

Summaries of Representations and Responses: Infrastructure

Summaries of Representations and Responses: Infrastructure.....	1
Infrastructure	2
I/ST: Sustainable Transport and Connectivity	9
I/EV: Parking and electric vehicles.....	17
I/FD: Freight and delivery consolidation	24
I/SI: Safeguarding important infrastructure	29
I/AD: Aviation development	34
I/EI: Energy infrastructure masterplanning	37
I/ID: Infrastructure and delivery.....	42
I/DI: Digital infrastructure.....	52

Infrastructure

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Infrastructure](#)> then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

33

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

Many respondents expressed support for the broad direction of the policies. Some respondents added caveats to their support, requesting that development is located appropriately to maximise the benefits from new strategic infrastructure and that new infrastructure receives adequate investment. Shepreth Parish Council argued that new development should fund the expansion of existing infrastructure. Natural England and the Environment Agency commented that infrastructure and connectivity improvements must be achieved in balance with the need to protect natural spaces and wildlife, ensuring that adverse impacts to the natural environment are avoided.

Some comments focussed on the relationship between national and local government. One respondent argued that discussion should take place with national government to enable Water Resources East to bring forward their timelines for infrastructure projects. Great Shelford Parish Council perceived there to be little joined up thinking between local authorities in relation to overseeing different infrastructure projects. Croydon Parish Council argued that national infrastructure policy will overshadow local policy, rendering the proposals irrelevant.

There were many suggestions to improve the policies. These sought to address perceived shortcomings on issues such as utilities to support sustainable travel and net zero, the need for improved health infrastructure, the needs of disabled people in respect of reducing car travel, the management of journeys to school and college, and broadband provision. A few respondents considered that the forecasted energy grid capacity figures were too low and would need to be increased. A few respondents considered that infrastructure should be operational before new houses were occupied.

Some respondents criticised the public transport system in Greater Cambridge, arguing that it needs to be improved to bring benefits to the area. Universities Superannuation Scheme argued that the Local Plan should recognise an integrated transport solution will take years to deliver and in the interim there should be no restrictions on existing modes of transport. One respondent questioned whether people buying new homes will necessarily be working or studying within the 30-minute walking radius. A number of respondents asked for specific traffic interventions in their area and North Newnham Resident Association asked for roads to not be destroyed when things such as bus lanes are added to them.

There were a few comments arguing against the proposed relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant on the grounds that it was functioning infrastructure. Another respondent argued that national infrastructure projects, such as East- West Rail do not align well with GCSP’s proposals. A few developers argued that that their sites were well-placed to deliver the aims of the policy and therefore the Plan should allocate their sites. One commentator argued that GCSP needed to enforce all developer obligations.

Table of representations: Infrastructure

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>General support for policy aims, including for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy I/ST seeks to deliver sustainable and inclusive communities by minimising the need to travel and reducing travel distances. • Development should be located appropriately to maximise the benefits of investment in this new strategic infrastructure, which has the ability to increase the availability and use of more sustainable modes of transport, addressing environmental impacts, and quality of life impacts of car use. 	<p>Developer or Landowners 57915 (Martin Grant Homes), 58392 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58406 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58612 (Marshall Group Properties), 58762 (Phase 2 Planning),</p> <p>Parish or District Councils 58480 (Linton PC), 59284 (Cambourne Town Council), 59703 (Central Bedfordshire Council), 60024 (Steeple Morden PC), 60100 (Guilden Morden PC)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intent to focus on planning for the right services, facilities and transport opportunities in the right place, bringing these forwards at the right times to support growth. • Investment in infrastructure. • Relationship between jobs & homes and sustainable transport opportunities. • Supports the recognition for the need to consider water, energy, digital networks, health, education, cultural facilities to support growing communities. • Policies on EV charging points and digital infrastructure in the future, to move away from carbon-based vehicles and shift to homeworking since the pandemic. • There should be support for community led projects (need to describe what form these take). 	
National infrastructure policy will overshadow local policy.	56784 (Croydon PC)
Proposals for extended bus network by Greater Cambridgeshire mayor should be abandoned.	56793 (Prof J Kirkbride)
<p>Public transport and bus systems fail to meet past or current needs and require immediate low-carbon improvements to meet projected growth, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated (electric) public transport system • Eliminating private car use • Trams • Light rail • Not guided bus ways (uncomfortable) <p>This would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce congestion • Reduce commuting times • Reduce air pollution (including CO2 emissions) and related health problems • Improve street and living environments 	59465 (S Buckingham), 56793 (Prof J Kirkbride)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be efficient, reliable, desirable and implementable. 	
There are not enough public bridges that cross the river Cam with capacity for cyclists, pedestrians, with some land privatised for College access.	57145 (North Newnham Res.Ass)
Tunnels under the City with the Cambridge Connect scheme is the only viable solution.	57145 (North Newnham Res.Ass)
Congestion issues are historical geography.	57145 (North Newnham Res.Ass)
Infrastructure and connectivity improvements must be achieved in balance with the need to protect the natural spaces and wildlife. Need to be aware of the effects on the landscape and avoid adverse impact to the natural environment (delivering net gain in accordance with Policy BG/BG: Biodiversity and geodiversity).	58480 (Linton PC), 59732 (Environment Agency), 59989 (Natural England)
A holistic approach should be adopted to consider the multifunctional possibilities that provision of new transport and utilities infrastructure provide. For example, by integrating new road or rail schemes with flood resilience measures, energy generation, and green infrastructure enhancements.	59732 (Environment Agency)
Disabled people are not considered in mentions of reducing car travel in favour of cycling and walking.	59768 (B Hunt)
No mention of transport infrastructure in Queen Edith's area.	59768 (B Hunt)
Shouldn't destroy roads by adding bus lanes, lights, gantries, new roundabouts.	57145 (North Newnham Res.Ass)
The plan fails to optimise the distribution and location of proposed housing in relation to existing rail connectivity as at Whittlesford. Refer to Grosvenor's main representations on the spatial strategy and RSC.	59184 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)
The Stapleford site is being promoted as 'good transport links' when there is one train per hour from Great Shelford Station. The connectivity problems arise from the A1307 (connecting Campus sites that are a ten-minute cycle from the village), and the lack of rail route from	57549 (Stapleford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Haverhill where employees live due to affordability of housing there. Re-opening the Haverhill train line would remove traffic created by the A1307.	
Need for a set of traffic lights at the A505 New Road exit due to being dangerous. Accidents will be inevitable with increased development.	60494 (Melbourn PC)
USS notes the ambitions of the infrastructure policies to deliver transport improvements and USS is supportive of an integrated transport solution and the benefits this will bring for the city centre. However, the Local Plan should recognise that such a solution will likely take many years to deliver and in the interim there should not be onerous restrictions on the existing modes of transport that are used to access the city centre.	58227 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Retail)
The Plan should allocate circa 8.6ha of land at Scotland Farm for the Scotland Farm Travel Hub. Information has been submitted separately through the call for sites.	58392 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58406 (Hallam Land Management Limited)
C2C is a key part of the Greater Cambridge Partnership’s sustainable transport programme. Scotland Farm Travel Hub is a key element of the C2C route. This should be recognised within the Plan and the land should be allocated.	58406 (Hallam Land Management Limited)
Cambridge East provides an opportunity to deliver transformational solutions that unlock the investment needed in transport infrastructure to fix its economic geography.	58612 (Marshall Group Properties)
The role of existing infrastructure, in particular public transport infrastructure, and the existing public transport links, should be recognised as a means of achieving sustainable growth.	58762 (Phase 2 Planning)
The Cambridge Biomedical Campus and immediate area will benefit from significant planned improvements in transport infrastructure, including from the Cambridge South Station and CSET extension. It is an appropriate,	58908 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
sustainable location for development that will provide access to new infrastructure and address deficit. Planning at scale enables the greatest opportunity to achieve modal shift and reduces pressure to existing transport networks.	
School and college journeys need to be taken into account. Cambridge to Peterborough is too slow by public transport.	58968 (A Sykes)
EWR and CSET current preferred routes do not align well with GCSP's proposals and policies and CSET does not take Addenbrookes 3 into account.	58968 (A Sykes)
There is no guarantee that those buying the new homes will be those working/studying within the proposed 30-minute walking radius.	59465 (S Buckingham)
Green Belt, City Conservation Areas, and all Historic Approach roads including: Madingley Road, Barton Road, must be protected with principles of enhance and protect in the transport strategy.	57145 (North Newnham Res.Ass)
Do not support the proposal to relocate the functioning Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant to Green Belt land. Reasons include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a good use of taxpayer's money • Infrastructure to treat the sewage is already in place and has capacity until 2050 • The proposed relocation 1.5km away will build a site that has capacity until 2050. 	58074 (Horningsea PC)
Development in the context of the local plan should benefit and expand the surrounding infrastructure and not be a burden on already overloaded waste and sewage networks in particular.	59488 (Shepreth PC)
Drainage concerns over Darwin Green 3 coming through Histon & Impington into a single award drain. There needs to be infrastructure in place before work starts.	58332 (Histon & Impington PC)
Need discussion with higher government to seek means to enable Water Resources East to bring forward the	59768 (B Hunt)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
timelines for their infrastructure project to mesh with timescales in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan.	
There is little joined up thinking when looking at the infrastructure projects for the area which various authorities are undertaking.	59198 (Great Shelford PC)
The document provides a list of new technologies but does not address the supply of utilities. The Local Plan document comments on the need for grid reinforcement but there are no comments for example in the Local Plan regarding continuing use of Natural Gas or conversion to hydrogen. Water supply and sewage handling does not appear to be considered although they are an essential part of infrastructure provision, the same is true of “green infrastructure”.	58956 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
<p>The growth assumed in the Local Plan does not explain how public services (for example in health and social care) are going to cope with the substantial projected population growth. Health infrastructure has been wrongly considered or ignored, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hospitals • Social care • NHS projects and need for securing and allocating S106 and CIL funds to deliver them • Impacts from development on healthcare requirements • Recognise statutory duty to help finance improved healthcare services through effective estate management. 	58968 (A Sykes), 59213 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)), (59465 (S Buckingham)
Infrastructure should be operational before occupation of new housing particularly needing to manage surface water runoff from hard surfaces to minimise sewage in waterways.	60064 (Steeple Morden PC), 60100 (Guilden Morden PC)
In addition, the planning authority is assuming approval will be given for transport infrastructure such as CSET, which has not yet gone for planning	59198 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
approval, which will not benefit the community of Great Shelford at all. Indeed, GSPC is opposed to the current CSET plans.	
Concern for WiFi Broadband provision. Some villages lack signal/have issues connecting which is fundamental in supporting home working and jobs, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teversham 	59243 (Teversham PC)
Need to enforce all developer obligations and not allow retrospective excuses.	59314 (M Berkson)
No clear renewable energy plans.	59465 (S Buckingham)
Concerned about forecasted energy grid capacity figures as these seem significantly too low.	59768 (B Hunt)
Electricity capacity needs to triple in the West of Cambourne. New development will have impact on already over-reliance on Little Barford power station (a gas turbine power station).	56657 (Gamlingay PC)
No comment.	57358 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

