It is essential that Anglian Water as a sewerage undertaker can continue to serve our customers both during construction and after the re-development. A relocation strategy should be clearly defined and clarified.
- Waterbeach Parish Council – Believe that the existing WTC is ideally located and expanded to include further capacity, and for the council to determine decisions rather than allow the market to resolve.
- Ridgeons Timber & Builders Merchants and Turnstone Estates - If Ridgeons are to be relocated, any new site needs to be located within Cambridge and be appropriate and viable.
- U+I Group PLC - Strategic opportunities must not be compromised by one or more parties that are unwilling to support the delivery of the NEC. Accordingly, the Councils cannot discount the possibility of using their CPO powers if required.

## Document Section

Chapter 12: Implementation and delivery

Issue: Funding and delivery of infrastructure

Question 72: Do you agree with an approach of devising a Section 106 regime specifically for the North East Cambridge area? If not, what alternative approach should we consider?

## Representations received:

Support:1 Object: 7 Comment: 1

Total: 9

## Main issues in representations:

32801, 33138, 33162, 33255, 33592, 33674, 33839, 33336, 33753

## Support

- Iansyst Ltd & Fen House Property Ltd - S106 regime should be specifically used, along with a contribution from Network Rail, to support the enhanced road bridge with the cycle and pedestrian bridge proposed to access recreational facilities.

## Object

- Brookgate Land Limited - No, it is more appropriate for individual S106 agreements which are site specific.

## Comment

- Natural England - Support a S106 regime to ensure all proposed developments across NEC contribute equitably to the provision and/or funding of all appropriate environmental infrastructure requirements.
- St Johns College, Cambridge - It will be difficult to sustain a case for S106 framework across the NEC given disparate objectives of landowners and site characteristics.
- Cambridge Past, Present & Future - S106 funds should be spread more widely to support places people use outside the site.
- U+I Group PLC - It would be reasonable to expect all development within the area to contribute towards the required infrastructure, where it benefits the AAP area as a whole rather than individual sites/landownerships.
- Trinity College, Cambridge - Agreeable to this being explored. It will, of course, be subject to the detail, but the principle is acceptable.
- It is absolutely vital that the sustainable transport infrastructure for walking, cycling and public transport be delivered prior to significant development as car-centric options will become the norm. Preferably all of the walking and cycling grid would be delivered before any development.
- Hold developers to account for decent S106 and stop letting them 'renegotiate' because they suddenly decide the development is not financially viable.

## Document Section

Chapter 12: Implementation and delivery

Issue: Funding and delivery of infrastructure

Question 73: What approach do you consider the most appropriate basis on which to apportion the cost of the infrastructure requirements arising from different land uses to ensure an equitable outcome?

## Representations received:

Support:0 Object: 0 Comment: 4

Total: 4

## Main issues in representations:

33297, 33675, 33754, 33840

## Support

- None.

## Object

- None.

## Comment

- The Crown Estate - Suggest that an effective approach would be one that is straightforward and transparent so that there is a clear apportionment of "cost" can be factored into assessments at the outset. This could comprise a tariff based approach linked to the type and amount of new development proposed.
- U+I Group PLC - We propose identifying specific infrastructure needed to meet the vision, where they should be located, establishing a cost base and appropriate equalisation formula to be levied on all new development. This could be one or a combination of a tariff and may be varied by use class. Set this out in a policy/legal framework with an appropriate indexing mechanism
- Brookgate Land Limited/Trinity College, Cambridge - At the outset, it would appear appropriate for it to be related to the amount of new floorspace provided against its use class and also based on number of and type of trips.

## Document Section

Chapter 12: Implementation and delivery

Issue: Development viability

Question 74: How should the AAP take into account potential changes over time, both positive and negative, that might affect development viability?

## Representations received:

Support:1 Object: 0 Comment: 2

Total: 3

## Main issues in representations:

33676, 33841, 33286

## Support

- The Crown Estate – Need clear review mechanisms to reflect changes in circumstances and standards over the lifetime of the AAP development. This could include, but should not necessarily be limited to, sustainability standards.

## Object

- None.

## Comment

- U+I Group PLC - This should be informed by a specific study that considers economic cycles, viability testing (whereby a reduction in S106/AH requirements are calibrated to protect infrastructure) and a robust review.
- Trinity College, Cambridge – Suggest a flexible policy framework which is not overly prescriptive.

