

APPENDIX A

GOVERNMENT AND REGIONAL GUIDANCE AND ADVICE

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Planning Policy Statements and Guidance

PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005)
PPG2: Green Belts (1995)
PPS3: Housing (2006)
PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (2005)
PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management (2005)
PPS12: Local Spatial Planning (2008)
PPG13 Transport (2001)
PPG15 Planning and the Historic Environment (1994)
PPG16: Archaeology and Planning (1990)
PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation (2002)
PPS22 Renewable Energy (2004)
PPS23: Planning and Pollution Control (2004)
PPG24: Planning and Noise (1994)
PPS25: Development and Flood Risk (2006)

Government Circulars

Circular 11/95 – The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions
Circular 05/2005 - Planning Obligations

Regional Guidance

Regional Planning Guidance for East Anglia to 2016
Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England
Regional Economic Strategy for the East of England

The new Coalition Government is planning to rapidly abolish Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS), and this is already a material consideration in planning decisions (from May 2010). Until such time, the RSS remains part of the development plan but should not be afforded as much weight as previously, in the decision making process.

APPENDIX B

CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH STRUCTURE PLAN, CAMBRIDGE LOCAL PLAN AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL LDF POLICIES

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003

P6/1	Development-related Provision
P8/10	Transport Investment Priorities
P9/2b	Review of Green Belt Boundaries
P9/2c	Location and Phasing of Development Land to be Released from the Green Belt
P9/8	Infrastructure Provision
P9/9	Cambridge Sub-Region Transport Strategy

Cambridge Local Plan 2006

3/1	Sustainable Development
3/2	Setting of the City
3/3	Safeguarding Environmental Character
3/4	Responding to Context
3/5	Mixed Use Development
3/6	Ensuring Co-ordinated Development
3/7	Creating Successful Places
3/8	Open Space and Recreation Provision Through New Development
3/11	The Design of External Spaces
3/12	The Design of New Buildings
3/13	Tall Buildings and the Skyline
4/1	Green Belt
4/2	Protection of Open Space
4/3	Safeguarding Features of Amenity or Nature Conservation Value
4/4	Trees
4/6	Protection of Sites of Local Nature Conservation Importance
4/9	Scheduled Ancient Monuments/Archaeological Areas
4/10	Listed Buildings
4/11	Conservation Areas
4/13	Pollution and Amenity
4/14	Air Quality Management Areas
4/15	Lighting
4/16	Development and flooding
5/1	Housing Provision
5/5	Meeting Housing Needs
5/9	Housing for People with Disabilities
5/10	Dwelling Mix
5/12	New Community Facilities
5/13	Community Facilities in Areas of Major Change

5/14	Provision of community facilities through new development
7/1	Employment Provision
7/2	Selective Management of the Economy
8/2	Transport impact
8/3	Mitigating measures
8/4	Walking and Cycling Accessibility
8/5	Pedestrian and Cycle Network
8/6	Cycle Parking
8/7	Public Transport Accessibility
8/10	Off-street car parking
8/11	New Roads
8/16	Renewable Energy in Major New Developments
8/18	Water, Sewerage and Drainage Infrastructure
9/1	Further Policy/Guidance for the Development of Areas of Major Change
9/2	Phasing of Areas of Major Change
9/3	Development in the Urban Extensions
9/7	Land between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road
9/8	Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road
10/1	Infrastructure improvements

South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework

Core Strategy (2007)

ST/1	Green Belt
ST/2	Housing Provision

Development Control Policies DPD (2007)

DP/1	Sustainable Development
DP/2	Design of New Development
DP/3	Development Criteria
DP/4	Infrastructure of New Development
DP/5	Cumulative Development
DP/6	Construction Methods
DP/7	Development Frameworks
GB/1	Development in the Green Belt
GB/2	Mitigating the Impact of Development in the Green Belt
GB/3	Mitigating the Impact of Development Adjoining the Green Belt
SF/7	Underground Pipes, Wires, Fibres And Cables
NE/4	Landscape Character Areas
NE/6	Biodiversity
NE/9	Water and Drainage Infrastructure
NE/10	Foul Drainage – Alternative Drainage Systems
NE/11	Flood Risk
NE/12	Water Conservation
NE/14	Lighting Proposals

NE/15	Noise Pollution
NE/16	Emissions
NE/17	Protecting High Quality Agricultural Land
CH/2	Archaeological Sites
TR/1	Planning for More Sustainable Travel
TR/3	Mitigating Travel Impact

Joint Policy

Northwest Cambridge Area Action Plan (2009)

