

## Chapter 9: Site Options

<b>Para Number: 9.1</b>		
<b>Total representations: 3</b>		
<b>Object: 3</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Comment: 0</b>
<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Erosion of the Green Belt will impact on countryside</li> <li>Technical assessment did not take into account submissions to previous consultation or benefits Broad Location 7 could provide with new employment land and self sustaining services and facilities</li> </ul>	

<b>Para Number: 9.2</b>		
<b>Total representations: 3</b>		
<b>Object: 3</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Comment: 0</b>
<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on setting of City</li> <li>Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>Criteria used in Council proforma are landscape issues and not relevant to purposes of Green Belt; and assessment doesn't take into account the Commercial Estates Group masterplan</li> <li>It is not clear how Level 1 and Level 2 conclusions were arrived at</li> </ul>	

<b>Para Number: 9.3</b>		
<b>Total representations: 1</b>		
<b>Object: 1</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Comment: 0</b>
<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear how assessment scores have been aggregated e.g. Green Belt 11 factors into one.</li> </ul>	

<b>Para Number: 9.4</b>		
<b>Total representations: 3</b>		
<b>Object: 3</b>	<b>Support: 0</b>	<b>Comment: 0</b>
<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of Green Belt and precedent it creates</li> <li>Traffic issues Babraham Road</li> <li>Guided busway not shown on map 2</li> </ul>	

<b>Question 2:</b>		
<b>Total representations: 181</b>		
<b>Object: 95</b>	<b>Support: 14</b>	<b>Comment: 72</b>
<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Views from Gogs and Beechwoods harmed by GB1 and GB2 but do not object to GB3, GB4</li> </ul>	

	<p>and GB5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objections to sites GB1, GB2, and GB3 on ecology grounds and impact on achieving Strategic Green Infrastructure Strategy. See below against these sites.</li> <li>• Will erode attractive countryside leading to Gogs which form important part of setting of City</li> <li>• Object to GB1 GB2 and GB5 loss of precious landscape Robert MacFarlane's "Wild Places"</li> <li>• Object to GB1-GB2 as will lead to sprawl and worsen congestion, including parking issues. No objection to GB3-4. Mixed views on GB5 sprawl, visual impact. No objection GB6</li> <li>• Relieved GB6 smaller than Broad Location10 but too close to Histon Road. Object to use of Green Belt but if justifiable others are least bad options</li> <li>• Protect Green Belt presumption its available destroys its purpose. Oppose GB6</li> <li>• Oppose GB1 and GB2 as will increase urbanisation of this entrance to City adding to pressure on services and congestion in southern fringe.</li> <li>• No "special circumstances" have been put forward to warrant building houses in the Green Belt. They reserve judgement on GB4 and GB5 and would like the Councils to make the case that they do constitute "special circumstances" for providing more employment.</li> <li>• Site GB6 has significant environmental issues. The technical assessment offers no mitigation of red scores.</li> <li>• Concern at approach to resist Green Belt releases in absence of objectively assessed needs and GL Hearn submission in relation to Q1 which suggests more housing is needed than that currently proposed by the Councils</li> <li>• NIAB 3/Darwin Green 3 boundary is incorrect see plan attached to rep 22639</li> <li>• Barton Road Land Owners Group-Green Belt boundary that would result from these sites would not deliver the long-term clearly defined boundary required in the NPPF. Boundaries do not follow the guidance and will not deliver the quantum of development needed to deliver sustainable development.</li> <li>• Additional development at GB1 and GB2 and R15 Glebe Farm exacerbates an unsustainable situation in relation to waste management which</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>is a strategic priority in the NPPF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes all site options. GB3 and GB4 have access issues</li> <li>• No further growth of any significance can be accommodated on edge of City. SCDC will have to take the burden and Bourn Airfield represents best option in terms of balance jobs and homes.</li> <li>• Oppose any development in Green Belt at Stapleford</li> <li>• Use smaller sites in villages. Its up to parish councils to come up with sites</li> <li>• Netherhall Farm could become an educational resource (urban farm)</li> <li>• Impact on bee population</li> <li>• Green Belt must be protected to prevent urban sprawl towards and compromising the character of necklace villages</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt creates a precedent</li> <li>• Area around Gogs has great historical interest and natural beauty and should be protected.</li> <li>• Impact on quality of life if use Green Belt</li> <li>• There is identifiable harm to Green Belt purposes by all sites put forward</li> <li>• The NPPF provides for Green Belt boundaries to be changed only in exceptional circumstances</li> <li>• Housing and economy don't require exceptional circumstances. 95% of City's 14,000 projected housing need met by consents allocations and SHLAA sites</li> <li>• Not worth going into Green Belt for such a small number of sites</li> <li>• Ecological impacts on rare species who thrive on existing enclosed farmland, reduced resistance to pests and impact on UK agricultural policy</li> <li>• Density will preclude providing amenities on site causing residents to jump into cars</li> <li>• Other good alternatives exist to meet targets including infill in villages, opportunity at Bourn Airfield, Northstowe, Cambourne, Waterbeach and on other sites on southern fringe.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Support</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for housing provided avoids the AQMA area and use latter for employment.</li> <li>• Commercial Estates Group support GB1, GB2, GB3, GB4 and GB5 but consider a larger area within Broad Location 7 could be considered.</li> <li>• Will help meet demand for affordable homes</li> <li>• Small size and location will have negligible</li> </ul>

	<p>impact on Green Belt and will help meet housing needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites are accessible by public transport and bicycle</li> <li>• Support GB1-GB3 for residential and GB4, GB5, and GB6 for employment</li> <li>• Sites are close to employment and services</li> <li>• Add to outside boundary of Green Belt to compensate</li> </ul>
<p><b>Comment</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on setting of BLI's on GB1; GB1 should be developed before GB2 is commenced. Plan for appropriate treatment of eastern boundary. GB3 and GB4 are modest and align with technology park. Treat southern boundary carefully. GB5 impacts on Green Belt and Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area. GB6 won't harm setting of Cambridge and can allow for robust landscape corridor. CS1 Abbey Stadium preferred option on grounds of not damaging the integrity of the Green Belt. Are cautious about Green Belt removal but at least work undertaken has identified those sites having least impact on Green Belt and setting</li> <li>• Green Belt release is not sequentially preferred to Denny St Francis proposal. All cause harm particularly GB6</li> <li>• Welcome fact that some of plans to develop on green belt have been dropped.</li> <li>• Concerned over impact of GB1-GB5 on local nature reserves and sprawl damaging setting of City. GB3-GB5 of most concern because of dangers to cyclists and pedestrians and traffic congestion on busy narrow roads.</li> <li>• Keep GB3-GB5 for employment. GB6 not suited to housing</li> <li>• Emphasis should be on new settlements rather than edge of Cambridge</li> <li>• recognise need for practical housing strategy. Congestion on southern approach routes needs tackling.</li> <li>• Given concentration of over 30 villages feeding onto the B1049 and A1307 Milton Rd and Madingley Rd P&amp;R sites are not accessible to these villages</li> <li>• All sites lend themselves to expansion. A14 and M11 provide barrier to future expansion</li> <li>• Sites will not deliver quantum of development needed</li> </ul>