I/ST: Sustainable Transport and Connectivity

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy I/ST: Sustainable transport and connectivity](#)> then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

62

Notes

- Representation 59954 (Suffolk Council) is a duplication of rep 59555 I/ID but is relevant to this policy, so it has been pasted below.

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

Many respondents supported the policy. However, a substantial number of respondents added caveats to their support and provided suggestions to improve the policy. For example, some respondents stated that a more ambitious approach is needed, that the effects of home working need to be considered in the policy and concerns were raised about e-scooters. The full list of suggestions is listed in the table below.

Some respondents argued that the policy had omitted things such as how elderly and disabled people will be included in the design of transport routes. Some argued that the policy should focus on designing active transport routes and not the provision of car parking. Other comments emphasised the importance of integrating new developments and new communities into existing facilities and transport routes.

Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) suggested including a reference to CCC's Transport Assessment Team's guidelines for new developments. North Hertfordshire District Council asked for more data relating to Cambridge South Station due to their concerns that it could create pressures in North Hertfordshire. Suffolk Council suggested that the policy should aim to enable transport across administrative boundaries. Suffolk Council also argued that there is a need to add rail dualling to the infrastructure delivery plan. Persimmon Homes East stated that the findings from the Active Travel Toolkit must be included in viability assessments. One commentator asked for the Active Travel Toolkit to be available for consultation prior to publication.

Many developers and landowners argued that the policy’s aims will be achieved if development is directed to sustainable locations. Linked to this, many developers and landowners argued that their sites were well-placed to deliver the policy’s aims. Smarter Cambridge Transport (SCT) argued that growth in the region will lead to an increase in Park and Ride usage, but the Plan has not allocated land for this. SCT also suggested that the Plan safeguards land for infrastructure and includes a policy for planning gain to retrofit infrastructure which is missing from areas which are not reached by funding.

Gamlingay Parish Council suggested that there needs to be a cycle link between Potton and Cambourne to address the missing link in the Bedford and Cambridge route. There were a few comments criticising the location of East West Rail. Some respondents objected to redeveloping NEC on the grounds that it would increase traffic. The Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) perceived there to be a lack of joined-up thinking between Greater Cambridge’s local authorities. CPRE and a few other respondents argued that there needs to be an integrated transport plan which aligns with the Local Plan. Trumpington Residents Association stated that development should be restricted unless essential infrastructure is planned and financed. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties argued that travel hubs are incorrectly equated as Park and Ride locations.