NW1	Vision
NW2	Development Principles
NW3	Implementing the Area Action Plan
NW4	Site and Setting
NW5	Housing Supply
NW6	Affordable Housing
NW7	Balanced and Sustainable Communities
NW8	Employment Uses
NW9	Employment Uses in the Local Centre
NW10	Mix of Uses
NW11	Sustainable Travel
NW12	Highway Infrastructure
NW13	Vehicular Access
NW14	Madingley Road to Huntingdon Road Link
NW15	Highway Provision
NW16	Public Transport Provision
NW17	Cycling Provision
NW18	Walking Provision
NW19	Parking Standards
NW20	Provision of Community Services and Facilities and Arts and Culture
NW21	A Local Centre
NW22	Public Art
NW23	Open Space and Recreation Provision
NW24	Climate Change and Sustainable Design and Construction
NW25	Surface Water Drainage
NW26	Foul Drainage and Sewage Disposal
NW27	Management and Maintenance of Surface Water Drainage Systems
NW28	Construction Process
NW29	Strategic Landscaping
NW30	Phasing and Need
NW31	Infrastructure Provision

APPENDIX C

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS AND MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Supplementary Planning Documents

Cambridge City Council

Sustainable Design and Construction (2007)

Affordable Housing (2008)

Public Art (2010)

Planning Obligation Strategy (2010)

South Cambridgeshire District Council

Biodiversity (2009)

District Design Guide (2010)

Health Impact Assessment (2011)

Landscape in New Developments (2010)

Open Space in New Developments (2009)

Public Art (2009)

Trees and Development Sites (2009)

Material Considerations

Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (March 2001)

Cambridge City Nature Conservation Strategy – Enhancing Biodiversity (2006): and Cambridge City Wildlife Sites Register (2005)

Cambridgeshire Bio-Diversity Action Plan (2000)

Cambridge City Council - Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2006)

Cambridge City Council - Provision of Public Art as Part of New Development Schemes (2002)

Cambridgeshire County Council - Northern Corridor Area Transport Plan (2003)

Cambridgeshire County Council–Western Corridor Area Transport Plan (2003)

Cambridgeshire Design Guide (2007)

Manual for Streets (2007)

Cambridgeshire Horizons - Green Infrastructure Strategy

Cycle Parking Guide for Residential Developments (2010)

Cambridge Sustainable Drainage Design and Adoption Guide (2009)

Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council - Foodstore Provision in North West Cambridge IPPG (2011)

Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council – Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2010)

APPENDIX D

EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

Statutory Consultees

Cambridgeshire County Council

June 2012 Comments

Since the time of the original submission, the applicants have submitted amendments to the application, and have continued to work with officers to resolve outstanding matters of detail, with all points either agreed, close to agreement, or will be the subject of detailed reserved matters applications.

The County makes detailed comments with regard to the following:

Education

On-Site Primary School

An approach has been agreed between the University and the County Council to secure, through the S106, a number of clauses that provide sufficient flexibility and assurance to meet both party's statutory obligations and design aspirations.

The school site will be provided to the County, alongside appropriate capital funding to deliver the school. Mechanisms will be put in place to enable the University to have design input into the school through either appropriate consultation or by virtue of being the promoter for the school themselves.

Off-Site Secondary Education

A contribution towards the requisite secondary education provision off-site has been agreed, with delivery mechanisms designed to be flexible to meet the varying needs arising from the potential location of this provision.

Transport

Originally concerns were expressed in a number of areas, addressed now, as follows:

- Design of Site Access Junctions - officers are now content with the design of the junctions, subject to approval of detailed design points. These can be resolved through design stage, design codes and reserved matters/discharge of conditions.

- Design of On-Site Highways – satisfied with level of detail currently provided. Detailed design considerations will need to be addressed at Design Code and reserved matters application stages.
- Bus Strategy – A full bus strategy has now been provided, containing S106 measures. Officers consider the proposals to be acceptable.
- Transport Mitigation Measures to be Provided or Secured Through S106 – the package of measures proposed, both on-site and off-site are considered acceptable, although detailed design considerations will need to be resolved at the appropriate stage, whilst timing of S106 contributions in some areas still needs to be agreed.

Adoption and Public Access

The submitted Adoption Strategy is acceptable, in principle, although a number of issues exist that are suggested could be resolved through planning conditions.

- Dedication of rights of way needs to be clarified to inform design process
- A suitable connection to Bridleway 30 needs to be identified and secured prior to the approval of the application.
- Public access needs to be secured at all times.
- The parking and cycling strategy need to be clarified prior to the commencement of development.

Other Matters

Minerals and Waste officers and Ecology officers wish to see various measures outlined in the submitted Environment Statement and Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) secured through planning condition(s).

September 2011 Submission Comments

The County Council have issued a holding objection to the application, until such time as a number of concerns are resolved to their satisfaction.

The main issues identified revolve around:

- S.106 Package
- Education and Community
- Key transport elements of the application

S106 Package

Although the County does not object, in principle, to the list of items included as Heads of Terms by the applicant, further discussions are required.

Given that the current s106 package is not agreed, a holding objection is lodged until such time as this has been completed and contains all of the elements that the Council expects.