<b>Question 3:</b>		
<b>Total representations: 57</b>		
<b>Object: 14</b>	<b>Support: 31</b>	<b>Comment: 12</b>
<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>		
<b>Objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rejects the Council's assessment of Grange Farm site in the light of the need to address objectively assessed needs, the scale and character of the site having regard to its sustainable location on the edge of Cambridge. The College's vision is to develop the eastern part of the site and provide significant open space to the west. They therefore do not accept there would be any impact on coalescence. Dominant features in this area include the West Cambridge Site, which has changed the character of the area and forms an abrupt edge. There are two green corridors into west Cambridge but this northern one is bounded by modern development on the West Cambridge site. Vehicular access could be gained from Clerk Maxwell Road. Council is pre-empting the results of technical studies of air quality near the M11.</li> <li>Barton Road Land Owners Group - believe land north and south of Barton Rd should be released for development in accordance with principles in the concept Master Plan. A strategy of dispersal is unsustainable. The scale of affordable housing need and the need to support the economy justify releasing more land on the edge of Cambridge to support the University and Colleges and research institutions in a sustainable location. Evidence to reject the sites was not robust. A number of supporting technical documents supported reps at Issues and Options Stage which have informed the production of a concept Master Plan to provide 1500 dwellings a small science park, local centre, a school, relocated sports pitches for colleges, green infrastructure and access roads. There are process issues in the timing of decisions to reject sites while the quantum of development has not been finalised which is procedurally unsound. GL Hearn's Housing Requirements Study for BRLOG concludes an objectively assessed housing requirement would require 43,800-46,000 homes 2011-2031. 19,000 in Cambridge and 25,300 in SCDC. Experience with Rushcliffe Core Strategy and elsewhere highlights</li> </ul>	

	<p>importance of an up to date SHMA in identifying housing need. The need for a long-term supply of land was highlighted in examination of Dacorum's Core Strategy. The Structure Plan Green Belt releases were only meant to provide land to 2016. Sites shouldn't have been assessed before the quantum of land needed is identified. If Cambridge East does not come forward in the plan period alternative locations should be considered. The Green Belt is tightly drawn and doesn't allow for any safeguarded land to meet longer-term needs. The approach taken is not justified in line with PAS guidance. In relation to a credible evidence base, consideration of reasonable alternatives, and how they perform. The evidence used to reject the site is not robust, and the proposed strategy is not justified and is likely to be found unsound unless early and material changes are made. The decision to reject the site also not legally compliant on basis that reps made to Issues and Options One have been ignored (Regulation 18(3) of 2012 Regs) given they promoted a reasonable alternative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commercial Estates Group-The summary assessment of BL7 is flawed as it did not take into account the detailed submissions to a previous consultation in particular the scope for the development to provide self-sustaining services. No overarching SA has been undertaken to look at the implications of the current development strategy before considering any departure. The assessment of impact against the Air Safeguarding Zone is flawed in that it represents a consultation zone with airport authorities. The site has been classified as not having access to high quality public transport even though it is close to the park and ride and has poor cycle access. The assessment of Green Belt in Chapter 7 is skewed in significance of the contribution BL7 makes to green belt purposes.</li> <li>• Cambridge South Consortium-The consultation document is not sound as it is not based on objectively assessed needs, the draft plan is not justified –fundamental background technical work has not been carried out. The draft plan is not the most appropriate strategy-there has been no strategic assessment of development on the edge of Cambridge. Joint working has</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>not addressed cross boundary delivery of housing and employment. The draft plan is not consistent with national policy. BL5 has been incorrectly assessed as a housing site despite reps to both council's as part of Issues and Options One for an employment led scheme comprising a 45ha science park and 1,250 homes. This would have led to a better scoring of the site. The green belt and SA assessment included criteria such as views green corridors and soft green edges, which are not relevant to SA, and has resulted in double counting. They have commented further in the Green Belt Critique and Critique of Interim SA. The allocation for and employment led mixed use scheme will have a number of benefits. City can be expanded in a sustainable way, access to good public transport, employment, rail station, Addenbrooke's. It would not harm the Green Belt. It would create jobs and benefit the economy, provide 1250 homes including 500 affordable homes to meet ongoing needs beyond 2021. Provide a new focus of R&amp;D development to the south related to a new sustainable community. Would meet all NPPF sustainability objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MCA Developments Ltd-have no objection to a new Community Stadium at Bourne Airfield provided it is commercially viable in its own right and is not used as catalyst for a large scale housing allocation on an unsustainable site.</li> <li>• Carter Jonas (4412) and the Quy Estate (2918)- Object to the rejection of BL9. It is an appropriate location is suitable viable and deliverable. The Council has underestimated the opportunity provided by the Science Park Station and Chisholm Trail. Inner Green Belt Review has not taken into account that this development will keep a green wedge between the development and the A14. Development by Marshall north of Newmarket Rd will fall short of anticipated delivery. It would redress the growth imbalance between SW Cambridge and NE Cambridge.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Support</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly support for rejection of BL1, BL2, BL3, BL4 and BL5 in the light of their Quarter To Six Quadrant vision document.</li> <li>• Trumpington Residents Association-Supports the Council's conclusions on the remaining sites in the Green Belt around Trumpington. They</li> </ul>

