

Appendix A

General comments on the Baseline Report

Comment No	Comment
1	Need for clear and inclusive GI definition and approach, and fuller description of the benefits of GI.
2	There should be greater clarity on the purpose of the strategy and what it can deliver, and whether additional documents are achievable and can be produced soon enough.
3	There should be a wider ranging and more critical analysis of base line information, existing initiatives and opportunities.
4	There should be a more accurate, complete and balanced description of the growth and planning policy contexts.
5	There should be a more accurate and fuller reference to GI policies which propose GI projects, strategies and other initiatives.
6	There should be greater clarity and accuracy on how planning can deliver GI including through tariffs or community levies.
7	Need to better reflect GI's role as integral to spatial and master planning.
8	The planning and delivery of GI outside the planning system should be given more emphasis.
9	The strategy should be providing a context for and promote community GI engagement, planning, and delivery.

General comments on the Delivery Report

Comment No	Comment
1	These comments do not repeat those already given on the Baseline Report unless it is necessary in order to make points on the Delivery Report. For the usual reason of lack of time they focus on areas where we have concerns and do not endorse the many areas which we support.
2	Weaknesses in the assessment given in the Baseline Report were noted in our previous comments. There are also a number of examples where analysis, opportunities and initiatives that were contained in that Report do not feed through into the Delivery Report. These include the need to respond to population increases and new development and initiatives linked to growth sites such as Northstowe.
3	The Delivery Report does not generally give a strong evidence base or methodology. It does not explain convincingly how and why the spatial framework has been developed. A robust evidence base and methodology are essential if the Strategy is to hold up to scrutiny, be integrated into planning policy documents or support decisions on planning applications, and justify funding.
4	The Biodiversity Enhancement Programme and Sustainable Movement Programme are both justified by existing pieces of work including mapping exercises. The latter involves a hierarchical approach whereas the former (at least as used in the Delivery Report) is limited to the strategic level. We are concerned, however, that the green infrastructure priorities in these subjects have not been drawn out.
5	There is a lack of cover of landscape, heritage, public open space, visitor sites and 'gateways'. This may be because the supporting evidence is not available from existing pieces of work (unlike biodiversity and access routes) but this should not be a reason for their exclusion. These themes should also be influencing those

Comment No	Comment
	which are covered in the Strategy.
6	Each of the subject areas need to be looked at spatially in term of the existing resource and what it does and can contribute to green infrastructure. Existing and future public and other needs should be fed in to influence the design of the network and help identify priorities.
7	The existing green infrastructure network should be identified, as one of the tasks of the strategy is to highlight what it is and seek its protection, management and enhancement.
8	The Report does not synthesise the different aspects of green infrastructure. While different subject layers will be justified in their own right, a fuller analysis of how they combine together (or don't in places) is needed.
9	A multi-functional approach is important. That does not mean that every part of the network is multi-functional but that the network will be, and that an integrated approach will be at the heart of GI work and culture.
10	If the Report - and by implication GI – do not synthesise different subjects and highlight existing projects – then arguably the Strategy will add little to what we have now.
11	The Report does not show a strong link between population and housing growth (on individual sites and across districts) and the delivery of green infrastructure to meet existing and new pressures.
12	The role of green infrastructure within, around and in the wider areas surrounding growth sites needs to be given greater emphasis.
13	The Report does not particularly help planners identify projects or approaches which can be supported by or integrated into new development.
14	The Report does not support the creation of a framework or hierarchy of green infrastructure plans and action, with district and local levels complementing the county strategy. This hierarchy should be introduced and promoted in the strategy and methodologies used which can be applied or adapted at the lower levels.
15	The Report should bring out more strongly the importance of community green infrastructure and action.
16	The different categories of Strategic Projects, Investment Programmes and Area Frameworks is complex and will not aid general understanding of the programme nor help a synthesis of different initiatives. The categorisation could diminish the importance of initiatives which aren't Strategic Projects.
17	The Strategy is set at a high and general (and sometimes provisional) level and refers in a number of places to the need for further work. It should look at some areas and subjects in more detail rather than defer their consideration to future pieces of work. Given other timescales, we cannot wait for more developed thinking and may well not have the resources to carry out further work.
18	The strategy needs to say what the implications of the spatial framework are, for example, if you are in a 'white area' or covered by an initiative with a limited focus.
19	There are links with some strategic projects in adjacent counties but there are generally not strong connections with green infrastructure strategies in neighbouring areas.
20	The document needs a conclusion and would also benefit from an executive summary to try to ensure effective public consultation.