Education and Community

There are concerns in relation to aspects of the school's design and access arrangements, which the County Council has set out in detail within its comments. Issues include:

- Fibre optic network coverage
- Building heights
- Delineation of school building and playing field site and uses
- Locations for parking and access
- Provision of on-site drop-off
- Connection between school site and adjoining areas of open land
- Timetable for provision and cost of energy provided through CHP, and ability of school to source heat/energy to secure best value

In addition, the emerging draft s106 Heads of Terms includes provisions for on-site and off-site contributions for appropriate educational facilities, library and community facilities. The quantum of these contributions is currently being negotiated although the broad principle of contributions has been agreed. Recently updated demographic profiles have been produced. Whilst these are being discussed between the Council and the applicant, it is not possible to finalise the size of the schools.

Transport

The Transport Assessment and Travel Plan are regarded as being robust and completed to a standard acceptable to the County Council.

Whilst officers have worked with the applicant at significant length, and much progress has been made, there are a number of transport related items of concern and these will require further discussions between the University and the County Council. These items are:

- Design of the site access junctions
- Design of on-site highways
- Adequacy of the walking/ cycling/ Rights of Way connectivity between the development site and external destinations
- Completion of the bus strategy

- Confirmation of the transport mitigation measures to be provided / s106 items.

Other Matters

Beyond the matters raised above, the County Council also made comments in the following areas:

- Waste plans are broadly acceptable although more detail is required in respect of Site Waste Management Plan and particular areas of the site.
- Green infrastructure plans are supported, although some minor errors on plans need correcting and conditions or obligations will be required to secure measures.
- Outline archaeological proposals are appropriate and need to be secured by condition.

Highways Agency

April 2012 Amendment Comments

The amendments have satisfactorily addressed the Agency's objections.

To ensure the development fully meets the Agency's expectations it has recommended a number of planning conditions to be attached to any consent. The recommended conditions address the following issues:

- Implementation of the Site Wide Travel Plan
- Mechanism to secure the scope, nature and timing of improvement works at M11 junction 13
- Details to be contained within the Construction Environment Management Plan, including: construction and phasing programme; contractors access arrangements; construction hours; construction delivery times; Outline Waste Management Plan; Soil Management Strategy; noise management and mitigation; vibration management; dust management; site lighting; drainage control measures; and screening and hoarding details.

September 2011 Submission Comments

It originally placed a holding direction, issued until 29th February 2012.

Environment Agency

April 2012 Amendment Comments

Having reviewed the amended documentation, the Agency has commented that the proposals are acceptable to it, but only on the

provisio that conditions recommended by it are attached to any consent.

The proposed conditions address the following issues:

- Strategic Site Surface Water Drainage – details to be submitted to build upon submitted documentation prior to any reserved matters application
- Individual Site Surface Water Drainage – to be submitted alongside any reserved matters application
- River Modelling: Wash Pit Brook – flood reduction scheme required ahead of commencement of development, in accordance with the applicant's submitted FRA
- Phasing – to address phased construction of development alongside necessary flood mitigation works
- Groundwater & Contaminated Land – to address any contamination discovered during development works not previously identified, and its subsequent mitigation; and also the control of piled or other penetration foundation designs
- Construction Environmental Management Plan – addressing ecological impacts, timing of onsite works and any necessary mitigations.
- Protection of on-site species of brown hares and skylarks

In addition to the above conditions, the Agency has also requested a series of informatives to be attached to any consent, that seek to provide background information to the developers and further guidance in respect of the proposed conditions and their general responsibilities, including elements in respect of the use of SuDS, water quality/wastewater, fisheries, recreation & biodiversity.

September 2011 Submission Comments

Have reviewed the documents and held recent discussions with the applicants in respect of flood risk and surface water drainage, the Agency has reserved its position regards these areas until further information is received from the applicant's consultants. However, it commented with regard to the following areas:

Groundwater & Contaminated land

It is satisfied with the conclusions in the ES that the site does not pose a risk to the quality of controlled waters. However, it has recommended conditions and informatives in respect of securing a remediation strategy for the site, contamination discovered during construction, surface water infiltration and penetrative foundation design, to ensure no harm arises through the detailed phases of development.

Fisheries, Recreation & Biodiversity

Recommendations within the ES should be followed, particularly in respect of off-site habitat mitigation and protection of the Washpit Brook.

Area Environment Planning and Waste Issues

Documentation is comprehensive, the recommendations of which should be followed.

Wastewater/Water Quality

It accepts the recommendations in REC WW1 of the Detailed Water Cycle Study. It agrees to a condition that references a scheme that mitigates the impact of the proposed development on the sewerage network, but comments that it has experience of Anglian Water being wary of greywater recycling systems due to increased potential for cross-contamination with clean drinking water. It is essential that any such drainage plan is agreed with Anglian Water alongside an adoption regime for new infrastructure.