	<p>offer additional reasons supporting the rejection of BL3-BL6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge Past Present and Future-Supports the rejections proposed in each Broad Location and acknowledges the great importance attached to them by the Councils. They do not however regard the Green Belt as sacrosanct and there may be special reasons to allow exceptions such as maintaining a balanced portfolio of sites to retain and attract a knowledge-based firms. This could constitute a very special circumstance.</li> <li>• Southacre Latham Rd and Chaucer Road Residents Association-support the rejections of sites in BL1 BL3 and BL4 and BL5. Sites are used by the community. Around Trumpington sites are visible from the M11 and impact on the identity of Trumpington as a village.</li> <li>• A further 7 Parish Council's supported the Council's reasons for rejection of edge of City Green Belt sites</li> <li>• Boyer Planning-RLW/DIO support rejection of other possible Green Belt sites in Appendix 4</li> <li>• Cllr Anthony Orgee and Cllr Gail Kenney-Supports the rejection of all sites in Appendix 4 because of their impact on Green Belt and for the other reasons given.</li> <li>• Hinxton Land Ltd-Councils are correct to dismiss all sites listed</li> <li>• Welcome rejection of BL1 sites due to loss of playing fields and open fields, BL3 sites due to loss of Lakes congestion and playing fields, and BL4 and BL5 due to setting of City</li> <li>• Strongly support rejection of BL1 and BL2 in light of importance of these locations</li> <li>• Need to retain Green Belt around Girton</li> <li>• Endorse reasons for rejection but criteria applied in subjective way and could equally be used to reject GB1 and GB2</li> <li>• Support rejections in BL3-5</li> <li>• City has rightly rejected sites that would aggravate flooding issues. Use of playing fields must be stopped there is not enough open space to replace them.</li> <li>• Support rejection of BL1 which would damage setting of the University city as well as views.</li> <li>• Strongly support the rejection of Site 911 in BL7.</li> <li>• Support all rejections there are no exceptional</li> </ul>
--	---



	circumstances
<b>Comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English Heritage-Sites in BL1 and BL2 and BL3 are all very sensitive and important to the setting of the historic core of the City. The historic skyline is clearly visible from the western approaches. The inner boundary should be regarded as permanent</li> <li>• English Heritage-BL4 is important for reasons set out in our objections to the Community Stadium. The current Green Belt Boundary was reviewed when Trumpington Meadows was allocated. At the time it was widely agreed to buffer the new edge away from the motorway</li> <li>• English Heritage- BL5 The new Addenbrooke's access road forms a logical boundary in this location as accepted by the Inspector at the Waste Recycling Facility Inquiry. Would lead to coalescence with Gt Shelford and Stapleford and harm the character of both villages.</li> <li>• English Heritage-BL6 and BL7. The proposed allocations GB1-5 provide only modest erosion into the Green Belt in this vicinity. Larger scale incursions would be harmful to the purpose of Green Belt.</li> <li>• English Heritage-BL9 in spite of its close proximity Fen Ditton retains a distinct identity with clear and discernible character of a small Cambridgeshire village. Allocation of any of the sites would harm the setting of many heritage assets within it.</li> <li>• Support rejection of Barton Road sites which would have adverse impact on very sensitive Green Belt</li> <li>• Would encourage re-assessment as it is more sustainable to develop close to City</li> <li>• Bottom line is we will be back here discussing these sites again within 10 years and some will have to go green especially if the airport site is locked out.</li> </ul>

<b>Site Number: GB1</b>		
<b>Total representations: 292</b>		
<b>Object: 250</b>	<b>Support: 25</b>	<b>Comment: 17</b>
<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>		
<b>Objections GB1 (number of similar comments in brackets)</b>	<b>Green Belt</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green belt /creates precedent (10)</li> <li>• If Green Belt is used it can never be replaced (2)</li> <li>• Cumulative impact of loss this and other green</li> </ul>	

	<p>belt land represents a 30% loss (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It will cause fundamental harm/impact upon the green belt (77)</li> <li>• Unjustified breach of Green Belt policy (5)</li> <li>• There is a wrongful assertion that GB1 and 2 are of low environmental value. The NPPF doesn't discriminate in this way.(1)</li> <li>• NPPF Para 83 provides for Green Belt boundary changes only in "exceptional circumstances" The Council has not presented a compelling case as to why this constitutes exceptional circumstances (10)</li> <li>• Needs of economy don't require exceptional circumstances (1)</li> <li>• Contravenes stated purpose of Green Belt as defined in NPPF in failing to check unrestricted sprawl, safeguarding the countryside from urban encroachment, which would further contribute to the destruction of the special character of an historic town. (2)</li> <li>• Area was not allowed to be developed in 2002 LDA Green Belt Boundary Study (1)</li> <li>• Reasons for designating it Green Belt have not changed (3)</li> <li>• Further attempts to move green belt boundaries will be subject to legal challenge (1)</li> <li>• This area must be the highest value Green Belt and is vital for keeping Cambridge attractive and compact. (4)</li> <li>• Object to development in green belt but site has minimal impact and good access to local services (1)</li> <li>• This is arguably the best landscape in the City (3)</li> <li>• It is the landscape which makes City attractive not its housing estates (1)</li> <li>• Will run risk of unrestricted sprawl extending/encroaching upon open countryside beyond this site toward the Gogs (45)</li> <li>• Area forms important visual and physical buffer between urban edge and higher ground (71)</li> <li>• Soft green edge works and should not be compromised (34)</li> <li>• The development of these forelands will destroy the iconic status of area (1)</li> <li>• Represents an unspoilt gateway to open countryside even a small number of dwellings will change this ambience (1)</li> <li>• Land at base of Gogs is visually important and</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>contributes to setting of City when viewed from south (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As you come over the hill the City appears and is largely unspoilt (1)</li> <li>• The Gogs are the only hilly feature in an otherwise singularly flat landscape (1)</li> <li>• Impact on views of Beech Woods (6)</li> <li>• Impact on views from and to the Gogs (8 + 1)</li> <li>• Paths provide safe access to Beech Woods and the highest public space in Cambridge (1)</li> <li>• Impact on views across Cambridge (11)</li> <li>• Visual impact will differ vastly from what is there now (2)</li> <li>• Impact on setting of Cambridge (7)</li> <li>• Development of Green Belt will lead to coalescence of villages which would lose their identify (3)</li> <li>• The integrity of necklace villages should be preserved at all costs and they should not be subsumed into the City (1)</li> <li>• Will destroy City's historic compact scale (1)</li> <li>• Green belt must remain for physical, emotional, mental and spiritual health as well as environmental reasons (6)</li> <li>• Building in the green belt will harm the attractiveness of Cambridge and thereby hamper economic growth (5)</li> <li>• Sir William Wort gifted this land in perpetuity in 1709 so that Cambridge scholars could be coaxed into the countryside and enjoy the view (1)</li> <li>• Green Belt should be more valuable and protected as population of our small city densifies (2)</li> <li>• Impact of other housing on outskirts of Cambridge has yet to be evaluated (1)</li> <li>• The Council's 2012 Green Belt Review comments at para 3.4 "that where the city is viewed from higher ground or generally has open aspects...it cannot accommodate change easily" This is a clear instance of a view from higher ground.</li> <li>• The area is important for passive recreation</li> </ul> <p><b>Natural Environment Biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will have unacceptable adverse impact on the local ecological network including SSSI's, County and City Wildlife sites and will compromise the ability to achieve the Gog</li> </ul>
--	---

Magogs Strategic Green Infrastructure Scheme. The Council's Assessment has underplayed impacts on natural environment and biodiversity in particular. They take issue with the assessment scores for GB1 re the scope for mitigation of impacts upon Netherhall Farm Meadow (County Wildlife site). To assume mitigation might be possible is arrogant. Reassessing GB1 could result in scores changing from amber to red in which case site should not be developed. They also question the Council's score on impact on an SSSI. This should not be green as traffic levels on LimeKiln Hill are already damaging the SSSI. Any increase would pose a real threat.