Table of representations: I/ST: Sustainable Transport and Connectivity

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>General support for policy, including for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimise need to travel and distances • Strategy approach consistent with NPPF paras 104 & 105 • Encourages innovative and flexible solutions to internalise trips and reduce vehicle use 	<p>Individuals 57304 (A J Johnson), 57696 (J Conroy), 58887 (J Pavey), 59785 (B Hunt),</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivers sustainable and inclusive communities • Addresses community transport and connections for non-motorised users • Provides tools to start generating modal shift to sustainable modes • Support for high quality cycle infrastructure; attractively designed, covered parking for all types of cycle, plentiful parking, direct routes • Positive impact on historic environment through reduced noise, air pollution, parking, traffic and congestion • Environmental and health benefits, including reduced emissions, air quality, and climate change • Whittlesford Parkway Station improvements will deliver on aims, enabling sustainable rail travel • Welcome initiatives to reduce movements in settlements, enhance active or electric transport and easily incorporated 	<p>Parish Councils, District Councils or Government organisations 56658 (Gamlingay PC), 57459 (Huntingdonshire District Council), 57490 (ESFA – Department for Education), 59686 (Historic England), 59988 (Natural England), 60025 (Steeple Morden PC), 60101 (Guilden Morden PC),</p> <p>Landowners or Developers 57066 (C Meadows), 57088 (Shelford Investments), 57289 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial), 57434 (Mission Street Ltd), 58443 (NW Bio and Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58525 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 58605 (Endurance Estates – Caxton Gibbet site), 58620 (Marshall Group Properties), 58845 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 58849 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58919 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and private family trust), 58978 (North of Barton Road Landowners Group), 60165 (U&I PLC and TOWN), 60358 (H J Molton Settlement), 60537 (Taylor Wimpey), 60598 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site),</p> <p>Charities or Political groups 57567 (Save Honey Hill Group), 58966 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60810 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p> <p>Education Institutions 59239 (University of Cambridge)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Comments on the policy, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognise some uses (education) are justified and important despite generating trips from wider sub-region • More innovative and ambitious approach needed (GCP and CPCA) for sustainable commuting • Recognise the effects of home working • Some travel will always be necessary, facilitate sustainable travel rather than hinder it • Design to avoid rat runs through villages • Recognise travel to market towns • Support dedicated cycling and walking infrastructure but provide segregation between the two • Trials of Mobility as a Service and e-scooters raise concerns about anti-social usage • Needs huge investment in safe and permeable active mode routes and public transport to achieve modal shift away from cars • Protect existing cycle and walking routes from development during construction and upon completion • Require commitment to clean, clear, de-ice and maintain the safety, usability and accessibility of cycle and walking routes • No indication how current infrastructure will change to integrate innovative transport solutions proposed by developers. • Design should focus on active travel and public transport, not provision of car parking • More detail and clarity is needed; travel hubs, 15-20 minute neighbourhood design principles • Sequencing of delivery before occupation is critical to promote sustainable travel behaviour 	<p>Individuals 57696 (J Conroy), 57978 (D Lister), 58125 (P Bearpark), 58318 (I Butnar), 59785 (B Hunt), 60232 (H Warwick),</p> <p>Landowners or Developers 60537 (Taylor Wimpey), 60598 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)</p> <p>Parish Councils, District Councils or Government organisations</p> <p>57490 (ESFA – Department for Education), 57757 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60025 (Steeple Morden PC), 60101 (Guilden Morden PC),</p> <p>Charities, Resident Associations, or Political groups 57567 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57922 (North Newnham Residents Association), 58966 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 59043 (Cambridge cycle Campaign), 59169 (Smarter Cambridge Transport), 59244 (National Trust), 60810 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p> <p>Education Institutions 59239 (University of Cambridge),</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure new development is integrated into existing facilities and services as well as seamless connectivity • Public Transport contributions need to be used effectively and have a long term impact • Address sustainable deliveries (cargo bikes); design, space requirements • Integrate existing and new communities with public and active transport routes • Provision for low carbon, electric vehicles is also important. • No mention of the elderly and disabled in relation to design of transport routes; disability scooters, blue badge holders • Improvements needed to rural public transport and last mile congestion into City • Need to address congestion and pollution by dissuading car use • Clarity is needed on thresholds for triggering developer contributions • Enable regular bus services to travel hubs and demand centres • Consider convenient and economical end to end journeys 	
Need a cycle link between Potton and Cambourne to address the missing link in strategic Bedford and Cambridge route.	56695 (Gamlingay PC), 57796 (PC of Waresley-cum-Tetworth)
Support proposals for enhancing rights of way network for safe use by all users, particularly horse riders. Provide for carriage drivers.	56705 (British Horse Society)
This is critical	56785 (Croydon PC), 59935 (Fen Ditton PC)
Danger of tokenism on the part of developers preparing transport plans. Developers seek to maximise development footprint at expense of sustainable travel.	56792 (J Kirkbride)
Suggest reference CCC Transport Assessment Team's guidelines as to what development sizes need to do	56951 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Align Local Plan and Local Transport Plan. Need a policy which limits development unless essential infrastructure is planned and financed.	57001 (Trumpington Residents Association)
Policy aims will be achieved if development is directed to sustainable locations	57066 (C Meadows), 57088 (Shelford Investments), 57289 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial), 57304 (A J Johnson), 58443 (NW Bio and Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58525 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 58605 (Endurance Estates – Caxton Gibbet site), 58620 (Marshall Group Properties), 58806 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58838 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58845 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 58849 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58919 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and private family trust), 58978 (North of Barton Road Landowners Group), 60537 (Taylor Wimpey)
Finds of the Active Travel Toolkit must be included in viability assessments	57401 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)
Flexibility is needed to take account of long term connectivity and travel projects.	57434 (Mission Street Ltd)
Objection to redeveloping NEC; will generate increase in commuting traffic. Better location is the airport.	57498 (A Martin)
Need emphasis on preserving green spaces and value for money (references GCP scheme)	57799 (Coton PC)
By locating growth in most sustainable locations, delivers the tools to start generating a modal shift towards sustainable travel methods. Cambridge East can contribute significantly towards a holistic solution for the whole city.	58620 (Marshall Group Properties)
Pressure on A10 may be relieved by Cambridge South station, but will create pressures in North Hertfordshire; passenger throughput and access to stations. Need data to help quantify and respond appropriately.	58687 (North Hertfordshire District Council)
Expansion of campus offers significant benefit; close to existing and proposed public transport connections, encourage modal shift, reduce emissions and pressure on road network. Development will be guided by a Mobility Strategy.	58919 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Transport Evidence shows traffic is assumed to grow from 2015 baseline, contravening local transport objectives, and huge growth in Park and Ride use for which land is not allocated.	59169 (Smarter Cambridge Transport)
Safeguard land for infrastructure: alignments for new railway, sites for new stations, land for new / rerouted roads, new non-motorised user routes	59169 (Smarter Cambridge Transport)
Include a policy for planning gain (match funded) to retrofit infrastructure missing from areas funding doesn't reach	59169 (Smarter Cambridge Transport)
Currently revising Local Transport and Connectivity Plan; includes same themes, likely to be alignment in plans. Continue engagement.	59295 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority)
Prefer EWR approach Cambridge from the north	59489 (Shepreth PC)
Lack of joined-up thinking between 4 authorities; transport planning should sit with CPCA with delivery by County Council, National Highways and Network Rail as appropriate. Concerned by activities of unelected GCP and impacts of schemes. EWR route will maximise damage to countryside and poorly integrate with rail network. Desperate need for integrated transport plan for whole county and current approach will not realise one.	59592 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)
Bicycle lane and green walkways	59708 (Caldecote PC))
Please could the "Active Travel Toolkit" be available for consultation prior to publication?	59785 (B Hunt)
Need to add electrification - non diesel - zero carbon policy to this.	59839 (Dry Drayton PC)
Look forward to an integrated approach between SCDC and CCC Highways for the development and delivery of integrated sustainable transportation for pedestrian, cyclists and vehicle users.	59881 (Cottenham PC)
Look forward to more consideration of sustainable transport in rural area, including bus and cycle links to rail hubs at Waterbeach and Cambridge North, improved direct bus to Cambridge and generally better cycling connectivity.	59881 (Cottenham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Should aim to enable transport across administrative boundaries. Welcome inclusion of key links (Figure 11). Strategic transport corridor to the East; A14 and rail. Developing bus improvement strategy; seek to improve cross border connections. Local Plan policies can assist joint working.	59954 (Suffolk Council)
Infrastructure delivery plan; add rail dualling, welcome inclusion of improved bus services.	59954 (Suffolk Council)
Not expected chosen distribution will create significant impact on infrastructure in Suffolk, but ensure mitigation considers cross boundary impacts.	59954 (Suffolk Council)
Housing is planned in north and northwest but EWR to the south and not stopping at villages along the route.	60639 (D Lean)
Scale of development puts pressure on travel links to City. Development should be net reducer of greenhouse gases and cars into City, not just provide access to Park and Ride. Subsidise buses, provide for other modes. Long delivery times for large scale infrastructure projects, no immediate effects. Public transport is lifeline to some people; consider good value, single ticketing. Travel hubs are incorrectly equated to Park and Ride; suggest pilots be set up.	60810 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

I/EV: Parking and electric vehicles

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy I/EV: Parking and electric vehicles](#)> then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

37

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

A variety of organisations expressed general support for the policy. Some organisations supported the policy but suggested changes, including providing additional information about the required parking standards, providing flexibility to consider site specific circumstances, and minimising visual clutter.

Some respondents provided critical responses to the policy; North Newnham Residents Association for example wrote that there is a tension between parking provision and encouraging more sustainable modes of transport which could require improvements at the expense of cars. B Hunt questioned whether the policy is needed when the Greater Cambridge Partnership are preparing an integrated parking strategy. A few respondents, including the Home Builders Federation, asserted that electric vehicle requirements should be addressed through building regulations. A few respondents, including Smarter Cambridge Transport stated that the policy title should be amended to reflect a wider range of transport modes.

Cambridge Past and Present and Future argued that the electric grid will need an increase in capacity of local substations by around 50% to deliver the policy. Persimmon Homes East wrote that viability does not consider the upgrades to the national grid that would be required by the policy.

Some respondents provided comments specific to the cycle and mobility parking elements of the policy and included suggestions to improve the policy. Examples include using S106 monies to retrofit neighbouring communities, ensuring there is space for non-standard cycles such as e-scooters in new developments, and ensuring that new developments deliver storage for all users. Some respondents provided comments specific to the car parking elements of the policy. Examples include addressing the lack of parking for visitors and deliveries in new developments, including operational parking for logistics uses, and designing new developments in a way which will prevent parking on the pavement.

Some respondents provided comments specific to the electric vehicle elements of the policy. Examples of the suggestions include addressing the issue of charging points in public car parks and on streets, the need for more charging points at community facilities in rural areas and rapid charging points were perceived to be essential.