Water Resources

Recommendations in the ES should implemented, particularly with regard to timing of development relative to water supply, locating development relative to existing water resources, and ensuring that water efficiency is planned into the development.

Anglian Water

Anglian Water has assessed the application with regard to waste water treatment, the foul sewerage network, surface water disposal and trade effluent.

It has noted that, whilst capacity exists in the existing wastewater system for the flows from the site, in respect of foul and surface water drainage it has concerns with the submitted information/strategies. It has also noted that, given that the scheme includes employment/commercial uses, permission to discharge effluent into the public sewer will require its consent.

Accordingly it has recommended two conditions to secure satisfactory foul and surface water drainage strategies and three informatives regarding trade effluent permissions and the use of technologies in construction.

With regard to these points, Anglian Water is in the process of agreeing a drainage strategy with the developer.

Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE)

CABE comment that there is much to commend the proposed masterplan, considering it to be clear and logical, presenting good principles of connectivity and a reasoned co-ordination of uses to create a mixed community. However, it has specific concerns that the diagrams lack spirit, with particular concerns that the illustrative block typologies suggest a generic form of development that does not reflect the particular character of the site.

To resolve some of these concerns it has suggested that further information should be captured to provide street level perspectives to illustrate how vistas may be achieved through the development and how the scheme may respond to the need to provide a coherent walking and cycling network and how potential conflicts between uses that overlap, such as the proposed hotel adjoining the central park, may be resolved.

East of England Development Agency (EEDA)

EEDA supports the development, considering it to make a significant contribution to the approved development strategy for the Cambridge sub-region and consequently the future strength of the economy. However, it highlights the findings of the 2011 study 'Cambridge at 50 – The Cambridge Economy Retrospect and Prospect', which seeks to understand long term threats and opportunities to Cambridge and its high-tech economy. Accordingly, it stresses the critical importance of considering how the development will create opportunities for social interaction and also the appropriateness of user restrictions for the employment provision on site, given the study's findings that there will be limited scope for general business uses in the City in 5 to 10 years time.

Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue

The Fire Authority request that if the application is approved then provision for fire hydrants be made either through S106 agreement or planning condition.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary

It is unable to comment on the detail of layout and permeability at this stage, however, it highlights a number of statements within the application documents which are supported.

It notes that, from the Masterplan, there will be a combination of on street, basement and parking court car parking. There is a requirement under Secure by Design for parking courts to be gated. Any on street parking will need to be the subject of good surveillance. Statistically, the safest places to park a vehicle is either in a garage or within the curtilage of a dwelling.

Cambridgeshire Constabulary does not object to the proposals and does not have any specific comments to make on the general layout but would ask for further information regarding crime prevention measures, traffic calming, size and orientation of parking areas together with layout and surveillance of open spaces be subject to further consultation at reserved matters stage from a Secure by Design perspective.

Cambridgeshire NHS

Cambridgeshire NHS consider that the proposals appear to be generally in line with the North-West Cambridge Area Action Plan and support the ambition of the University in much of what they set out to achieve. However, it considers there to be a lack of detail about how some of the hard infrastructure elements will be delivered and sustained (including lack of detail regards timing) and little detail about how social infrastructure will be installed to integrate the new community with those existing that surround the site.

Commenting specifically regards health provision, it has two principle concerns:

Although the NHS have previously agreed that a 700sqm facility would be required by the site and that it could be provided on site (in part to mitigate the effects of the economic down turn and potential for it to not come forward if delivered off-site), it has now reviewed this position and now seeks one co-located facility on the NIAB site to service all 3 proposed developments in the North-West Quadrant of the city (NIAB, NIAB Extra, and the University scheme).

The proposal sets out that the developers would build the health facility in the first phase on the development (although the timing and mechanism of delivery is unclear), and then rent it out on commercial terms to the NHS. This would be unacceptable and unaffordable, particularly in the early stages of the site's development, therefore presenting an unacceptable risk that adequate health provisions would be made to service the site in the long-term. The facility should be provided as fully funded through S.106 obligations, with no premises revenue cost passed on to the NHS.

In respect of the proposed Senior Care facility, the NHS challenge the assertions in the application that there is a lack of capacity within the existing network or that it will help provide for a mixed and balanced community, given the lack of apparent support network for such a facility.

Regarding the submitted Health Impact Assessment, the NHS comments that the recommendations should be expanded to encompass the wider determinants of health; that the health policy section should be updated in light of recent policy changes; and that the health effect of the development are only potentially positive at this

stage, and that careful attention will need to be paid at the detailed planning stage to ensure that such benefits are achieved.

Ministry of Defence

No safeguarding objections, in respect of Cambridge Airport, provided no buildings or structures exceed 45.7 metres above ground level.