**Pollution**

- Will create air, noise, and light pollution (9)
- Addenbrooke's incinerator requires open areas nearby (1)
- This Green Belt Land is a valuable part of the City's heritage visually and also with wildlife sheltered from noise and light pollution. Any partial development would have a knock-on effect on the northern part of the GB1 site. (1)

**Loss Agricultural Land**

- Would destroy productive arable land (21)
- Permission for conversion of barns on site to dwellings granted in 2012 subject to surrounding land remaining open and of agricultural appearance (1)

**Traffic Issues**

- Transport infrastructure in this area cannot cope with additional development
- Doesn't feel it is possible to assess these sites options without a set of traffic options (which could be met within budget limits) alongside an assessment of the impact on the local network (1)

**Infrastructure**

- Lack of local amenities and social infrastructure including schools and doctors surgeries;
- flooding risk on lower land (1)

**Alternative locations**

- Consider Marshalls land instead (2)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider Waterbeach or Northstowe instead (7)</li> <li>• With all other sites in City and at Marshalls no need to further urbanisation. Need more balance (1)</li> <li>• Expand selected villages and new settlements instead (37)</li> <li>• In view of Northstowe going ahead the balance is against building on any Green Belt land around Cambridge (1)</li> <li>• Focus on other brownfield sites instead (11)</li> </ul>
<b>Support GB1 (number of similar comments in brackets)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fills a natural corner that lends itself to the purpose (1)</li> <li>• Provides a reasonable choice provided it doesn't spread nearer the Beechwoods (1)</li> <li>• Sites are suitable for residential development agree with arguments in favour (1)</li> <li>• Site appears to be well connected (1)</li> <li>• More homes are needed close to Addenbrooke's (1)</li> <li>• Proximity to Park and Ride, Addenbrooke's, and Guided Bus and Science Parks. (3)</li> <li>• Visually satisfactory (1)</li> <li>• Limited green belt development in established settlement may be appropriate (1)</li> <li>• Site accessible by public transport and bicycle and close to employment and services. Preferable to village locations where it adds to commuting/pollution/congestion/environmental impact (1)</li> <li>• Support on basis green belt setting is not compromised (2)</li> <li>• Development here would be beneficial (1)</li> <li>• Support as not as congested as area as Fulbourn Road (1)</li> <li>• Large developments should be kept close to Cambridge City (1)</li> <li>• Site could be extended to Junction of Worts Causeway and Lime Kiln Road (2)</li> <li>• Support as it would only extend existing built up areas (1)</li> <li>• Proximity to centres of employment, good public transport, schools and facilities thereby putting minimum strain on road congestion (1)</li> </ul>
<b>Comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favour Worts Causeway sites because they wouldn't fundamentally change the nature of that part of the Cambridge boundary, visually or functionally (1)</li> <li>• Development here seems practical and has</li> </ul>

	<p>minimal impact (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>English Heritage-</b> The curved alignment of Beaumont Road will ensure that to some extent this allocation will give the appearance of 'rounding off' the city edge, though the eastern boundary might then have taken a more northeast-southwest alignment up to the track that forms the western boundary of the large field, whereas the current north-south alignment appears better suited to justifying the allocation of site GB2. We note the site includes locally listed farm buildings and while these might be retained, their setting is likely to be compromised by the allocation. It will therefore be necessary to consider whether or not there is sufficient wider public benefit to be derived from this allocation to justify the harm. The eastern boundary would need careful treatment to form an appropriate junction between the city and the Green Belt.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Site Number: GB2</b>		
<b>Total representations: 284</b>		
<b>Object: 240</b>	<b>Support: 26</b>	<b>Comment: 18</b>
<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>		
<b>Objections GB2</b>	<p><b>Green Belt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green belt /creates precedent (43)</li> <li>• Cumulative impact of loss this and other green belt land represents a 30% loss (1)</li> <li>• It will cause fundamental harm/impact upon the green belt (73)</li> <li>• Serious impact on Green Belt but less than GB1 since land is flat (1)</li> <li>• Unjustified breach of Green Belt policy (6)</li> <li>• There is a wrongful assertion that GB1 and 2 are of low environmental value. The NPPF doesn't discriminate in this way.(3)</li> <li>• NPPF Para 83 provides for Green Belt boundary changes only in "exceptional circumstances" The Council has not presented a compelling case as to why this constitutes exceptional circumstances (9)</li> <li>• Building in the green belt will harm the attractiveness of Cambridge and thereby hamper economic growth (4)</li> <li>• Contravenes stated purpose of Green Belt as defined in NPPF in failing to check unrestricted sprawl, safeguarding the countryside from</li> </ul>	

	<p>urban encroachment, which would further contribute to the destruction of the special character of an historic town. (8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area was not allowed to be developed in 2002 LDA Green Belt Boundary Study (1)</li> <li>• Reasons for designating it Green Belt have not changed (5)</li> <li>• Object to green belt development but if absolutely required this site has minimal impact and good access to local services and employment. (1)</li> <li>• Scores for green belt significance questionable in 2012 document as they relate to two halves of same field (1)</li> <li>• Keep Green Belt for future generations to enjoy (1)</li> <li>• Green belt has prevented ribbon development (2)</li> <li>• This is arguably the best landscape in the City (1)</li> <li>• Will run risk of unrestricted sprawl extending/encroaching upon open countryside beyond this site toward the Gogs (40)</li> <li>• Support the rejection of Site 911 Cambridge SE but same criteria apply to GB1 and GB2 (1)</li> <li>• Area forms important visual and physical buffer between urban edge and higher ground (67)</li> <li>• Soft green edge works and should not be compromised (33)</li> <li>• The development of these forelands will destroy the iconic status of area (1)</li> <li>• Represents an unspoilt gateway to open countryside even a small number of dwellings will change this ambience (2)</li> <li>• Land at base of Gogs is visually important and contributes to setting of City when viewed from south (1)</li> <li>• As you come over the hill the City appears and is largely unspoilt 1)</li> <li>• The Gogs are the only hilly feature in an otherwise singularly flat landscape (1)</li> <li>• Impact on views of Beech Woods (1)</li> <li>• Impact on views from Gogs (5)</li> <li>• Impact on views of Gogs (4)</li> <li>• New developments will be visible all way into Cambridge from south (1)</li> <li>• Development of Green Belt will lead to coalescence of villages which would lose their identify (4)</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The integrity of necklace villages should be preserved at all costs and they should not be subsumed into the City. (1)</li> <li>• Green belt must remain for physical, emotional, mental and spiritual health as well as environmental reasons (2)</li> <li>• Sir William Wort gifted this land in perpetuity in 1709 so that Cambridge scholars of Emmanuel College could be coaxed into the countryside and enjoy the view (1)</li> <li>• Green Belt should be more valuable and protected as population of our small city densifies (1)</li> <li>• Impact of other housing on outskirts of Cambridge has yet to be evaluated (1)</li> <li>• Land off Long Road should never have been taken out of the Green Belt (1)</li> <li>• Green Belt should never be reviewed? (3)</li> <li>• The Council's 2012 Green Belt Review comments at para 3.4 "that where the city is viewed from higher ground or generally has open aspects...it cannot accommodate change easily" This is a clear instance of a view from higher ground. (2)</li> </ul> <p><b>Natural Environment Biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will have unacceptable adverse impact on the local ecological network including SSSI's, County and City Wildlife sites and will compromise the ability to achieve the Gog Magogs Strategic Green Infrastructure Scheme. The Council's Assessment has underplayed impacts on natural environment and biodiversity in particular. Reassessing GB2 could result in scores changing from amber to red in which case site should not be developed. They also question the Council's score on impact on an SSSI. This should not be green as traffic levels on LimeKiln Hill are already damaging the SSSI. Any increase would pose a real threat. Some of the scores against Green Belt on GB2 also underplay impacts and may be categorised red or amber. Cumulative scores may end up being changed amber to red. (66)</li> </ul> <p><b>Pollution</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will create air, noise, and light pollution (9)</li> </ul>
--	--