## Document Section

Chapter 12: Implementation and delivery

Issue: Land assembly and Compulsory Purchase Orders

Question 75: Do you agree with the proposal to require land assembly where it can be demonstrated that this is necessary for delivering the agreed masterplan for the North East Cambridge area and/or the proper planning for development?

#### Representations received:

Support:7 Object: 2 Comment: 1

Total: 10

#### Main issues in representations:

33842, 33191, 33208, 33226, 33320, 33417, 33490, 33677, 32505, 33022

#### Support

- U+I Group PLC - This does not directly affect U+I. Land assembly will help to ensure the delivery of comprehensive redevelopment of NEC.

#### Object

- Trinity College, Cambridge - This would not be supported in CSP because all matters should be achieved through discussion given there is strong shared ambition.
- Orchard Street Investment Management – Many of the current businesses could be left without premises due to the lack of alternative industrial and other business premises within the City. This could also then result in the closure of and loss of employment for local residents.

#### Comment

- None.

#### Document Section

Chapter 12: Implementation and delivery

Issue: Land assembly and Compulsory Purchase Orders

Question 76: Should the AAP state that the Councils will consider use of their Compulsory Purchase powers? If so, should the AAP also set out the circumstances under which this would be appropriate?

#### Representations received:

Support:8 Object: 3 Comment: 4

Total: 15

#### Main issues in representations:

33023, 33163, 33566, 33843, 32901, 33192, 33209, 33227, 33321, 33418, 33491, 33678, 32506, 32730, 33774

#### Support

- U+I Group PLC - The strategic opportunities must not be compromised by one or more parties that are unwilling to support the delivery of the NEC. Policy must specify how the Councils will use their CPO powers if required, and the



circumstances for doing so. This will need to include the viability and timescales of pursuing a CPO process.

#### Object

- Trinity College, Cambridge - This would not be supported in CSP because all matters should be achieved through discussion given there is strong shared ambition.
- Veolia and Turnstone Estates - There should be no requirement for the Council's to consider use of CPO powers and this should not be included within the AAP.
- Compulsory purchase is absolutely not justified in this setting. It is not right to think the council can buy up land they don't own.

#### Comment

- None.

#### Document Section

Chapter 12: Implementation and delivery

Issue: Joint working

Question 77: Should the Councils actively seek to facilitate joint working between the various landowners/developers within the North East Cambridge area? If so, what specific matters could we target for joint working?

#### Representations received:

Support:8 Object: 3 Comment: 4

Total: 15

#### Main issues in representations:

33293, 33356, 33567, 33844, 32876, 33272, 33284, 33593, 33679, 33755, 33775

#### Support

- Anglian Water Services Ltd - This should follow on from the development of the AAP with Anglian Water and other stakeholders as outlined in the extant Local Plan.
- Cambridge Past, Present & Future - Joint working is required.
- U+I Group PLC - A joint approach will need to consider a range of issues including connectivity, infrastructure locations, parking/trip budget, smart-city coordination, delivery programmes, design principles, energy/utilities and waste etc.
- Brookgate Land Limited – Fully support, evidenced by our continued engagement.
- Also include community representation within this joint working to ensure developers don't just prioritise their own short-term economic needs.

#### Object

- None.

## Comment

- The Crown Estate - We suggest consideration is given to the appointment of a jointly funded independent lead of North East Cambridge AAP to give strategic governance, act as facilitator, to co-ordinate the preparation of joint studies, etc.
- Ridgeons Timber & Builders Merchants and Turnstone Estates/Veolia and Turnstone Estates - A coordinated approach will need to consider a range of issues including the potential relocation of the existing industrial uses including Ridgeons/Veolia.
- Trinity College, Cambridge - Joint working focussed around connectivity, sustainable transport infrastructure and public transport.
- Do not want a duplicate of the CB1 area and the broken promises from Brookgate.

## Document Section

Chapter 12: Implementation and delivery

Issue: Pre-AAP planning applications

Question 78: Do you agree with the Councils' proposed approach to dealing with planning applications made ahead of the AAP reaching a more formal stage of preparation?

## Representations received:

Support:3 Object: 0 Comment: 2

Total: 5

## Main issues in representations:

33292, 33845, 33273, 33680, 33756

## Support

- Anglian Water Services Ltd/Brookgate Land Limited - Proposals made ahead of the AAP reaching an advanced stage should be considered in the context of extant Local Plan and not watered down through the AAP process.
- U+I Group PLC - A coordinated approach is required and decisions on applications should be made against the AAP with appropriate, equitable contributions made.

## Object

- None.