Natural England

June 2012 Amendment Comments

The amendments address most of the concerns raised previously, and it is, therefore, now content to remove its objection.

Its outstanding concerns now only include the need for clarification of the proposed enhancement measures within the SSSI and for inconsistencies, in relation to lighting proposals and inclusion of ramped walkways, within the Design, Landscape and Access Statement to be addressed. It has confirmed that its concerns could be addressed by way of planning condition.

April 2012 Amendment Comments

Detailed concerns and required points of clarification, expressed at the time of the original submission, appear to have been overlooked, in respect of comments made within Chapters 2 and 8 of the Environmental Statement and the submitted Geological Site Management Plan (GSMP), Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) and Design, Access and Landscape Statement, regarding the impact of elements of the development upon the Travellers Rest SSSI.

September 2011 Submission Comments

Whilst acknowledging a number of areas to commend the application, Natural England objects to the scheme as currently submitted, on the grounds of concerns that significant detrimental impact could occur to the integrity of the Traveller's Rest Pit SSSI.

Most specifically, whilst it generally welcomes the findings of the contamination investigations, utilities and services strategy, sustainability proposals across the site, Design, Access and Landscape Statement, and the proposed construction code of conduct, in respect of the various themed areas such as sustainable use of soils on site, loss of agricultural land, the connectivity within the site (including the linkages between green spaces) and the ecology and nature conservation strategy for the site (mindful that some such details will need to be secured by either planning condition or S.106 obligation), it is concerned that the Geological Site Management Plan (GSMP) and

Environmental Statement either contain some vague statements or appear to encourage elements such as footpaths, steps, boreholes, drainage pipes and services into the SSSI that may serve to disturb or damage the important features of the site.

Furthermore, it is also concerned no mention is made at present seeking to restrict elements such as the proximity of certain development types to the fringes of the SSSI or boundary treatments for adjoining uses such as the school, that would seek to discourage disturbance to the SSSI either during the construction phase of the development or post-occupational use.

Finally, whilst not objecting to the Public Art Strategy, Natural England is disappointed that it does not make specific reference to the nationally important geology on-site and would welcome further discussions with it to understand how this could be reflected in the strategy going forward.

Sport England

April 2012 Amendment Comments

Given that the proposals have not significantly changed since the original submission, Sport England's position has not changed overall. It supports the approach of securing sporting facilities via the S.106 and an agreed phasing plan. It would welcome the opportunity to comment on detailed proposals when they are submitted.

September 2011 Submission Comments

Sport England has assessed the application in regard to quantity and quality of outdoor sport, indoor sport, and youth provisions and with regard to phasing and maintenance/management of spaces.

In principle it is broadly supportive of proposals, but raises some specific comments/concerns, around the following:

Outdoor Sport

Population projections would require 7.8ha of outdoor sport provision. At present there is a lack of detail provided regards the quantum of provision proposed. It would request that quantum of space details are provided, alongside indicative details of pitch mix and layout.

No objection, in principle, to the quality of space provided, but it would require further information to be provided, either by condition or through later submissions, to secure details of ground conditions to identify development constraints and inform design/mitigation measures, and the submission of details of siting and design of facilities required to service outdoor sports, such as pavilions and clubhouses.

Indoor Sport

Support principle proposals, but require further information. Most specifically, the proposed 450sqm of indoor sport provision meets policy standards, but it is unclear whether this accounts for ancillary facilities within that floorspace. Equally, it is unclear what the proposed dimensions of the floorspace would be, which requires careful design so as not to preclude some activities.

Support the principle of contribution towards an off-site swimming facility. Using its own costing models and the anticipated population, would expect a contribution to equate to £405,600.

Youth Provision

Broadly supported, but wishes to see more information regards the development meeting the specific needs of teenagers.

Phasing

Broadly supported, and recommend that such details are secured by condition or planning obligation.

Maintenance and Management

Comment that it is important to secure these details at an early stage for at least a 10 year period.

Sport England would object if such measures are not resolved, either prior to consent or by condition/planning obligation, and expect that any scheme to be agreed in consultation with local authorities and relevant national sports governing bodies.

English Heritage

English Heritage comment that the most significant aspect from their point of view is the impact of the scheme upon the historic setting of Cambridge and the Green Belt. When reviewed in light of PPS5, they consider that the scheme will result in a degree of harm to the historic setting of the City, and therefore the Authorities must satisfy themselves that the benefits of the scheme to the wider public benefit outweigh such harm.

In assessing such benefits, English Heritage highlights several key areas for consideration:

Setting of Cambridge

It identifies the existing city edge and the importance of views into the site. Accordingly it identifies that the western edge of the scheme and the landscape fingers that permeate it will be extremely important in establishing the appearance of the site from the west. It has concerns

that the green fingers may be too narrow, whilst it would wish to see more detailed modelling of the built form along the western edge.