	<p><b>Loss Agricultural Land</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would destroy productive arable land (18)</li> </ul> <p>A number of attractive permissive footpath links are threatened by the proposed development along with impacts on biodiversity and the loss of safe attractive off road routes to Beech Woods and the Park &amp; Ride.</p> <p><b>Traffic Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport infrastructure in this area cannot cope with further development</li> </ul> <p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of local amenities and social infrastructure including schools and doctors surgeries;</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternative Locations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider Marshalls land instead (2)</li> <li>• Consider Waterbeach or Northstowe instead (10)</li> <li>• Expand selected villages and new settlements instead (33)</li> <li>• Focus on other brownfield sites instead (12)</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Reasons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a GHQ Line Anti tank trench running across the GB1 and GB2 sites which presents contaminated land issues and cultural heritage /archaeological issues and historic monument of national and regional importance requiring a risk evaluation under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (1)</li> <li>• Area is important for passive recreation (50)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Support GB2 (number of similar comments in brackets)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fills a natural corner that lends itself to the purpose (1)</li> <li>• Provides a reasonable choice provided it doesn't spread nearer the Beechwoods (1)</li> <li>• Sites are suitable for residential development agree with arguments in favour (1)</li> <li>• Most sites look suitable for housing (1)</li> <li>• Proximity to Park and Ride, Addenbrooke's, guided bus, Science Parks, and rail station to be built at Long Road (1)</li> <li>• Visually satisfactory (1)</li> <li>• Limited green belt development in established settlement may be appropriate (1)</li> <li>• Site accessible by public transport and bicycle and close to employment and services.</li> </ul>

	<p>Preferable to village locations where it adds to commuting/pollution/congestion/environmental impact (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support on basis green belt setting is not compromised (2)</li> <li>• Development here would be beneficial but Cambridge still needs infrastructure to overcome congestion (1)</li> <li>• Support as not as congested as area as Fulbourn Road (1)</li> <li>• Support as it would only extend existing built up areas (1)</li> <li>• Proximity to centres of employment, good public transport, schools and facilities thereby putting minimum strain on road congestion (1)</li> <li>• Support if site includes significant green space to moderate impact of Addenbrooke's from the Gogs (1)</li> <li>• Support but traffic along Babraham Rd needs to be <b>addressed</b> first (1)</li> <li>• Support development of site which is logical extension to Cambridge with minimal impact on green belt. It is a sustainable location. Site is available and can be developed independently or as part of larger phased scheme. It is unconstrained by infrastructure capacity and is unlikely to have contamination issues. Background evidence supports its development and is endorsed by the County Council. Offers potential for provision of affordable housing.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Comments GB2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favour Worts Causeway sites because they wouldn't fundamentally change the nature of that part of the Cambridge boundary, visually or functionally (1)</li> <li>• Development here seems practical and has minimal impact (1)</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage-</b> The curved alignment of Beaumont Road will ensure that to some extent this allocation will give the appearance of 'rounding off' the city edge, though the eastern boundary might then have taken a more northeast-southwest alignment up to the track that forms the western boundary of the large field, whereas the current north-south alignment appears better suited to justifying the allocation of site GB2. We note the site includes locally listed farm buildings and while these might be retained, their setting is likely to be compromised by the allocation. It will</li> </ul>

	<p>therefore be necessary to consider whether or not there is sufficient wider public benefit to be derived from this allocation to justify the harm. The eastern boundary would need careful treatment to form an appropriate junction between the city and the Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English Heritage-Not logical to develop on its own but justified if developed in conjunction with GB1. Recommend GB1 is developed first. The eastern boundary would need careful treatment to form an appropriate junction between the City and the Green Belt.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Site Number: GB3</b>		
<b>Total representations: 115</b>		
<b>Object: 74</b>	<b>Support: 24</b>	<b>Comment: 17</b>
<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>		
<b>Objections GB3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of views of fields and peace and quiet</li> <li>• Negative visual impact on views of Lime Kiln Hill</li> <li>• It is an encroachment on the Green Belt</li> <li>• Proposal doesn't check unrestricted sprawl nor does it assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment</li> <li>• Contributes to coalescence Cambridge and Fulbourn</li> <li>• Object as development should be located in new settlements and better served villages</li> <li>• Object to development in Green Belt but if absolutely required this site is near employment and has good access to City</li> <li>• NPPF Para 83 provides for Green Belt boundary changes only in "exceptional circumstances" The Council has not presented a compelling case as to why this constitutes exceptional circumstances (1)</li> <li>• Will encourage ribbon development along Fulbourn Rd (1)</li> <li>• Adverse impact on Green Belt due to its location on rising ground (37)</li> <li>• Adverse impact on Green Belt due to its location on rising ground. Proximity to and pressure upon Chalk Pits Nature reserve compromising its value as a nature reserve by increasing its isolation from wider countryside. The access to the development goes through existing housing areas and contributes to increased vehicular and pedestrian movements at the busy Robin Hood junction.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will have unacceptable adverse impact on the local ecological network including SSSI's, County and City Wildlife sites and will compromise the ability to achieve the Gog Magogs Strategic Green Infrastructure Scheme. The Council's Assessment has underplayed impacts on natural environment and biodiversity in particular. Reassessing Site GB3 could result in the score changing from amber to red in which case they should not be developed</li> <li>• Site lies close to nationally and locally designated sites Cherry Hinton Chalk Pit SSSI, Limekiln Hill Local Nature Reserve. Natural England would only be satisfied with these sites being allocated if they result in no adverse effect on these sites through uncontrolled access, fly tipping, fires etc.</li> <li>• Concerns over transport implications of the proposal – area already heavily congested.</li> <li>• At bursting point on services and infrastructure (3)</li> <li>• Lack of school places (1)</li> <li>• Impact on health facilities (1)</li> <li>• Adds to flood risk on lower ground (2)</li> <li>• Loss of arable land (6)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Support GB3 (number of similar comments in brackets)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would do not change the beauty of the area (1)</li> <li>• Good choice as close to Cherry Hinton with its facilities and transport links although Chalk Pits and Nature Reserve must be protected (1)</li> <li>• Support provided shared use cycle path can be converted to proper cycle lanes on both sides of Fulbourn Road (1)</li> <li>• Support employment or housing but address traffic issues prior to development (1)</li> <li>• Beneficial development but Cambridge still needs infrastructure to overcome congestion (1)</li> <li>• Support provided setting not compromised (2)</li> <li>• General support of option (5)</li> <li>• Support as only extending built up area slightly (1)</li> <li>• Support as large developments should be kept close to Cambridge (2)</li> <li>• Support this site as is accessible by public transport and bicycle. And is close to employment and services. This is preferable to village locations which add to commuting and</li> </ul>