## Comment

- The Crown Estate - It is important that the AAP ensures that a "first past the post" position does not arise. We would suggest that applications for development on land within the AAP area henceforth need to have regard to the draft AAP and that the Councils seek to prioritise the formulation of a regime for the delivery of infrastructure etc.

- Trinity College, Cambridge - The recently adopted Local Plan made it clear that planning applications are capable of being granted planning permission in advance of the AAP being adopted, the AAP needs to adhere to this overarching policy position.

## Document Section

Chapter 12: Implementation and delivery

Issue: Meanwhile (temporary) uses

Question 79: What types of 'meanwhile uses' should the AAP support for the North East Cambridge area?

## Representations received:

Support:1 Object: 0 Comment: 4

Total: 5

## Main issues in representations:

33274, 33681, 33757, 33846, 33594

## Support

- Cambridge Past, Present & Future - It should be a balanced mix of public benefit use and customer buy in against the requirements of a construction site.

## Object

- None.

## Comment

- Anglian Water Services Ltd – Dependent on when/where WTC is being relocated to. Analysis must be made of potential risk of odour from Cambridge WRC and the acceptability of different types of development.
- U+I Group PLC - Would not expect policy to impose any particular restriction on types of use, with meanwhile uses serving to provide early foundations for the new Quarter of innovation. A positive policy approach to obligations and planning requirements will be needed to encourage temporary/meanwhile activation.
- Brookgate Land Limited/Trinity College, Cambridge – Supportive of appropriate meanwhile uses where they add to the vibrancy of the area and its Science and Technology foundation.

## Document Section

Chapter 12: Implementation and delivery

Issue: Meanwhile (temporary) uses

Question 80: Should there be any limit on the scale of a proposed 'meanwhile use'?

### Representations received:

Support:0 Object: 2 Comment: 1  
Total: 3

### Main issues in representations:

33275, 33682, 33758

#### Support

- None.

#### Object

- U+I Group PLC – Imposing a limitation on the scale of a proposed 'meanwhile use', is contrary to its purpose and prevents optimism of site, especially if it stifles innovation and creativity.
- Brookgate Land Limited – Object to any limits.

#### Comment

- Anglian Water Services Ltd – Any limits would be dependent upon the timing of the re-development of NEC, particularly when the WTC is relocated.

### Document Section

Chapter 12: Implementation and delivery

Issue: Meanwhile (temporary) uses

Question 81: Do you think it appropriate to set a maximum period for how long a 'meanwhile use' could be in operation?

### Representations received:

Support:0 Object: 1 Comment: 2  
Total: 3

### Main issues in representations:

33276, 33759, 33683

#### Support

- None.

#### Object

- U+I Group PLC - A minimum period should be based on the need and timetable for the permanent development. A reasonable period of operation is required in order to recoup the initial capital investment.

#### Comment

- Anglian Water Services Ltd - Any limits would be dependent upon the timing of the re-development of NEC, particularly when the WTC is relocated.

## Document Section

Chapter 12: Implementation and delivery

Issue: Meanwhile (temporary) uses

Question 82: Should the AAP also include a requirement for 'meanwhile uses' to demonstrate how they will add vibrancy and interest and/or deliver on the wider development outcomes and vision for the North East Cambridge area?

### Representations received:

Support: 0 Object: 1 Comment: 1

Total: 2

### Main issues in representations:

33277, 33684

#### Support

- None.

#### Object

- U+I Group PLC - 'Meanwhile' uses are temporary in nature and an approach that seeks to make efficient use of land, in a compatible manner with surrounding uses, so should be encouraged.

#### Comment

- Anglian Water Services Ltd - It is unclear how 'meanwhile uses' as defined could demonstrate that they would contribute to the overall outcomes and vision for the re-development of the area and depends on the WTC relocation.

## Document Section

Chapter 13: General issues

Issue: Equalities impacts

Question 83: What negative or positive impacts might the proposed plans have on residents or visitors to Cambridge with low incomes or who have particular characteristics protected under the Equality Act 2010? (The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation).

### Representations received:

Support: 2 Object: 0 Comment: 19

Total: 21

### Main issues in representations:

32591, 32601, 32653, 32802, 32879, 32881, 32945, 32980, 33193, 33210, 33228, 33322, 33397, 33419, 33457, 33492, 33508, 33685, 33847, 32607, 32973

#### Support

- Restricting accessibility by car could affect elderly, disabled or pregnant people, and those with young children. Good intentions for sustainability and

inclusivity may damage community, for example by preventing elderly parents visiting residents.