Response to Cambridge

It would like to see more information about how street forms will be designed to reflect the historic street pattern within the City. Whilst agreeing that courtyards can present public realm issues, they would not wish to see them precluded in the detailed scheme.

Landmarks

It agrees that landmark buildings/features are important across the site, but challenges that landmarks can be achieved through design detail, and would wish to guard against a reliance on height and scale to achieve landmark status.

Floodlight of Sports Provision

Given the location of the formal sports provision on the western edge, English Heritage has concerns that this location is highly visible and therefore light sensitive from views into the countryside.

Other organisations

Ramblers Association (Cambridge Group)

The Association has commented stating that the development must protect and enhance footpath access to the countryside from the development site.

Specifically, it has suggested that the existing Girton Footpath 5 crossing of Huntingdon Road be at least maintained, if not enhanced within the scheme, whilst provisions should be made to enhance its links beyond the site to the west, possibly including some measures that originally formed part of the now abandoned A14 upgrade package. It welcomes the proposals to improve the M11 underpass in this location.

The Association has also proposed that an additional connection be established between Bridleway 30 and the application site to improve links to the countryside, with a further suggestion that new countryside links could be established towards Madingley, including a potential new crossing of the M11 into the scheme's proposed Western landscape edge.

Cambridge Cycling Campaign

Has written stating that whilst it has no objection to the principle of the NW Cambridge development, it strongly opposes the application at present for two principal reasons: 1) The scale of the many of the major junctions and associated difficulties for cyclists, 2) the lack of detail and clarity regards cycling infrastructure.

The Campaign has made specific comments in relation to the proposed junction designs and considers that foot and cycle users should be designed to have priority over motor vehicles at these junctions, whilst it supports the proposed demand responsive signal at the North-West junction for the site, it considers the overall designs lacking in user-friendliness, highlighting specific concerns with design of the junction on Madingley Road which links into the West Cambridge site.

Further to junction specific issues, the Campaign is also concerned that the indicative designs for the primary routes within the site give rise to concerns regarding relationships with parking areas and the crossings over the 'green fingers', whilst overall it is critical of a lack of detail regards the design of the Ridgeway cycle route. It endorses the aspiration for 20mph speed limits across the site and wishes to see measures incorporated from the outset of development to ensure this is secured.

The Campaign goes on to state its preferences for cycling to be incorporated between footpaths and drainage systems, the maximisation of the use of Home Zones and red raised table crossing points across the site, and query where cycle parking would occur throughout the development.

Faith Representatives for NW Cambridge

The group is encouraged by the provision of the four houses proposed to be available for faith group leaders from the first phase of development, considering these critical for facilitating the early contribution of faith leaders in the development of the community.

They consider that it is key the that the Community Centre be accessible for faith groups, and also, in part, designed and managed by their members to ensure that it is fit for purpose. They query whether the applicant has engaged with such groups sufficiently at this stage to achieve such aims.

They also query whether the proposed community facility is sufficiently sized to meet the needs of faith users, as well as other elements of the community. In making such comments they cite several case studies and provide a dossier of Shared Faith Facilities in the UK.

Sustrans

Overall, consider the scheme to present a realistic possibility of achieving low car usage and considers the Transport Assessment ('TA') to be generally encouraging. Furthermore, it considers the movement network proposed to be good.

However, it is concerned that the scheme lacks detail in parts and therefore lacks clarity. It suggests use of a Design Code to include a car and cycle strategy, taking into account parking principles in the residential and employment areas of the site. It wishes to see a code to underpin principles of designing the scheme consistently to promote walking, cycling and public transport. It would wish to see the road network designed to restrict vehicles to a maximum 20mph speed limit.

Sustrans also notes comments in the TA regards overall traffic flow management from the site into the surrounding road network and presumes that this accounts for what it considers to be “very large road junctions”, which it believes to be inappropriately large given the stated aims of achieving low car use across the site. It also considers that the chosen design solutions of the junctions have been previously shown to discourage walking and cycling.

Parish Councils

Girton Parish Council

April 2012 Amendment Comments

The Parish Council rejects the plans in their present form.

It has challenged a number of detailed comments within the application in respect of the following:

- Strategy of reducing the number of car parking spaces as a means to reduce car ownership
- Impact upon Oxford Road and Windsor Road, the need for identified mitigation and query where displaced traffic will go if not on these roads.
- It requests more detail in respect of enhancements along Huntingdon Road, Victoria Road, Castle Street and a crossing of Huntingdon Road at Whitehouse Lane
- Queries why a base year of 2010 is chosen for modelling and queries the potential for disproportionate impact on Girton, citing impacts of existing ‘new’ developments.
- Identifies a number of areas where negative impact is possible to Girton residents, such as severance, level of fear and intimidation and impact upon sensitive receptors within the village (such as LEAPS, schools and churches) and contests that the level of impact is disproportionate/unacceptable.
- Request that motorcycles be removed from cycle survey
- Also highlights areas where spelling mistakes have occurred.