Table of representations: I/EV: Parking and electric vehicles

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>General support for policy, including for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future proofing car parking for electric vehicles • Provision of charging points is critical to meeting national targets • Consistent with climate change agenda at local and national levels • Welcome that parking standards provide flexibility to adapt to site specific circumstances • Developers should be required to provide extensive and inclusive cycle parking 	<p>Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations 56659 (Gamlingay PC), 56952 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 59687 (Historic England), 60102 (Guilden Morden PC)</p> <p>Landowners or developers 57438 (Mission Street Ltd), 58848 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 58921 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust), 59534 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 60599 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)</p> <p>Charities or Political Organisations 58998 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60811 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p>
General comments on policy, including:	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for flexibility to consider site specific circumstances • Need detailed, quantified standards for all sizes of development, with guidance for mixed-use developments where facilities may be shared • More detailed standards are needed for; parking and access for cycles/micromobility, car and cycle visitor parking, motorcycle parking, car club spaces, delivery bays, customised for car-free and mixed-use developments • Preparation of Supplementary Planning Guidance to address micromobility parking • Clarify what is meant by communal parking areas • Be mindful of Making Connections and proposal for congestion charging and parking within potential charging area • Need for flexibility to respond to changing travel habits and technologies • Minimise visual clutter, especially from post-mounted traffic signs, and use materials or furniture that is appropriate for the historic environment. Historic England has produced good practice guidance • Clarify the threshold for 'larger development' • Provide indicative standards, outlining the difference between urban area of Cambridge and surrounding settlements 	<p>Individuals</p> <p>58128 (P Bearpark),</p> <p>Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations</p> <p>59687 (Historic England),</p> <p>Landowners or developers</p> <p>57291 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial), 58904(Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 59534 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 60538 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd), 60599 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)</p> <p>Charities or Political Organisations</p> <p>58586 (Smarter Cambridge Transport), 58998 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)</p>
<p>Comments on the cycle and mobility parking elements of policy, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs clear minimum standards and more specific guidance • Need for flexibility to consider site specific circumstances, including public transport availability, whether an urban or rural location 	<p>56952 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 57438 (Mission Street Ltd), 57865 (Histon and Impington PC), 57977 (D Lister), 58128 (P Bearpark)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assume multiple bikes of different types per person • Space for maintenance, storage lockers, accessories • Safe & secure storage for all users • Community wide spaces for shared facilities; trailers, e-cargo-bikes • Use S106 monies to retrofit neighbouring communities without sufficient facilities • Mandate higher levels on all developments, to higher standards • Use a ratio of space per person not per bedroom • Car free developments should provide minimum 1 space per person • Space for non-standard cycles, micromobility vehicles, mobility scooters, e-scooters • Cap the proportion of two-tier parking, as not accessible to all • Provide guidance on parking; two-tier racks, access and ramps, security and personal security 	
<p>Comments on the car parking elements of policy, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of parking for visitors, deliveries • Include operational parking for logistics and warehousing uses • Need for flexibility to consider site specific circumstances • Reduce residential parking to improve financial viability; wastes land and encourages cars • Facilitate lower parking with car clubs / shared vehicles, smart parking, and safe cycling routes • Design developments to prevent pavement parking and minimise car traffic near homes, schools, gathering places • Plan for 40% short/medium trips by non car modes, comparable to Netherlands 	<p>57002 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57291 (Universities Superannuation Scheme – Commercial), 57438 (Mission Street Ltd), 57780 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge), 58128 (P Bearpark), 58175 (H Brown), 58319 (I Butnar), 60811 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide guidance on ratio of short/medium/long stay for visitors, deliveries and service providers, and controls particularly where not on public highway • Address motorcycle parking • Shared and pool car parking should have precedence in space allocation • Implement innovative and flexible solutions in existing areas as well as new developments • Design on 'need to have' rather than 'nice to have' basis to disincentivise car ownership 	
<p>Comments on the electric vehicle elements of policy, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7kW charging is slow for retail, suggest 20-75kW depending on dwell time • Address charging points in public car parks and on-street • Prioritise a network of charging points • Clarify how residential charging will work where there is no on-plot parking • Charging points for employment and retail appear arbitrary, need to be supported by further evidence • Need for flexibility to consider site specific and changing circumstances • Support provision of at least one charging point per home • Proportion of active spaces and minimum power should reflect likely length of stay • Charging infrastructure must not impact cycle and walking accessibility • Clarity needed on what active and passive charging points are • Need Management Strategy for communal charge points • Be mindful of national and local policy and technical requirements 	<p>Individuals 56683 (S Houlihane), 57977 (D Lister), 58128 (P Bearpark), 58319 (I Butnar),</p> <p>Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations 56952 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 58334 (Histon and Impington PC),</p> <p>Landowners or Developers 57438 (Mission Street Ltd), 59106 (Metro Property Unit Trust), 60538 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd),</p> <p>Charities, Resident Associations, or Political Organisations 57002 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57780 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge), 58998 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60026 (Steeple Morden PC), 60143 (Home Builders Federation), 60811 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communal points should be minimum 20kW to accommodate short term parking • Address requirements for student accommodation • Support for rural public charging points at community facilities • Rapid charging is essential • Unambitious; minimum 11kW with smart loading, easy access to 3 phase charging 	
Critically important	59936 (Fen Ditton PC)
Prevent garages being turned into living accommodation with consequent increase in on-street parking	57758 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)
Tensions between parking provision and encouraging use of sustainable modes, which need improvements at expense of cars. Car commuting should be discouraged; needs City wide parking controls.	57927 (North Newnham Residents Association)
Extend residents parking schemes to prevent commuter parking	57957 (F Goodwille)
Question why policy is needed when GCP are preparing an Integrated Parking Strategy	59786 (B Hunt)
Policy has potential to exclude vulnerable people who rely on cars from participation in aspects of society	59786 (B Hunt)
Strongly support a workplace charging levy to further disincentivise all but essential car ownership and fund eco-travel infrastructure.	60811 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Demand for fast charging in accessible locations. New EV charging stations (similar to petrol stations) need space for longer dwell times, ancillary services. Proposal for Lolworth, accessed from Bar Hill junction of A14, adjacent to site being proposed for commercial including hotel, restaurant and convenience uses.	57258 (R Cowell)
EV requirements should be addressed through building regulations with nationally set standards, policy should not conflict.	57403 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands), 60143 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Viability does not consider the upgrades to the national grid that would be required.	57403 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)
Subsidise and install EV charging points widely in existing areas as well as in new developments	57758 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 59786 (B Hunt), 59841 (Dry Drayton PC)
Needs a clear way forwards with grid reinforcement. This level of provision will require an increase in capacity of local substations by about 50%.	58998 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60811 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Installation of charging points	59707 (Caldecote PC)
Possible alternative pricing for electric vehicles could be explored to make it fairer to all sections of society.	60811 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Amend policy title to 'Parking and electric charging for cars, motorcycles, cycles and other micromobility vehicles'	58128 (P Bearpark), 58586 (Smarter Cambridge Transport)
No comment on this matter	57460 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

I/FD: Freight and delivery consolidation

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy I/FD: Freight and delivery consolidation](#)> then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section: 13

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

Many respondents expressed support for the policy, for example, the Universities Superannuation Scheme requested that the role of larger logistics, warehousing facilities and last-mile hubs are supported in the Local Plan. Huntingdonshire District Council suggested more information needs to be included to understand how unacceptable impacts to the strategic networks are to be assessed and also requested additional information to assess the impact of developments upon surrounding areas. Histon and Impington Parish Council emphasised the need for GCSP to speak to people in the logistics industry so they can gain more expertise.

Smarter Cambridge Transport (SCT) argued that the Local Plan needs to identify a logistics hub location and included possible suggestions where it could be located and requirements it needed to meet. SCT also asserted that there should be a variety of sites in different locations to provide break-out and consolidation logistic centres. I Butnar argued that cargo cycles for local deliveries and the provision of cycling logistics depots should be common across Greater Cambridge. Similarly, SCT stated that the access roads for logistic hubs should be appropriate in relation to weight and size of vehicles and non-motorised user routes should be sufficiently wide for cargo bikes to use. Endurance Estates argued that Logistical hubs will not address longer journeys by delivery vehicles because the identified need for strategic logistics floorspace will not be met and therefore their site should be allocated.

The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties requested stronger wording in the policy to support the need to move to a system of rail freight and suggested a further 'Green Line' should be established so that existing levels of road freight transport will not increase as a result development. They also proposed ensuring villages have access to freight travel hubs to lower net carbon emissions. A few developers explained how their sites could potentially deliver the aims of the policy.