#### Object

- None.

#### Comment

- Campaign to Protect Rural England Cambridgeshire and Peterborough - An inclusive approach to community development should include the deprived areas of Arbury and King's Hedges, other existing communities within the proposed AAP boundary and the villages that will sit alongside it.
- U+I Group PLC – A Health Needs and Impact Assessment, should be performed to better understand the challenges and issues faced in deprived neighbouring wards, so as to link into opportunities that will arise in NEC.
- Trinity College, Cambridge – A successful AAP should make significant positive impacts to the wider community.
- The bridge mentioned in point 6.25 "Crossing the railway line" should include road access to the north end of Fen Road. It would make a valuable positive impact on that community (a large percentage are an ethnic minority: Irish Traveller), with regards access to the emergency services, travel and employment opportunities, currently limited by the Fen Road level-crossing. Not doing this will increase division between rich and poor and breach the Equality Act.
- All the walking and cycling infrastructure must be designed to be fully accessible to people with disabilities. That includes people who use adapted cycles, tricycles, tandems or mobility scooters to get around. All pathways and cycleways must be designed with parameters that are feasibly navigated by these vehicles.
- There is very little mention of facilities and access for disabled people who cannot walk far or cycle. What are your plans to meet these needs?

#### Document Section

Chapter 13: General issues

Issue: Any other comments

Question 84: Do you have any other comments about the North East Cambridge area and/or AAP? Are there other issues and alternatives that the councils should consider? If you wish to make suggestions, please provide your comments.

#### Representations received:

Support: 5 Object: 5 Comment: 33

Total: 43

#### Main issues in representations:

##### Main Issues in reps

32496, 32580, 32613, 32731, 32732, 32883, 32946, 33120, 33122, 33141, 33145, 33149, 33164, 33241, 33278, 33345, 33394, 33441, 33450, 33461, 33463, 33514,

33545, 33549, 33595, 33601, 33686, 33782, 33852, 32599, 32630, 32647, 32978, 33283, 33303, 33402, 33506, 33697, NECIO145, NECIO146, NECIO147, NECIO148, NECIO149

### Support

- Hurst Park Estate Residents' Association/Milton Road Residents Association - The consultation needs to address the issues which are likely to be of most interest to residents such as provision of genuinely affordable housing, not the official definition.
- The Crown Estate - Supports a comprehensive approach to the planning and regeneration of the AAP area which contributes to the overall vision.
- Provide vehicle access to the area east of the railway.
- Provide for a church building within the North East Cambridge area.
- Encourage sustainable travel, but without cutting off access for those who need cars.
- Lesson can be learned from the Milton Road Project, namely developing working relationships between residents, stakeholders and the council as well as transport and traffic issues. Having someone as a resident's contact is essential.

### Object

- The local authorities have not shown that the particular transport challenges which the proposals will pose for Milton Road can be addressed or will be addressed.
- Object due to impacts on lack of clarity on how impacts on Fen Ditton and Ditton Meadows will be considered and minimised.
- Oppose building heights.
- Big mistake to omit a secondary school.

### Comment

- Historic England - Glossary - Historic Environment typo - time rather than tine. We also suggest the addition of a definition for Conservation Areas.
- Natural England - Planning positively for ecological networks, protected species and priority habitats using robust evidence will contribute towards a strategic approach for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of green infrastructure, as identified in the NPPF.
- The Crown Estate - Welcome the opportunity to become actively involved.
- Campaign to Protect Rural England Cambridgeshire and Peterborough - New WTC must not harm greenbelt, countryside, the River Cam corridor or other communities or water supply and must include suitable employment space.
- Waterbeach Parish Council - Ensure that the required upgrade of the A10 corridor and sustainable transport links between Cambridge and Ely are strategically delivered (and managed by the LA) ahead of the proposed Waterbeach New Town and NEC development should they come forward together.
- Cllr Hazel Smith - Please consider safeguarding a way to connect a foul sewer across under the railway. Inequalities in public services must not be made worse by the plans you are putting forward.