September 2011 Submission Comments

The Parish Council wishes to object to the Planning Application on the following grounds:

- The education assessment is flawed and proposed provision inadequate. It requests that the County undertake a more rigorous demographic study on likely school places at both primary and secondary levels (noting that there will certainly be no capacity in Girton or its environs) and that a plan to ensure that adequate provision can be made is in place before even outline permission can be granted.
- It believes the proposed transport plans do not adequately take the transport hierarchy and Manual for Streets advice into consideration, either in the pathways proposed through the site or in the two main entrances. It requires clarification on predicted levels of traffic through the site and on provision to be made for it, also on speeds and permeability by pedestrians.
- It believes that the design of the two access points, and the cycle provisions along Huntingdon Road, generate unnecessary and dangerous conflict between various classes of user, in particular cyclist/pedestrian and bus/cyclist.
- It requests more detailed descriptions of the energy generation measures to ensure that the development will satisfy carbon and renewable criteria.
- It requests more work be done on the 'Girton gap' layout, which must function as a gateway to the village as well as a gateway to the City.
- The transport assessment places significantly more traffic on Huntingdon Road and (particularly) on Windsor Road/Oxford Road. The latter cannot just be dismissed as anomalous, since this traffic must go somewhere else if it is believed that it will not enter Oxford Road. It requires the modelling to be re-run with proper data and the assessment revised.

Bar Hill Parish Council

It notes that the application does not include a cycle path link between the application site and Cambridge Road, Madingley, which would then link to Dry Drayton and Bar Hill. The Parish Council considers that lack of such provisions would constitute a non-compliance with the adopted AAP for the site in respect of access to the countryside, specifically policies NW17 and NW18.

Histon and Impington Parish Councils

No comments received.

Coton Parish Council

April 2012 Amendment Comments

The Parish Council doesn't agree with findings of Transport Assessment and consider that there will be a negative impact upon Coton village. It objects until a suite of mitigation for the village is outlined.

September 2011 Submission Comments

Coton Parish Council met to discuss the application on 8th November 2011. It is currently awaiting a follow-up response from the University in respect of a traffic analysis of the effect on Coton before responding.

Madingley Parish Council

Madingley Parish Council has expressed two principal concerns that it would wish to see addressed: 1) the large number of high buildings proposed will be visible across high quality land when viewed from Madingley. Steps should be taken to mitigate this impact, potentially including significant tree planting on the western edge, 2) the proposals do not include a cycle path link to Madingley, contrary to Policies NW17 & NW18 of the AAP, which seek to secure linkages to the surrounding villages and countryside.

Residents Associations

Nineteen Acre Field Residents Association (NAFRA)

April 2012 Amendment Comments

NAFRA initially commented that the submitted documentation was presented in a manner which made it difficult to establish whether/how the submission addressed the officer comments.

Notwithstanding that point, they made comments in the following regard:

Open Space and Recreation

NAFRA have not been able to locate a 'strategic management strategy' and so has concluded that a University-led management solution is not proposed.

Community and Local Centre

NAFRA supports the inclusion of a health facility on the site, but is not convinced that the need for the hotel has been made.

Transport

NAFRA considers it unfortunate that the bus strategy is being prepared bilaterally with the County Council and not available to public scrutiny. Whilst welcoming the appearance of the Framework Car Parking Management Plan, there is also concern at how enforceable the arrangements/aspirations will be given previous experience of managing student car ownership. Similarly concern also remains that the connection to Storey's Way for bicycles/pedestrians will threaten the well-being of existing trees in the area where the connection will be created. Alongside this, NAFRA expected more information to be provided by the applicants in respect of connections to external destinations. Whilst some information has been submitted, this does not appear sufficient to address concerns regarding the overall connectivity of the scheme. Finally, plans are under consultation for the 30mph speed limit on Huntingdon Road to be extended, which NAFRA supports. The scheme/junction designs should be compatible with such potential changes.

Parameter Plans

PP02 – cannot see any changes and would ask officers to ensure changes required have been actioned.

PP03 – Removal of the secondary open land adjacent to the Burial Ground is noted and appreciated.

PP05, 06, 07 – still finds the relationship between these plans difficult to grasp and, as such, is unclear whether changes are sufficient to overcome concerns.

S.106

NAFRA is pleased to see a working summary of the Section 106 agreement, which is clearly an extensive list of major items. There is some concern that residents are not involved in such discussions, with limited opportunity to debate issues of considerable interest to residents.

September 2011 Submission Comments

The proposed development will have a significant impact upon the residents of properties surrounding the field known as Nineteen Acre Field in terms of:

- Future loss of amenity and outlook.
- The impact of a lengthy construction programme.
- The increase in traffic and congestion from a result of this development.
- A fundamental change to the nature of this corner of Cambridge.