Table of representations: I/FD: Freight and delivery consolidation

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
General support for policy	<p>Individuals 58321 (Isabela Butnar), 58897 (J Pavey)</p> <p>Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations 56660 (Gaminglay Parish Council), Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC),</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
	<p>Landowners or Developers</p> <p>57292 (Universities Superannuation Scheme Commercial)</p> <p>Charities or Political Organisations</p> <p>57759 (57781 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge), 60812 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties))</p>
Supportive of policy, which is felt to be particularly important for villages.	56660 (Gaminglay Parish Council)
Requests that the role of larger logistics / warehousing facilities as well as last-mile hubs are recognised and supported in the Local Plan.	57292 (Universities Superannuation Scheme Commercial)
Consideration should be given to how unacceptable impacts to the strategic networks are to be assessed to ensure a clear approach for developers and further detail would be useful for surrounding districts to assess knock-on impacts of such developments, especially in terms of congestion and carbon emissions.	57461 (Huntingdonshire DC)
It is important for planners to speak to industry about their ideas in relation to travel/freight to avoid bad planning outcomes. They asserted that Officers who have been writing the NE Cambridge Travel Plan have not spoken to industry about this issue.	57864 (Histon and Impington PC)
Would support a local delivery of hub, or edge of city collection point if it can be shown to be commercially viable.	57951 (Daniel Lister)
Logistic hub location needs to be identified in the Local Plan to ensure	58604 (Smarter Cambridge Transport)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>efficient functioning and minimisation of vehicle-milage associated with moving freight. Appropriate locations are identified as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major hubs on strategic roads • Hubs for processing rail-born freight. • Smaller hubs to serve all parts of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire villages. • Land within the Girton interchange could a prime location for the principal road-freight hub for Cambridge. 	
<p>Cargo cycles for local deliveries and the provision of cycling logistics depots should be common across Greater Cambridge area and not only in new developments.</p>	58321 (I Butnar)
<p>The comment includes further detail about how this policy should be implemented including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy depends on having land available in the right locations to create a functional hierarchy of break-out/ consolidation centres. • Site should operate around the clock. • Site should not disturb nearby residents. • Access roads should be appropriate in relation to weight, size and weight of vehicles. • Non-motorised user routes should be sufficiently wide for cargo bikes to use. 	58604 (Smarter Cambridge Transport)
<p>Support the idea for Travel Hubs set out by Smarter Cambridge Transport.</p>	60812 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Logistical hubs will not address longer journeys by delivery vehicles because the identified need for strategic logistics floorspace will not be met in Greater Cambridge's Local Plan. The respondent made a similar point to Policy J/NE and argues that Greater Cambridge is relying on other parts of the region to provide industrial and logistical premises. Policy I/FD is therefore judged to only address the 'last mile' part of the delivery chain. Therefore, the respondent requests for a specific strategic employment allocation at land at Caxton Gibbet for Class B2 and Class B8 uses.</p>	<p>58607 (Endurance Estates – Caxton Gibbet Site)</p>
<p>Want stronger wording in the policy to support the need to move to a system of rail freight and other sustainable delivery mechanisms. The Party suggests that a further 'Green Line' should be established so that existing levels of road freight transport will not increase as a result developments.</p>	<p>60812 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p>
<p>As in the case of human transport, planning should be made to account for end-to-end journeys and to provide infrastructure broad enough to lower net carbon emissions. This could be achieved by ensuring villages have access to freight travel hubs.</p>	<p>60812 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p>
<p>In relation to I/FD, it requested that the development strategy for freight and delivery consolidation includes an additional allocation at Buckingham Business Park as promoted by Cambridgeshire County Council, with the policy requirements of: Site area of 7.54 HA, provision of highways depot and associated facilities and access from Anderson Road and A1307</p>	<p>57515 (Cambridgeshire County Council as landowner)</p>
<p>In relation to I/FD, the respondent requests for a specific strategic</p>	<p>58607 (Endurance Estates – Caxton Gibbet Site)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
employment allocation at land at Caxton Gibbet for Class B2 and Class B8 uses.	
In relation to I/FD, the respondent states that land within the Girton interchange could a prime location for the principal road-freight hub for Cambridge.	58604 (Smarter Cambridge Transport)

I/SI: Safeguarding important infrastructure

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - Policy [I/SI: Safeguarding important infrastructure](#)> then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

13

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

A variety of organisations expressed support for the policy's direction. The policy was supported by the Environment Agency, who also noted that they expected safeguarding to include what is required for water infrastructure more broadly (water supply and waste), green infrastructure and biodiversity. The University of Cambridge supported the intention to continue to safeguard research at the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory at Lord's Bridge.

Anglian Water Services Ltd requested that GCSP considers safeguarding land in the next stages of the Local Plan for new infrastructure, possibly including a recognition of the need for the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plan relocation. The Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) which is linked to the Ministry of Defence, stated that Bassingbourn Barracks should be identified as safeguarded infrastructure to support its ongoing defence needs and protect it from being impacted by external development. The DIO suggested that GCSP should consider including a specific planning policy to deliver this. DIO also stressed the importance of safeguarding the airspace above Cambridge airport and keeping it free from obstruction. The DIO also noted that the Plan needs to ensure that new development does not disrupt their technical asset ‘East 2 WAM Network’ which contributes to aviation safety by feeding into the air traffic management system.

B Marshall criticised the policy for not mentioning water infrastructure and did not perceive the Lord’s Bridge Telescope to be important infrastructure. I Butnar asserted that the rail infrastructure plans are not ambitious enough and instead the policy should place a greater emphasis upon how the provision of station can help neighbouring communities thrive. Steeple Morden Parish Council suggested including disused railway lines for potential infrastructure needs.

Table of representations: I/SI: Safeguarding important infrastructure

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
General support for the policy direction and intent.	<p>Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations</p> <p>56661 (Gamlingay PC), 57760 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60027 (Steeple Morden PC), 60103 (Guilden Morden PC)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
	<p>Landowners or Developers</p> <p>60482 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)</p> <p>Charities or Political Organisations</p> <p>60813 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p>
<p>Welcome the intention to work with infrastructure providers to consider whether planned strategic infrastructure or future land should be safeguarded. This should also include land for flood storage and flood risk infrastructure which is likely to include river corridors.</p> <p>Creating extra flood storage to allow space for flood waters will be a vital component of that plan. We'd also expect safeguarding to include what is required for water infrastructure more broadly (water supply and waste) and green infrastructure/biodiversity.</p>	<p>59733 (Environment Agency)</p>
<p>Would like to consider with the Councils the merits of safeguarding land or identifying areas of search in the next stages of the Local Plan for new infrastructure including, if appropriate recognition of the need for the Cambridge Wastewater facility relocation. One consideration will be the timing and progression of the Local Plan when the relocation application is brought forward and then determined by the Secretary of State.</p>	<p>60482 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)</p>
<p>Bassingbourn Barrack should be considered for two reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ongoing operational defence needs • to protect operational defence land from being affected adversely from third party development proposed in the area. <p>To ensure that the site delivers on its defence output there will be times when further developments are required at the site. It is important for national defence that the local plan is able to support the</p>	<p>57486 (Defence Infrastructure Organisation – MOD)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
principle of such developments. The Council may consider it prudent within the new local plan to include a specific planning policy.	
No mention of water infrastructure (a finite resource).	580781 (B Marshall)
The intention to continue to safeguard research at the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory at Lord's Bridge, from the adverse effects of development, is supported.	59263 (University of Cambridge)
Don't see the Lords Bridge telescope as being important infrastructure.	580781 (B Marshall)
Rail infrastructure plans do not seem ambitious. It is not about protecting those four train stations from being negatively impacted by development, but they should be at the heart of new development, which should thrive around them.	58323 (I Butnar)
A rail station at Cherry Hinton should be open and connected to Cambridge main rail station. Other targeted locations for new developments would also benefit from enhanced rail availability. This only can be made with appropriate planning and investment.	58323 (I Butnar)
Should also include disused railway lines with potential for future use.	60027 (Steeple Morden PC)
MOD interest in the plan area is a new technical asset known as the East 2 WAM Network which contributes to aviation safety by feeding into the air traffic management system in the Eastern areas of England. There is the potential for development to impact on the operation and/or capability of this new technical asset which consists of nodes and connecting pathways, each of which have their own consultation criteria. Elements of this asset are located within and/or pass through the Greater Cambridge Local Plan area of interest.	60040 (Defence Infrastructure Organisation)
No comment.	57462 (Huntingdonshire District Council)

I/AD: Aviation development

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy I/AD: Aviation development](#)> then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

8

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

A limited number of representations were received to this policy. A few parish councils expressed general support for the policy. There were some criticisms of the policy: Cambridgeshire County Council questioned the wording of the policy, specifically the implication that aviation would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties also argued that, due to environmental concerns, the policy should support no development of the airport except under exceptional circumstances. Contrastingly, D Lister perceived the balance of the Plan to be weighted too far towards protecting other parties from aviation and does not do enough to protect airfields.