	<p>congestion (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support as there are good local employment, schools and shopping facilities (2)</li> <li>• Creates minimum strain on roads (1)</li> <li>• Minimal problems/ limited green belt development in established settlement may be appropriate (2)</li> <li>• Support as small developments and benefit housing (1)</li> <li>• Some of this land may provide opportunity for ARM to meet its growth requirements in the City, which could involve it doubling of its floorspace from 150,000sqft to 300,000sq ft over the next 10 years through a series of phased developments. Given its expansion requirement and its desire to remain in Cambridge it is therefore supportive of the allocation</li> <li>• Support development of this site as GB3 and GB4 are infill sites screened from the road by tall buildings on Peterhouse Technology Park and the rising ground to the south. Development should be recessed into the hillside to reduce visual impact further. Site GB3 should not be promoted for industrial development due to its proximity to residential development.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Comment</b></p>	<p><b>Green Belt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site seems to cause low impact (2)</li> <li>• Best option is Fulbourn road site and NIAB site (1)</li> <li>• Fulbourn Rd with local employment preferable (1)</li> <li>• Most sites look suitable for housing (1)</li> <li>• Support Fulbourn Road (1)</li> <li>• Support for employment use as discrete and aligns with Peterhouse Technology Park. Proposers should offset balancing green belt provision elsewhere.</li> <li>• Would not materially effect the village of Fulbourn</li> <li>• Do not object to employment on this site as aligns with Peterhouse Technology Park and would be discrete.</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> - These sites are relatively modest allocations where the boundary of the southern edge of the city would be aligned with the Peterhouse Technology Park. English Heritage does not object and would wish to see</li> </ul>

	careful treatment of the southern boundary to form an appropriate boundary with the green belt.
--	---

<b>Site Number: GB4</b>		
<b>Total representations:</b>		
<b>Object: 28</b>	<b>Support: 25</b>	<b>Comment: 49</b>
<b>KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION</b>		
<b>Objections</b>	<p><b>Green Belt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Special circumstances” case for a green belt release has not been made (1)</li> <li>• Will lead to creep up the hill and is unwelcome (1)</li> <li>• Proposal doesn’t check unrestricted sprawl nor does it assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment (1)</li> <li>• Contributes to coalescence Cambridge and Fulbourn (2)</li> <li>• Object as development should be located in new settlements and better served villages (1)</li> <li>• Green belt must remain for physical, emotional, mental and spiritual health as well as environmental reasons (2)</li> <li>• Visual impact misrepresented in document (2)</li> <li>• It will cause fundamental harm/impact upon the green belt (5)</li> <li>• Loss of Green belt /creates precedent (6)</li> <li>• If green belt is used it can never be replaced (2)</li> <li>• Object to development in Green Belt but if absolutely required this site is near employment and has good access to city/minimal impact (2)</li> <li>• Development will be an eyesore and should be recessed into the hill side to reduce visual impact further (1)</li> <li>• Will be visible from higher ground to the south (1)</li> <li>• Object to all green belt sites they should be left for future generations to enjoy (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Natural Environment Biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will ruin natural beauty of area (1)</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitats and biodiversity (1)</li> <li>• Puts pressure on Chalk Pits. Wildlife needs corridors to move between habitats should include a buffer zone between reserves and this site (3)</li> <li>• Adverse impact on Chalk Pits Nature Reserve</li> </ul>	

	<p>SSSI (2)</p> <p><b>Active and Passive Local Recreation/Leisure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have long campaigned for a safe off road footpath link from Fulbourn Road south to the Roman Road. Lime Kiln Hill is dangerous for walkers and lacks a footpath for most of its length. Improved rights of way could be provided as part of this development to provide safe access to the wider countryside.</li> </ul> <p><b>Traffic Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport infrastructure in the area cannot cope with additional development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At bursting point on services and infrastructure (2)</li> <li>• Infrastructure (1)</li> <li>• Lack of school places (1)</li> <li>• Impact on health facilities (1)</li> <li>• Adds to flood risk on lower ground (2)</li> </ul> <p><b>Loss Agricultural Land</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of arable land (5)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Support (number of similar comments in brackets)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good choice as close to Cherry Hinton with its facilities and transport links although Chalk Pits and Nature Reserve must be protected (1)</li> <li>• Support provided shared use cycle path can be converted to proper cycle lanes on both sides of Fulbourn Road (1)</li> <li>• Beneficial development but Cambridge still needs infrastructure to overcome congestion (1)</li> <li>• Support provided setting not compromised (2)</li> <li>• General support of option (9)</li> <li>• Limited green belt development in established settlement may be appropriate (1)</li> <li>• Represents a natural extension of the Technology Park (1)</li> <li>• Support as only extending built up area slightly (1)</li> <li>• Support as large developments should be kept close to Cambridge (2)</li> <li>• Support this site as is accessible by public transport and bicycle. And is close to employment and services. This is preferable to village locations which add to commuting and</li> </ul>