- Railfuture East Anglia - Ensure that construction materials for the development should be as far as possible be delivered to and through the modern multiuser rail freight terminal already on site.
- U+I Group PLC - Would encourage a specific section on education and health provision within the NEC, noting the different requirements of both on and off-site provision.
- ESP Utilities Group LTD (Plant Protection Team) - Have provided advice regarding utility pipeline location and management during construction.
- Close the level crossing.
- Need link from Fen Road to A14.
- Access to new site cannot be through Chesterton.
- All rests on relocation of WTC. Where is it going? Only when this is sorted can a proper consultation take place.
- Cycle paths need to be updated to include equestrians. Encourage the building of new homes immediately to meet the urgent need for housing.
- Housing stock need to be council or housing association as current policy of shared housing and new buyer incentives is only driving up the prices, increasing the London commuter distance and generating large profits for developers who contribute nothing to the local community.
- Lessons to be learned. We need to learn from the recent development at Cambourne and Northstowe of villages with limited travel links and poor-quality communities.
- The consultation was too long since the previous consultation, with documents inaccessible, too long and detailed and consultation itself too short and not well-enough promoted which prevented it to be able to be understood and considered by the public fully. Consult in an open and transparent manner.
- Very concerned about the increase of traffic this development will create.
- Build publicly accessible toilets ideally of highest standards to make areas accessible to all.
- Consider air quality with district heating schemes; if using fossil fuels do not burn in living and working areas.
- If sewage passes underneath site will there be a pumping station? What happens if pump fails? No-one should end up living/working with the smell of sewage.
- Parking controls should be in place from construction stage.
- Cycleway surfacing needs to be considered and safety in the ice and snow. Consider heating paths.
- Industries requiring lots of large lorries are incompatible with safe cycling and walking.
- Integrate art into the design using high quality materials.
- If excessive height and density is the only basis on which funding can be obtained to move the WTC, then it would be better to leave the sewage works where it is until an appropriate alternative approach can be found that is not alien to Cambridge.
- Can the required infrastructure facilities for the high number of residences be provided? It seems highly unlikely.
- More security at night.



- In the action plan there is no provision for working with communities and individuals to instil behaviour change with respect to transport use. Nor is there any indication of research into current and anticipated population, dwelling, distance and amenity mix to ensure cohesion and connectivity.
- There is the opportunity to create a bridge or underpass to Fen Road as well as improve planting in some areas.
- The existing sewage works is in a great location to deal with growth in this area.
- The local area beyond the site boundary should be improved.
- Streets and spaces should be planned so they design out crime to avoid the mistakes of CB1.

## Document Section

Chapter 14: Interim sustainability appraisal North East Cambridge AAP Issues and Options 2019

### Representations received:

Support: 0 Object: 0 Comment: 2

Total:

### Main issues in representations:

33243, 32513

## Comments

- Encourage the building of new homes immediately. Plan a site for a secondary school as part of the current sewage works land.
- "In peak periods, parts of the network frequently operate at or near capacity" should be changed to reflect a more realistic view, Milton Road, Green End Road, and Kings Hedges Road are heavily congested during peak periods and are massive sources of pollution.
- The substantial increase in vehicle traffic that will occur from having a large development built in the middle of this needs serious thought. If not, we will experience significant additional delays and frustration, with economic and health implications. The development should have little or no provision for commuting by car.

## Appendix 3

### Consultees at Issues and Options 1 (2014)

The following organisations were directly notified of the consultation on the Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan Issues and Options Report 2014 in accordance with the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 via email or by post where no email address was available (individuals are not listed).

#### Duty to co-operate bodies

Cam Health (Clinical Commissioning Group)  
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group  
CATCH (Clinical Commissioning Group)  
Civil Aviation Authority  
English Heritage  
Environment Agency  
Greater Cambridge & Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership  
Greater Cambridgeshire Local Nature Partnership  
Highways Authority  
Homes and Communities Agency  
Marine Management Organisation  
Natural England  
NHS England (The National Health Service Commissioning Board)  
Office of the Rail Regulator  
Transport for London

#### Specific Consultation bodies

Affinity Water  
Anglian Water  
Bedford Borough Council  
Bedfordshire and River Ivel Internal Drainage Board  
Braintree District Council  
British Gas  
British Telecom Network Capacity Forecast  
Cambridge Crown Court  
Cambridge University Hospital (Addenbrooke's)  
Cambridge Water Company  
Cambridgeshire Constabulary  
Cambridgeshire County Council  
Central Bedfordshire Council  
E.On Energy  
East Cambridgeshire District Council  
Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards

Essex County Council  
Fen Ditton Parish Council  
Fenland District Council  
Forest Heath District Council  
Hertfordshire County Council  
Highways Agency  
Histon and Impington Parish Council  
Homes and Communities Agency  
Horningsea Parish Council  
Huntingdonshire District Council  
Hunts Health – Local Commissioning Group  
Landbeach Parish Council  
Middle Level Commissioners  
Milton Parish Council  
Npower  
National Grid Transco Property division  
Natural England  
Network Planning National Grid Gas Distribution  
Network Rail (Town Planning)  
NHS Cambridgeshire  
NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Trust  
NHS Property Services  
North Hertfordshire District Council  
Npower Renewables  
Oakington and Westwick Parish Council  
Orchard Park Community Council  
Over and Willingham Internal Drainage Board  
Papworth NHS Trust  
Peterborough City Council  
Scottish and Southern Electric Group – SSE  
Scottish Power  
St. Edmundsbury Borough Council  
Suffolk County Council  
Swavesey Internal Drainage Board  
UK Power Networks (formerly EDF Energy Networks)  
Uttlesford District Council  
Waterbeach Parish Council

## **Councillors and MPs**

Cambridge City Council Members  
South Cambridgeshire District Council Members  
Cambridgeshire County Council Members (for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire wards)  
South Cambridgeshire Parish Councils  
Councils adjoining South Cambridgeshire District Council  
Local MPs

## Community Organisations

Advisory Council for the Education of Gypsy and other Travellers  
Age Concern Cambridgeshire  
Age UK Cambridgeshire  
British Romany Union  
Brown's Field Community Centre  
Cambridge Citizens Advice Bureau  
Cambridge Council for Voluntary Service  
Cambridge Ethnic Community Forum  
Cambridge Federation of Residents' Associations – FECRA  
Cambridge Forum for Disabled People  
Cambridge GET Group  
Cambridge Interfaith Group  
Cambridgeshire Acre  
Cambridgeshire Community Foundation  
Cambridgeshire Ecumenical Council  
Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum  
Cambridgeshire Older Peoples Enterprise (COPE)  
Cambridgeshire Race Equality and Diversity Service  
Cam-Mind  
Disability Cambridgeshire  
Disability Panel  
East of England Faiths Council  
Ely Diocesan Board  
Encompass Network  
EQIA Panels  
Equalities Panel  
Fen Road Community Group  
FFT Planning  
Friends, families and Travellers Community Base  
Irish Traveller Movement in Britain – Traveller reform project  
MENTER  
Milton Community Centre  
National Association of Health Workers with Travellers  
National Association of Teachers of Travellers  
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups  
National Romany Rights Association  
National Travellers Action Group  
Ormiston Children's and Family Trust  
Romany Institute  
Smith Fen Residents Association  
The Amusement Catering Equipment Society (ACES)  
The Association of Circus Proprietors  
The Association of Independent Showmen (AIS)  
The Church of England Ely Diocese  
The COVER Group  
The East Anglian Gypsy Council  
The GET Group  
The Gypsy and Traveller Law Reform Coalition

The Gypsy Council (GCECWCR)  
The Showman's Guild of Great Britain  
The Society of Independent Roundabout Proprietors  
The Traveller Law Reform Project  
The Traveller Movement  
Traveller Solidarity Network  
Work Advice Volunteering Education Training (WAVET)

### **Environmental Groups**

Cam Valley Forum  
Cambridge Carbon Footprint  
Cambridge Friends of the Earth  
Cambridge Past, Present and Future  
Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum  
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)  
Conservators of the River Cam  
Countryside Restoration Trust  
Forestry Commission  
Landscape Institute  
National Trust  
RSPB Eastern England Office  
Sustrans (East of England)  
The CamToo Project  
The Varrier Jones Foundation  
The Wildlife Trust (BCN)  
The Woodland Trust – Public Affairs  
Transition Cambridge

### **Major City Businesses and Networks**

Airport Operators Association  
ARM Holdings  
Cambridge Ahead  
Cambridge Cleantech  
Cambridge Energy Forum  
Cambridge Hoteliers Association  
Cambridge Network  
Cambridge Science Park (Trinity College)  
Cambridgeshire Chambers of Commerce  
Chemical Business Association  
Confederation of British Industry – East of England  
CRACA (Cambridge Retail and Commercial Association)  
Creative Front  
Ely Cathedral Business Group  
Encompass Network  
Federation of Small Businesses  
Freight Transport Association

Future Business  
Institute of Directors – Eastern Branch  
Love Cambridge  
Marshalls Group of Companies  
One Nucleus  
Redgate Software  
Road Haulage Association  
Royal Mail Group Ltd