There were some suggestions to improve the policy: Imperial War Museum and Gonville and Caius College argued that the proposed policy does not consider Policy T1/5 from South Cambridgeshire's Local Plan and stated that the Local Plan needed to align with policy proposals from Civil Aviation Authority. Steeple Morden Parish Council argued that the Local Plan should recognise the need for a national network of general airfields.

Table of representations: I/AD: Aviation Development

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
General support for policy	57761 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60104 (Guilden Morden PC)
Question the wording of the policy which implies that aviation will not have a	56953 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
significant adverse impact on the environment. Specifically, it is unclear how the development could not have an adverse impact on the environment given aviation's carbon emissions.	
<p>Argue that the proposed policy does not fully consider the previous policy T1/5 which is being taken from South Camb's Local Plan. Specifically, T1/5 (1) (a), from South Camb's Local Plan highlights the economic benefits from aviation and this is omitted in the new policy</p> <p>It is therefore requested that Policy I/AD fully recognises and supports the potential economic benefits of aviation growth in assessing proposals which will also reflect NPPF 104.</p>	58026 (Imperial War Museum/ Gonville and Caius College)
Expect the Local Plan to align with revisions to CAP738 currently being proposed by CAA to enhance clarity on protection for airfields from local development.	58026 (Imperial War Museum/ Gonville and Caius College)
The Local Plan should recognise the need for a national network of general airfields.	60028 (Steeple Morden PC)
Environmental health concerns should be taken into account when deciding on housing location, i.e. Local Plan should carefully consider the decision to place houses next to airfields.	60028 (Steeple Morden PC)
Perceives that the balance of the Plan seems weighted too far towards protecting other parties from aviation and does not do enough to protect airfields from the possibility of being sold off for development.	57969 (D Lister)
No comment	57463 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Policy should support no development of the airport except under exceptional circumstances (such as replacing outdated infrastructure with safer or lower-impact alternatives).	60814 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
The Party would like to add an additional objective to future planning applications. Permission should be granted on the criterion of 'whole project' emissions	60814 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
reduction and positive ecological impacts.	
<p>MOD interest in Cambridge Airport for which Statutory Aerodrome Height and Birdstrike Safeguarding Zones have been designated. The statutory Aerodrome Height safeguarding zone serves to protect the airspace above and around aerodromes to maintain an assured, obstacle free environment for aircraft manoeuvre. This airspace is to be kept free of obstruction from tall structures to ensure that aircraft transiting to and from or circuiting the aerodrome can do so safely.</p>	<p>60040 (Defence Infrastructure Organisation)</p>

I/EI: Energy infrastructure masterplanning

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy I/EI: Energy infrastructure masterplanning](#)> then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

17

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

There were many comments expressing support for the policy. A few respondents added caveats to their support: Carbon Neutral Cambridge wanted the policy strengthened to require developers to contribute to the costs of improving the power grid and I Butnar argued that smart localised energy systems should be the new norm, no matter the size of new development and that new development provides an opportunity to bring this service to existing developments.

Some comments criticised the policy; Persimmon Homes East Midlands argued that clarification is required on the definition of an energy masterplan and the outcomes of these should be fully considered within any viability assessment. D Blake stated that the policy mentions digital systems but omits discussion of water supply, sewage, gas, and hydrogen. Metro Property Unit Trust stated that the policy only sets requirements for households and should also set the requisite non-residential floorspace threshold, including whether thresholds/exemptions for other types of applicable accommodation. Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties stated that the threshold should be based on impact, not scale. R Pargeter stated that the policy focusses on new development, but a significant increase in electric cars is likely to require grid reinforcement, especially in rural locations, even in the absence of any new site developments.

A few comments wanted to change the scope of the policy. Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC argued that the timespan for these changes should be brought forward in anticipation of new demand from new railways. D Lister stated that the plan should consider the role of a distributed grid of micro generation, not just large power station supply and substation infrastructure. Cambridge Past, Present &

Future states that there needs to be committed way forward for strategic electrical energy supply planning.

Table of representations: I/El Infrastructure masterplanning

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>General support for policy</p>	<p>Individuals</p> <p>Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations 57762 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 59937 (Fen Ditton PC),</p> <p>Landowners or Developers</p> <p>58856 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company a joint venture between Grosvenor Britain & Ireland and Universities Superannuation Scheme), 58926 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)</p> <p>Charities or Political Organisations 60483 (Anglian Water Services Ltd), 60815 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p>
<p>Support policy, but with caveats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to see it strengthened, so that developers were required to contribute to the costs of improving the power grid in order to enable widespread connections of distributed renewable power generation 	<p>57782 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge),</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Support policy, but with caveats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is there a requirement that smart grids apply to developments over 100 dwellings? The new developments are neighbouring existing residential and commercial areas, smart grids could expand to cover adjacent areas (if the 100 dwellings is what is required for e.g. efficiency purposes). • Smart localised energy systems should be the new norm, no matter the size of new development. The new development provides the opportunity to bring this service to existing developments. You should plan for cross-funding new infrastructure which could benefit existing built areas and new developments together. 	58329 (I Butnar)
<p>Further clarification is required on the definition of an energy masterplan and the outcomes of these should be fully considered within any viability assessment.</p>	57404 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands)
<p>This policy appears to be aimed at ensuring adequate energy infrastructure for new developments only. Particularly in rural locations where people will have to rely on car transport, a significant increase in electric cars is likely to require grid reinforcement even in the absence of any site developments.</p>	57602 (R Pargeter)
<p>Likely demand for future rail electrification (including east West Rail</p>	57762 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
and routes east of Cambridge should be included) so action should be taken early in the plan period.	
The plan should consider the role of a distributed grid of micro generation, not just large power station supply and substation infrastructure. By mandating and investing in micro generation on all new sites, this could potentially help meet future demands.	57963 (D Lister)
There are many comments regarding digital systems but nothing about water supply, sewage, gas -hydrogen and natural. Looks like work in progress as currently not fit for purpose.	58032 (D Blake)
No restriction should be put in place for those requiring more than the average amount of electricity. Advising how to use less power fine but some will require more than the estimated amount of power.	58336 (Histon & Impington PC)
Back-up needed. Cannot have only one type of fuel that we are not producing ourselves.	58484 (Linton PC)
The detail for energy infrastructure provision at the Campus is to be developed through the joint working process with GCSP.	58926 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)
It is good that the Local Plan recognises the need for grid reinforcement. However, whilst there is recognition of the need for strategic electrical energy	59002 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
supply planning, there appears to be no committed way forward. Without adequate power, the Local Plan will not succeed. The issue must be addressed.	
The policy sets the requirement at 100 dwellings or over. The policy should set the requisite non-residential floorspace threshold also, including whether thresholds/exemptions for other types of applicable accommodation.	59113 (Metro Property Unit Trust)
no comment	57464 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Anglian Water supports the intentions of Policy I/EI as planning for infrastructure including low and net zero options is more effective when growth is concentrated rather than dispersed. We agree with the need for the plan to identify and protect existing infrastructure locations and to provide for growth at these locations.	60483 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)
Proposal aligns with our policy, should be seen within the context of 'net reductions' for the city. Puts a community obligation on those responsible for developments that would otherwise result in an increase in emissions. The criterion should be impact not scale.	60815 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

I/ID: Infrastructure and delivery

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy I/ID: Infrastructure and delivery](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

20

Note

- Some representations included in this summary of representations table have been moved from the Homes heading as the comments were specific to infrastructure and delivery. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

Some respondents expressed general support for the policy, although a few added caveats to their support. The Wildlife Trust stated that greater emphasis should be placed on funding strategic natural greenspace and green infrastructure which needed to be delivered with explicit funding mechanisms outlined in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties stated that the policy should include penalties for not delivering on infrastructure commitments.