	<p>congestion (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support as there are good local employment, schools and shopping facilities (2)</li> <li>• Creates minimum strain on roads (1)</li> <li>• Minimal problems/ limited green belt development in established settlement may be appropriate (1)</li> <li>• Some of this land may provide opportunity for ARM to meet its growth requirements in the City, which could involve it doubling of its floorspace from 150,000sqft to 300,000sq ft over the next 10 years through a series of phased developments. Given its expansion requirement and its desire to remain in Cambridge it is therefore supportive of the allocation</li> <li>• Support development of this site as GB3 and GB4 are infill sites screened from the road by tall buildings on Peterhouse Technology Park and the rising ground to the south. Development should be recessed into the hillside to reduce visual impact further.</li> <li>• Support development of this site from an economic perspective as it forms a logical extension to the existing Peterhouse Technology Park and provide quality employment development for high tech uses</li> <li>• Supports the development as it represents a discrete extension to the mini science and technology park and will provide employment for local people, provide synergy with existing businesses, and contribute to business generally in the Cherry Hinton local centre</li> </ul>
<p><b>Comments</b></p>	<p><b>Alternative Locations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most jobs opportunities in north of the City. Focus instead on Histon Girton Milton Waterbeach Cottenham (1)</li> <li>• A limited expansion may be acceptable if careful attention is given to height massing &amp; materials (inc colour) the site can be seen from higher ground to the south. Any development must safeguard the amenity of adjoining housing to the north, be no more than 2 storeys and incorporate a green roof to minimise visual impact from the higher ground and respond to environmental considerations (32).</li> <li>• Any development must safeguard the amenity of adjoining housing to the north , be no more than 2 storeys and incorporate a green roof to</li> </ul>



	minimise visual impact from the higher ground and respond to environmental considerations (1)
--	---

CHAPTER 9: SITE OPTIONS	
QUESTION NO.	SUMMARY OF REPS
QUESTION / Paragraph	
<p><b>Site Option GB5 : Fulbourn Road East</b></p> <p>District: SCDC Area: 6.92ha Use: Employment development</p> <p>Support: 19 Object: 77 Comment: 14</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b> (number of similar comments in brackets)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support if well designed as a small development adjacent to the urban area. (14)</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - Support the proposed employment use for this site from an economic development perspective. It forms a logical extension to the existing Peterhouse Technology Park and presents the opportunity to provide additional quality employment development for high tech related uses. (1)</li> <li>• Support because accessible by public transport and bicycle, close to services so preferable to development in villages which would contribute to more commuting, traffic congestion, pollution, environmental impact. (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of Site GB5 would be an unsympathetic "ribbon" development of commercial premises on rising ground, which would be contrary to the fundamental Green Belt purposes and functions bringing a "finger" of urban sprawl out into the Green Belt countryside. The development effectively further reduces the separation between Cambridge and Fulbourn. The development would be highly visible from the high ground to the south - the roofs of the existing Technology Park are already prominent when viewed from Shelford Road. (46)</li> <li>• The Parish Plan is opposed to changes to the Green Belt around the village to retain the environment and ambiance of Fulbourn. (1)</li> <li>• This is green belt land. Building here will impact on wildlife and farmland, and people's pleasure in the countryside. It will add to existing heavy traffic on Fulbourn Road. This would put increased pressure on schools, and Addenbrooke's and the Rosie. (3)</li> <li>• It would increase traffic at peak times (cars</li> </ul>

	<p>already queue along Fulbourn Road, concerned about safety and environmental impact). It may be 'easily accessible' by bike but not safely plus currently Fulbourn Road serviced by one bus route only. (6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no need for this development, which would adversely affect the Green Belt setting of Cambridge as there is an acknowledged surplus of allocated employment land in South Cambridgeshire. (2)</li> <li>• Development of the full site would harm the character and appearance of the nearby Conservation Area. Strongly recommend that the site does not extend to the east of Yarrow Road and that the southern boundary gets further consideration to ensure development is not built on the crest of the hill that rises to the south of the Fulbourn Road. (1)</li> <li>• Site could be developed but only up to the roundabout. (1)</li> <li>• Sites GB3, GB4 and GB5 lie close to nationally and locally designated sites including; Cherry Hinton Chalk Pit SSSI, Limekiln Hill, LNR and Netherhall Farm Meadow CWS. NE would only be satisfied with these sites being allocated if it can be demonstrated that development will not have an adverse effect. (1)</li> <li>• Any development close to Cambridge will put pressure on the City Centre and local infrastructure. (1)</li> <li>• It is possible that a case can be made that these sites meeting the requirement for 'very special circumstances' but the argument to support the release of Green Belt has not yet been made. Until a strong case is made, such as the extension of ARM, then both sites should be opposed on principle as they are in the Green Belt. (1)</li> <li>• Object to loss of Green Belt land. (9)</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land. (1)</li> <li>• Loss of view south when driving down Yarrow Road (1), visible from Fulbourn Road (1).</li> <li>• Site is too big, if it were half the size it could be supported. (1)</li> <li>• Object as there is no assessment of traffic impacts. (1)</li> <li>• Move employment growth to other parts of the UK that need it more. (2)</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option seems practical with minimal impact. (2)</li> <li>• Woodland screening will be required, consideration should be given to the provision of public open space, which the area is deficient in. Regarding transport, the current narrow shared use pavement on the Fulbourn Road needs to be converted such that both sides of Fulbourn Road have proper on-road, cycle lanes, which continue around Gazelle Way. Cycle provision also needs looking at on routes into the City and into Cherry Hinton village centre to encourage residents or employees to not use cars. This bit of the Fulbourn Road is not on a bus route. (1)</li> <li>• Low fluvial risk. Groundwater beneath site is valuable resource needing protecting and improving. Site investigations and risk assessments needed. Infiltration drainage potential. (1)</li> <li>• Do not object to this site. Although development is Green Belt land it aligns with the adjacent Peterhouse Technology Park site. Part of the proposed site might be considered suitable for employment development consistent with the adjacent existing employment areas provided that the boundaries of the site are widely buffered and wooded or otherwise screened to merge with the adjacent rural landscape. (2)</li> <li>• Low impact development. (1)</li> </ul>
<p>Site Option GB6: Land to south of the A14 and west of Cambridge Road (NIAB 3)</p> <p>Support:24 Object: 177 Comment: 24</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b> (number of similar comments in brackets)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whichever site is chosen will not make traffic situation any better, but support NIAB3 as less housing built on that side of town than Fulbourn / Worts Causeway sites.</li> <li>• Ideal site with access from Histon and Huntingdon Roads - should include a link road to both.</li> <li>• Support all sites so long as well considered and do not detract from setting of Cambridge. What do they offer in compensation for loss of Green Belt?</li> <li>• Option seems practical with minimal impact. (2)</li> <li>• Support as only extending existing built up</li> </ul>