## **Education**

Anglia Ruskin University  
University of Cambridge Estate Department  
Colleges of the University of Cambridge  
The Bursars' Committee  
Cambridge Sixth Form Colleges  
Cambridge Regional College  
Local Secondary Schools in Cambridge  
Local Cambridge Primary Schools

## **Local Residents Associations/Groups**

Bradmore & Petersfield Residents Association  
Cambanks Residents Society Ltd  
Cambridge Federation of Tenants Leaseholders & Residents Associations  
East Chesterton Community Action Group  
FeCRA (Federation of Cambridge Residents Associations)  
Fen Estates and Nuffield Road RA (FENRA)  
Fen Road Steering Group  
Friends of Stourbridge Common  
Iceni Homes (Hundred Houses) Tenants' Association  
Kings Hedges Neighbourhood Partnership  
Nuffield Road Allotment Society  
Old Chesterton Residents' Association  
One Hundred Houses Residents' Association  
Protect Union Land group  
Save Our green Spaces  
Three Trees Residents' Association

## **Key Delivery Stakeholders**

Ambury Developments Ltd  
Anglian Water Services Ltd  
Cambridge Business Park – The Crown Estate  
Cambridge City Council property Services  
Cambridgeshire County Council Estates Department  
Cambus Ltd (Stagecoach)

Compserve Ltd  
Coulson & Son Ltd  
Cranston Properties Ltd  
David William Poyntz Kendrick & Elizabeth Anne Kendrick  
Dencora Trinity LLP  
Friends First Life Assurance Company Ltd  
Graham Martin Dacre

### **Landowners**

Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd  
Rathbone Pension & Advisory Services (Trustees Ltd) and Anthony James  
Alexander Helme  
Santino Barresi & Antonio Barresi  
Secretary of State for Transport  
St.John's Innovation Centre (The Master, Fellows and Scholars of the College of St  
John The Evangelist in the University of Cambridge)  
Stuart James Woolley  
The Company of Biologists Ltd

### **Developers/Agents/Registered Providers**

A2 Dominion Housing Group  
Accent Nene Housing Society Limited  
Artek Design House  
Barratt Eastern Counties  
Barton Wilmore  
Beacon Planning Ltd  
Bedfordshire Pilgrims Housing Association  
Bellway Homes  
Berkeley Homes  
Bidwells  
Bovis Homes Ltd  
Brookgate  
Cambridge and County Developments (formerly Cambridge Housing Society)  
Capita Symonds  
Carter Jonas  
Chartered Institute of Architectural Technologist  
Cheffins  
Circle Anglian Housing Trust  
Countryside Properties  
Crown Estate  
DPP  
Drivers Jonas  
Estate Management and Building Service, University of Cambridge  
Flagship Housing  
Gallagher Estates  
Granta Housing Society Limited

Grosvenor USS  
Hastoe Housing Association  
Home Builders Federation  
Hundred Houses Society Limited  
Iceni Homes Ltd  
Januarys  
Jephson Housing Association Group  
Kier Partnership Homes Ltd  
King Street Housing Society  
Liberty Property Trust  
Luminus Group  
National Housing Federation  
Paradigm Housing Group  
Persimmon Homes East Midlands Ltd  
Pigeon Land  
Quy Estate  
Quy Farms Ltd  
RLW Estates and Defence Infrastructure Organisation  
RPS  
Sanctuary Housing Association  
Savills  
Skanska UK Plc  
Taylor Wimpey Developments Ltd  
Terence O'Rourke  
The Cambridgeshire Cottage Housing Society  
The Home Builders Federation  
The Howard Group of Companies  
The Papworth Trust  
The Universities Superannuation Scheme  
Turnstone Estates Ltd (c/o Januarys)  
Unex

## **Other**

Abellio Greater Anglia  
BT Open Reach New Sites  
Building Research Establishment  
Cable and Wireless UK  
Cambridge Allotment Networks  
Cambridge And District CAMRA – Campaign for Real Ale  
Cambridge Association of Architects  
Cambridge Cycling Campaign  
Cambridge Dial-a-Ride – Community  
Cambridge Federation of Tenants and Leaseholders  
Cambridge Local Access Forum  
Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust  
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Association of Local Councils  
Cambridgeshire Campaign for Better Transport  
Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service