Some respondents criticised the policy; D Lister stated that thresholds for contribution to infrastructure should be replaced as it allows for developments to be sized just under the threshold to avoid contributions. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group stated that funding must be consistently leveraged through developer contributions for health and care services to meet growing demand.

Cambridgeshire County Council expressed a preference for contributions towards educational facilities to be sought through S106. The Education & Skills Funding Agency of Department for Education posted a substantial representation and made

many points, including their request that the Plan identifies specific sites that can deliver school places to support growth based on the latest Infrastructure Delivery Plan, that viability assessment inform options analysis and site selection in the district, and they recommend that to pass the soundness test of 'effectiveness', the Plan should ensure that education contributions made by developers are sufficient to deliver the school places required to meet the increase in demand generated by new developments.

A few respondents argued that the scope of infrastructure provided for in the Local Plan should be widened. North Hertfordshire District Council requested that GCSP shares data with them to understand the potential impact of Cambridge South Railway Station. Suffolk County Council provided a substantial representation which emphasised the importance of cross-boundary working on a number of key planning issues, such as transport and green infrastructure and the need to ensure that planning obligations can be used to mitigate impacts upon neighbouring authorities.

Table of representations: /ID: Infrastructure and delivery

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
General support for policy	<p>Individuals 59787 (B Hunt)</p> <p>Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations 59734 (Environment Agency), 59938 (Fen Ditton PC),</p> <p>Landowners or Developers 58611 (Endurance Estates), 60484 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)</p> <p>Charities or Political Organisations 59259 (National Trust),</p>
Expressed a preference for contributions towards educational facilities to be sought through S106 as this allows for cost per place to be calculated.	56954 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Greater emphasis should be placed on funding strategic natural greenspace and green infrastructure in the Local Plan.	57301 (The Wildlife Trust)
Policies such as BG/BG and BG/GI and the required strategic natural greenspaces will not be delivered without explicit funding mechanisms linked to all new development. Such mechanisms need to be developed with partners and included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to make the Local Plan sustainable.	57301 (The Wildlife Trust)
Acknowledge the preparation of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and will comment on it in due course.	57405 (Persimmon Homes East Midlands), 57465 (Huntingdonshire DC)
There is a need for more detailed assessment of the infrastructure requirements rising from the development strategy of the Local Plan. Linked to this, an Infrastructure Delivery Plan would help to ensure that new development does not create additional strain.	57465 (Huntingdonshire DC)
<p>The Local Plan should seek to identify specific sites (existing or new) which can deliver school places to support growth based on the latest Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Viability assessment should inform options analysis and site selection in the district. Site allocations should clarify requirements for the delivery of new schools, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum site area • Preferred site characteristics • Requirements for safeguarding additional land for future expansion. 	57491 (ESFA Department for Education)
It is especially important to identify and secure education sites at an appropriate value because the Department of Education's 'Basic Need' funding allocations do not factor in the costs of site acquisition.	57491 (ESFA Department for Education)
The Local Plan should, in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance, assume that applicable developments will provide both land and funding for the construction of new schools. Total cumulative cost of complying with all	57491 (ESFA Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>relevant policies should not undermine deliverability, so important education needs should be incorporated at the outset to inform local decisions about site selection and infrastructure priorities.</p>	
<p>Retaining a degree of flexibility is necessary because the need for school places can vary over time. It is recommended that the next Local Plan include the below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the application stage, specific requirements for developer contributions to increase capacity of existing schools and provision of new schools should be confirmed. • Requirements to deliver schools on some sites could change if the schools are deemed surplus to requirements. 	57491 (ESFA Department for Education)
<p>One of the tests of soundness is that a Local Plan is 'effective', relating to this there is a need to ensure that education contributions made by developers are sufficient to deliver the school places required to meet the increase in demand generated by new developments.</p>	57491 (ESFA Department for Education)
<p>Education infrastructure requirements should be set out for the plan period within an Infrastructure Funding Statement, which would be reviewed annually. This Statement should identify where anticipated CIL and/ or S106 funding should be spent on additional infrastructure needs. This Statement should also report on the amount of funding received via developer contributions and how it has been used, providing transparency to all stakeholders.</p>	57491 (ESFA Department for Education)
<p>In the Local Plan, it is requested that a reference is included explaining that developer contributions may be secured retrospectively where it has been necessary to forward fund infrastructure projects in advance of anticipated housing growth.</p>	57491 (ESFA Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>The Department is particularly interested in responding to any update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan/ Infrastructure Funding Statement, viability assessment, or other evidence relevant to education which may be used to inform local planning policies and CIL charging schedules. Linked to this, it is requested that the Department is added to the database for future consultations on relevant plans and proposals.</p>	<p>57491 (ESFA Department for Education)</p>
<p>Appropriate funding must be consistently leveraged through developer contributions for health and care services in order to meet growing demand. Request that when setting planning obligation policies that the Council seek to address strategic as well as local priorities and engage the NHS in the process as early as possible.</p>	<p>59196* (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)</p>
<p>Thresholds for contribution to infrastructure should be replaced as it allows for developments to be sized just under the threshold to avoid contributions, yet small developments still strain services. Instead, a sliding scale contribution from all developments should be adopted.</p>	<p>57965 (D Lister)</p>
<p>This area needs more thinking and consultation as it is currently vague. More thought should go into topics such as the circular economy, energy-to-waste, community zones including repair cafes and 'libraries of things' to reduce consumption.</p>	<p>58330 (I Butnar)</p>
<p>The promoted employment development by Endurance Estates at land at Caxton Gibbet would be well-related to following infrastructure proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National highways proposed A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet improvement project • Cambourne to Cambridge Better Public Transport project • Making Connections Project that identifies St Neots/ St Neots East and Cambourne/ Cambourne West as transport hubs 	<p>58611 (Endurance Estates)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East-West Rail project identified preferred options via Cambourne and station at Cambourne. <p>The proposed piece of land at Caxton Gibbet would also be consistent with the economic objectives of the plan and the principle of sustainable development.</p>	
<p>The Cambridge South railway station will possibly relieve pressures on the A10 but will create different pressures in North Hertfordshire. To address these pressures, North Herts, Hertfordshire and Great British Railways will need data from GCPS to quantify those pressures and respond appropriately to them- in terms of funding and installation of walking/ cycling infrastructure.</p>	58691 (North Hertfordshire DC)
<p>The Local Plan should include all infrastructure, including water supply, sewage handling and green infrastructure.</p>	59006 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
<p>It is important to avoid placing unnecessary pressure on existing services and places across the Local Plan area, so it is vital that the right infrastructure is provided at the right time to ensure that new development is supported.</p>	59259 (National Trust)
<p>Councillors commented that infrastructure was needed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of charging points • Bicycle lane and green walkways • Adequate community facilities • Access to mental health care was needed • Adequate community facilities • Communication infrastructure (fibre) 	59709 (Caldecote PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>As noted for Policy S/DS, the Agency support the idea of development limited to levels that can be supported by a sustainable water supply until the time the strategic infrastructure is in place. It is important that development is sustainable, and the environment is protected throughout the process of infrastructure planning.</p>	<p>59734 (Environment Agency)</p>
<p>The Agency supports the policy direction to propose only permitting development if there is sufficient infrastructure capacity to support and meet all the requirements arising from the new development. The developer has a role in delivering this within a robust and deliverable strategic framework led by the Council and other strategic infrastructure providers.</p>	<p>59734 (Environment Agency)</p>
<p>It is not expected that the chosen distribution will create significant impacts on infrastructure in Suffolk. Nevertheless, where the evidence identifies negative impacts are occurring, policies in the Plan should ensure that planning obligations can be used to mitigate impacts in neighbouring authorities. For example, rural communities in Suffolk around Haverhill are reporting increased traffic due to increased development of housing in South Cambridgeshire. Related to this, policies which require site assessments should also account for the impacts across boundaries where this is relevant.</p>	<p>59955 (Suffolk County Council)</p>
<p>In relation to the specific issue of A1207 communities, SCC officers recently met with a Villages Working Group formed to address this issue. SCC would</p>	<p>59955 (Suffolk County Council)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
encourage the Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership to continue engaging with this group, SCC and other community groups where cross-boundary impacts result from growth in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.	
Green Infrastructure is an issue which is a cross-boundary issue. Development management policies should enable the development of green infrastructure across boundaries where relevant.	59955 (Suffolk County Council)
It is recommended that the Local Plan takes a positive stance towards contributing to the aims of statutory Nature Recovery Strategies established by the Environment Act 2021. The Council are awaiting secondary legislation to specify the details of these strategies, but planning policies could take a positive stance towards them by pre-empting them.	59955 (Suffolk County Council)
The SCC Green Access Strategy (Rights of Way Improvement Plan) sets out the Council's approach to improving the rights of way network within Suffolk. The Council would welcome joint working to improve cross boundary rights of way connections.	59955 (Suffolk County Council)
The chosen spatial option to achieve net zero is supported by Suffolk. The chosen distribution, focusing additional areas of development largely near Cambridge City, is also the least likely to impact on infrastructure within Suffolk and is therefore supported.	59955 (Suffolk County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Reference to improved bus services between Haverhill and Cambridge in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is welcome. SCC is working on a bus improvement strategy but will need to work with operators and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority to deliver the strategy. The Local Plan can assist by ensuring transport policies support the provision of public transport measures which cross administrative boundaries.</p>	<p>59955 (Suffolk County Council)</p>
<p>The Council welcomes the enabling of transport across administrative boundaries which should be a key aim of Local Plans. The Council also welcomes the identification of key transport links specifically the rail links from Ipswich via Bury St Edmunds and Newmarket within the plan area and beyond. The Council also welcomes the identification of the corridor between Ipswich and Cambridge as a corridor of regional and national importance. In addition to this, the Council recommends that the dualling of the rail link to Newmarket is included in the infrastructure delivery plan.</p>	<p>59955 (Suffolk County Council)</p>
<p>Greater Cambridge is in a severely water stressed area; development should be curtailed until new water supply and sewage infrastructure is operational.</p>	<p>60029 (Steeple Morden PC), 60105 (Guilden Morden PC)</p>
<p>The need to ensure infrastructure capacity is available to serve growth underpins Anglian Water's five-year WRMP and DWMP planning process with its 25-year horizon. Anglian Water therefore considers the policy to</p>	<p>60484 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>appropriately identify the need for developers to fund infrastructure.</p> <p>Related to this, Anglian Water agrees that the funding and timing of infrastructure should be set out in an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Anglian Water notes that they work closely with developers to ensure they plan for water sector investment. For residential development this includes connections and improvements to the wastewater network.</p>	
<p>Supports policy subject to new development should not result in net increase of life-cycle emissions.</p>	<p>60816 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p>
<p>The policy should include severe penalties for not delivering on agreed infrastructure commitments. Penalties should not be factored into project costings.</p>	<p>60816 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p>
<p>In relation to I/ID, assessment of infrastructure needs should specifically include the impact of traffic from the Fulbourn Road East and Fulbourn Road West (GB3 and GB4) sites together with Cambridge East. It should also include a focus on traffic into and out of Queen Edith's Way and Cherry Hinton Road, including at the Robin Hood junction.</p>	<p>59787 (B Hunt)</p>