	<p>areas. <b>(3)</b> / Limited Green Belt development. <b>(1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large developments should be kept nearer to Cambridge (within A14/M11 corridor). <b>(2)</b></li> <li>• <u>Accessible</u> by public transport and cycle, close to employment and services – preferable to new houses in villages which contribute to commuting, congestion, pollution, environmental impact. <b>(1)</b> Access to Park &amp; Ride, guided bus and Addenbrooke’s Hospital and Science Parks as employers. <b>(1)</b> Proximity to centres of employment, good public transport schools and facilities. Thereby putting minimum strain on road congestion. <b>(1)</b></li> <li>• Most of the sites look suitable for housing.</li> <li>• Most suitable site – current development in area, proximity to A14, could also be considered for Community Stadium.</li> <li>• Would lessen traffic travelling into Cambridge.</li> <li>• Road network better with access to A14.</li> <li>• Since most jobs in north of city, further development in the north seems logical.</li> <li>• Best place for community stadium – road access and transport easily improved – good use of site. Moe pylons if an issue. Restrict housing to high density and away from A14.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No further housing, nor a proposed Community Stadium, should be built on land adjacent to existing NIAB development sites 1 and 2. <b>(143)</b></li> <li>• <u>Protect Green Belt</u> - Object to all sites that encroach onto Green Belt land. <b>(4)</b> No Green Belt unless exceptional circumstances <b>(2)</b> Green Belt can never be replaced. <b>(3)</b> Better alternatives. <b>(1)</b></li> <li>• <u>Air Quality</u> – How does encouraging families to live in areas of poor air quality tally sustainability and environmental agendas? <b>(1)</b> Green Belt needed to protect air quality. <b>(1)</b> Development within AQMA caused by high exhaust emissions is unacceptable - remain green space to assist with carbon absorption to aid improved air quality. <b>(1)</b> No sense to develop site if issue for living and working there. <b>(2)</b></li> <li>• Not suitable for residential – too close to A14</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>– not fair or healthy for future residents. <b>(2)</b> / commercial would encourage long distance commuting. <b>(1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Coalescence</u> - Loss of separation with Histon &amp; Impington – turn into suburb of Cambridge. <b>(3)</b> Create coalescence – loss of remaining small, but important gap and increase urbanisation along Histon Road due to Orchard Park. <b>(1)</b> Impact on Girton and surrounding villages to become part of Cambridge. <b>(1)</b></li> <li>• Infrastructure needed may be unaffordable and/or delayed.</li> <li>• No to NIAB 3 - area cannot cope with more. <b>(4)</b> Overcrowding of residential area <b>(1)</b></li> <li>• Health issues with pylons. <b>(2)</b></li> <li>• This side of city will experience greatest impact of development already envisaged. Further development will be straw that breaks camels back. 'Community stadium' would threaten amenities of residence close by.</li> <li>• On NIAB 3 infrastructure, the effect on Girton would be too deleterious for the Parish Council to approve it.</li> <li>• Object to residential – could be considered for improvement for open space purposes.</li> <li>• 1. Green Belt - threat of coalescence. 2. Much of site in Air Quality Management area, and unsuitable. 3. Likely to require noise barriers from A14 - unacceptable visual impact. 4. No demand for employment development - unlikely to be mixed use development.</li> <li>• Only remaining open land separating City and Impington – don't want to lose identity, be seen as extension to Cambridge. Community Stadium will generate traffic from north through Histon and Impington adding to existing traffic issues.</li> <li>• <u>Impact on Roads</u> - Commercial development off Madingley Road greatly added to congestion and increased journey times because of new traffic. <b>(1)</b> Strain on roads into Cambridge and Histon's High Street, already congested. <b>(1)</b> Increase traffic into Cambridge – already nearing breaking point. <b>(1)</b> Exacerbate traffic problems. <b>(3)</b></li> <li>• <u>Drainage</u> - How can be confident that SUDS will work for NIAB 1, 2 and 3? Orchard Park required £7 million surface water attenuation</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>scheme - underground strata is identical. Unless addressed, ground water will saturate award drain and Beck Brook catchments with serious threats to properties and businesses in Histon, Westwick, Rampton and Cottenham. Surface water flow in northwest direction towards Westwick. Ditches already overflow, during heavy rains.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on species identified in SA - retain and enhance biodiversity. NPPF – allocate sites with least environmental or amenity value &amp; consider benefits of best agricultural land.</li> <li>• Not suitable for housing due to poor air quality and noise problems.</li> <li>• Support for industrial but not residential due to AQMA.</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land and Green Belt. <b>(2)</b></li> <li>• Impact on Green Belt purposes – coalescence. 2. Air quality issues. 3. Visual impact. 4. Public transport overcrowded and unreliable. 5. Histon Road unsafe for cycling &amp; congested (even before NIAB 1&amp;2). 6. Overdevelopment. 7. New community facilities required.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Near motorway and Park &amp; Ride.</li> <li>• <u>A14 capacity</u> - needs upgrading. <b>(1)</b> Worry about adding to the overload on A14, especially if Cottenham developed. <b>(1)</b></li> <li>• <u>Object in principle, but if absolutely necessary, NIAB3 least worse</u> <b>(3)</b>. Area nearest A14 should be restricted to non-domestic development / leave southern part for amenity space for residents of NIAB developments - allows access close to A14 and not add to traffic congestion on Histon Road.</li> <li>• Not supportive of employment development given its relative isolation from other employment areas. Support some residential development linked to 'NIAB' 1&amp;2.</li> <li>• Do not replicate mistakes of Orchard Park. <b>(2)</b> Looks scrappy, unfinished, poor streetscapes, bad cycle permeability, being completely cut off from Cambridge by hostile King's Hedges Road. <b>(1)</b></li> <li>• NIAB 3 site close to Hauxton is seeing huge development already with Great Kneigton and</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>site next to Waitrose. More development will cause serious traffic problems - queuing at dangerous levels on M11 during morning rush hour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• While A14 will ensure no real harm to setting of Cambridge, important northern boundary of site kept sufficiently distant from A14 to allow landscape corridor and avoid repeat of poor relationship between Orchard Park and A14.</li><li>• Groundwater beneath site important base-flow to local watercourses and for local abstractions - need to be maintained and protected. Potential for contamination needs investigating. Potential to use infiltration drainage. Pollution prevention measures are likely for any employment use.</li><li>• Area near junction 31 of A14 may be suitable but concern that Histon Road and Huntingdon Road are becoming far too busy.</li><li>• Housing on NIAB site is appalling and too crowded – presumably NIAB3 would be similar.</li></ul>
--	---