Cambridgeshire Fire Service (Operational Support Directorate)  
Care Network Cambridgeshire  
Centre for Ecology and Hydrology Directorate  
Church Commissioners  
Country Land and Business Association  
Defence Infrastructure Organisation  
Defence Lands Ops North  
Department for Business Innovation and Skills  
Department for Transport  
Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs  
Design Council/CABE  
Education Funding Agency  
Equality and Human Rights Commission  
Fields in Trust  
Friends of Milton Road Library  
Great Ouse Boating Association  
Hazardous Installations Inspectorate  
Health and Safety Executive  
Local businesses in the Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan area.  
Milton Country Park  
Ministry of Defence  
Mobile Operators Association  
National House Building Council  
Network Regulation  
Post Office Property  
Ramblers' Association (Cambridge Group)  
Registered Social Landlords (TBD)  
Renewable UK  
Respondents to the Cambridge Northern Fringe East policies in the Cambridge City Council Local Plan: Proposed Submission 2014 and the South Cambridgeshire District Council Draft Local Plan.  
RLW Estates and Defence Infrastructure Organisation  
Shelter  
Skills Funding Agency  
Sport England (Football, Tennis, Ice Sports Associations, etc)  
Tenants and leaseholders in the Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan area including St John's Innovation Centre, Cambridge Business Park and Cambridge Science Park.  
The Linchpin Project  
The Magog Trust  
The Theatres Trust  
Travel for Work Partnership  
Travel Plan Plus for the Northern Fringe (Local Transport Plan Network)  
Visit East Anglia Ltd  
Whippet Coaches Ltd

## Appendix 4

### Consultees at Issues and Options 2 (2019)

The following organisations were directly notified of the consultation on the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan Issues and Options Report 2 in accordance with the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 via email or by post where no email address was available (individuals are not listed).

#### Duty to co-operate bodies

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group  
CATCH (Clinical Commissioning Group)  
Civil Aviation Authority  
Historic England  
Environment Agency  
Greater Cambridge & Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership  
Highways England  
Homes and Communities Agency  
Marine Management Organisation  
Natural England  
NHS England (Midlands & East)  
Office of the Rail & Road Regulator  
Transport for London

#### Specific Consultation bodies

Affinity Water  
Anglian Water  
Bedford Borough Council  
Bedfordshire and River Ivel Internal Drainage Board  
Braintree District Council  
British Gas  
British Telecom Network Capacity Forecast  
Cambridge Crown Court  
Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust  
Cambridge Water Company  
Cambridgeshire Constabulary  
Cambridgeshire County Council  
Central Bedfordshire Council  
E.On Energy  
East Cambridgeshire District Council  
Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards  
Essex County Council  
Fen Ditton Parish Council  
Fenland District Council  
Hertfordshire County Council

Highways Agency  
Histon and Impington Parish Council  
Homes and Communities Agency  
Horningsea Parish Council  
Huntingdonshire District Council  
Landbeach Parish Council  
Middle Level Commissioners  
Milton Parish Council  
Npower  
National Grid  
Natural England  
Network Planning National Grid Gas Distribution  
Network Rail (Town Planning)  
NHS Cambridgeshire  
NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Trust  
NHS Property Services  
North Hertfordshire District Council  
Npower Renewables  
Oakington and Westwick Parish Council  
Orchard Park Community Council  
Over and Willingham Internal Drainage Board  
Papworth NHS Trust  
Peterborough City Council  
Scottish and Southern Electric Group – SSE  
Suffolk County Council  
Swavesey Internal Drainage Board  
UK Power Networks (formerly EDF Energy Networks)  
Uttlesford District Council  
Waterbeach Parish Council  
West Suffolk (Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils)

### **Councillors and MPs**

Cambridge City Council Members  
South Cambridgeshire District Council Members  
Cambridgeshire County Council Members (for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire wards)  
South Cambridgeshire Parish Councils  
Councils adjoining South Cambridgeshire District Council  
Local MPs

### **Community Organisations**

Various organisations representing equality groups (age, disability, race (including Gypsy and Travellers), faith) and the wider community.

## **Environmental Groups**

Various organisations representing natural environment, wildlife, historic environment, and sustainable travel interests.

## **Major City Businesses and Networks**

Various organisations representing business interests and local businesses.

## **Education**

Various education establishments.

## **Local Residents Associations/Groups**

Various residents' associations/groups and housing associations.

## **Key Delivery Stakeholders**

Various utility/power/telecoms providers, landowners/agents/developers, registered providers, transport providers.

## **Other**

Various other organisations such as emergency services, Hazardous Installations Inspectorate, Health and Safety Executive, local businesses in the Cambridge Northern Fringe area, Building Research Establishment, Design Council, Milton Country Park, house building groups, ramblers association and Sport England.