I/DI: Digital infrastructure

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy I/DI: Digital infrastructure](#)> then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

22

Note

- Some representations included in this summary of representations table have been moved from the Homes heading as the comments were specific to infrastructure and delivery. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

Some organisations expressed general support for the policy, with a few organisations such as Carbon Neutral Cambridge emphasising its importance. A few parish council stated that there was a need for enhancement of mobile phone coverage in villages with poor reception by well sited and suitably camouflaged masts.

Trumpington Residents Association stated that there was a need for the GCSP to ensure that the policy is properly implemented so that residents have connectivity when they move into new homes. D Lister criticised the policy, stating that the wording of the policy provides a loophole for developers and instead the policy should mandate that new developments have at least 1 gigabit per second connectivity. D Lister also stated that it should be mandated that developers supply Category 6 network points in every room in new dwellings to allow hard wiring equipment. Cambridge Past, Present & Future also criticised the policy stating that it was disappointing that developers are not required to consider gigabit connections at all sites and that Cambridgeshire needs to support the delivery of gigabit connections in areas where fibre connections are not cost effective.

A few developers asked for confirmation in relation to whether all development is required to provide a 'Connectivity Statements', or whether the policy direction is intended for major developments. If the latter, floorspace, and dwelling thresholds should be stated, to provide applicants with clarity. Some other developers argued that it is important that the eventual policy wording recognises to what degree digital infrastructure is under the control of the developer themselves as opposed to statutory bodies. Linked to this, the Home Builders Federation argued that the Council should not impose new electronic communications requirements beyond the provision of infrastructure as set out in statutory Building Regulations.

Table of representations: I/DI: Digital infrastructure

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>General support for policy including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal to increase the quality and availability of superfast broadband and mobile coverage. • Importance of this policy. • Inclusivity to the communities. 	<p>Individuals 58331 (I Butnar)</p> <p>Parish Councils, District Councils, County Councils or government organisations 57763 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 56662 (Gamlingay PC), 58338 (Histon & Impington PC), 59490 (Shepreth PC), 59712 (Caldecote PC), 59939 (Fen Ditton PC), 60030 (Steeple Morden PC), 60106 (Guilden Morden PC),</p> <p>Landowners or Developers 59535 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield)</p> <p>Charities or Political Organisations 57784 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge), 59011 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 59593 (CPRE), 60600 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site), 60817 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Need for enhancement of mobile phone coverage in villages with poor reception by well sited and suitably camouflaged masts.	60030 (Steeple Morden PC), 60106 (Guilden Morden PC)
This is essential for home working and for new settlements.	56786 (Croydon PC)
This is important for enabling a thriving low carbon economy, because it reduces the need to travel, and improves the quality of life while reducing carbon emissions, congestion and road building (with its associated embodied carbon and habitat destruction)	57784 (Carbon Neutral Cambridge)
There are references to support "via multiple providers" and "in all cases, to encourage competition and consumer choice, this will include the provision of multiple ducts to enable several providers to access the site" (both page 322), but in our experience in the Southern Fringe we are aware that this may not happen. The infrastructure would be in place for early residents, who should not be expected to live without connectivity for months, as was the case in some areas of the Southern Fringe.	57004 (Trumpington Residents Association)
<p>Gigabit capable broadband connectivity should be download speeds of *at least* 1Gbps, not "up to". This wording provides a loophole and doesn't match the intention. It should be mandated that new developments have at least 1Gbps capable connectivity, even if the service level chosen by the consumer is lower. Anything less is not sufficient investment for increased demands from home working etc.</p> <p>It should be mandated that developers supply CAT6 network points in every room in new dwellings to allow hard wiring equipment. High density developments are relying on wifi with poor service.</p>	57973 (D Lister)
Need to look at infrastructure needed to support future generations (in 15 years) without major changes.	58338 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Using wide conduit (for example) should prevent roads pavements been dug up again when new gen is needed.	58338 (Histon & Impington PC)
Disappointing that developers are not required to consider Gbit connections at all sites. "That housing developers are obliged to provide a gigabit-capable connection unless the cost to the housing developer of providing connectivity exceeds £2,000 per connection, or the network operator declines to provide a connection." The UK Government has invested heavily in the OneWeb company to provide gigabit connections in remote areas. Cambridgeshire needs to support similar ventures to deliver gigabit connections in areas where fibre connections are not cost effective.	59011 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
The policy direction should confirm whether all development is required to provide a 'Connectivity Statements', or whether the policy direction is intended for major developments. If the latter, floorspace, and dwelling thresholds should be stated, to provide applicants with clarity.	59116 (Metro Property Unit Trust), 60539 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)
It is important that the eventual policy wording recognises to what degree elements of digital infrastructure to support new developments are under the control of the developer themselves as opposed to statutory undertakers.	59535 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 60600 (Countryside Properties – Fen Ditton site)
The Council should not impose new electronic communications requirements beyond the provision of infrastructure as set out in statutory Building Regulations. In 2020, the Government confirmed future legislation to ensure that new build homes are built with gigabit-capable broadband. Any type of technology may be used, which is able to provide speeds of over 1000 Mbps. All new build developments will be equipped with the physical infrastructure to support gigabit-capable connections from more than one network operator. The Council's approach is therefore unnecessary and repetitive of Building	60142 (Home Builders Federation)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Regulations and should not be taken forward into the local plan.	
Digital infrastructure should align with best practice for futureproofing in order to ensure that incentives to work without the necessity to use car transport are clearly established.	60817 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
No comment.	57567 (Huntingdonshire District Council)