Notwithstanding these basic concerns NAFRA has set out some core expectations for the development of the parcel of land that is immediately adjacent to the residents.

- Properties on the perimeter of the field should be detached, substantial, 2 storeyed family dwellings, with gardens no less than 20 metres that will abut the back gardens of the surrounding properties; parking should be at the front of the house, not the back.
- NAFRA acknowledges that the application reflects this but it would like to be involved at the design guide stage to ensure that this is followed through to the detailed design stage.
- Objection to the open space adjacent to the cemetery, which will encourage a short cut through the cemetery into the city. NAFRA requests that this open space is removed and replaced with a unbroken line of housing along the perimeter of the site.
- Concerns over the traffic impact of the proposed supermarket within the local centre.
- NAFRA urge that particularly close attention is paid to possible environmental alleviating measures as the planning process develops further.
- The number of junctions/crossings on Huntingdon Road should be kept to a minimum in order to facilitate the free flow of traffic on Huntingdon Road.
- It is recommended that the assumptions underpinning access to public transport are challenged and that evidence beyond a statement of aspiration is provided to support these assumptions.
- NAFRA requires the University to provide firm evidence that it can effectively regulate the level of car ownership and associated parking requirements. In this regard reference to current regulatory impact should be provided to the planning authorities. Concern is expressed that if this is not done successfully that overflow parking (from the reduced parking rate) on the site will occur in nearby streets.
- There should be the inclusion of a photographic/videographic record of the development of the site (change from rural to urban) as a strand within the Public Art Strategy.

Windsor Road Residents Association (WIRE)

April 2012 Amendment Comments

The resident's association supports a number of elements within the Transport Assessment Addendum:

- the additional pedestrian/cycle crossing facility on the Eastern Huntingdon Road arm of the proposed accesses (Chapter 2.4 (paras. 2.4.7 and 2.4.16; Appendix 2.1 plans 1 and 2))

- the improved cycle facilities, especially between Girton Road and the Huntingdon Road west junction (Chapter 2.6 (para 2.6.1 and Appendix 2.4))
- the need for the public transport strategy to be sustainable (Chapter 2.7).

Whilst it welcomes and supports the commitment to manage traffic impact on Windsor Road/Oxford Road and to set up a fund to contain any increase in vehicular movement, it requests clarification on how this will be delivered – timescale and mechanism for establishing need and consultation.

It also has specific concerns regarding the proposed traffic calming measures illustrated in the addendum. Principal concerns relate to the need for change to priority in Windsor Road from the existing setup and the introduction of structures that may prevent larger or emergency vehicles from accessing properties.

September 2011 Submission Comments

- WIRE appreciate the level of consultation with local residents and appreciate the commitment to produce a high quality development that will serve purpose well into the future.
- The proposal to monitor traffic levels in Windsor and Oxford Rd and to provide measures to alleviate as necessary, is welcomed.
- Measures to upgrade cycle links off site, at Murketts corner and interconnecting with NIAB are supported also.
- The ownership of the open space by the University is supported since it will be in their interest to maintain this to a high standard.
- Infrastructure provision including roads, schools, open space, health etc. should be integrated between this site and NIAB.

Oxford Road Residents Association (ORRA)

April 2012 Amendment Comments

It welcomes the acknowledgement that traffic will increase in Oxford Road and the agreement to contribute financially to any traffic calming measures. However, some concern over the details outlined, as follows:

- Queries over the nature and responsibility for traffic monitoring
- The illustrated design for traffic calming causes a number of concerns, including: may frustrate existing residents without preventing rat-running, visually unappealing, increased traffic noise through ‘funnelling effect’, cycle paths aren’t wide enough, loss of parking spaces to residents.

September 2011 Submission Comments

The Resident's Association is currently progressing with its own independent traffic calming scheme and would like this to be given consideration as an alternative.

- Concerns relate to transport in particular the impact on Oxford and Windsor Road which is already a rat-run.
- Estimates suggest that a significant number of extra traffic movements (ORRA estimate 97,750 cars per year) will be significant. Most of the traffic using the road does not come from residents but from people moving across the city or neighbouring streets.
- While the monitoring of traffic is welcomed it does not present a solution and the existing traffic is already too high and needs to be reduced.
- More detail regarding the S106 commitments are required, and who decides whether the traffic being monitored becomes too much.
- It would be far better to act sooner rather than later- and measures should be put in place to discourage traffic from the start such as a home zone transformation of the road or transponders/number plate recognition.
- Broadly the development is welcomed but the traffic mitigation measures need to be considered from the outset.

Friends of Ascension Burial Ground (FAB)

- Why is the green space adjacent to the Ascension Burial Ground necessary?
- There is a security threat if this green space is retained and there would have to be a substantial planting along the boundary for the adjacent residents.
- This green space would encourage a cut through into the city.
- Suggestion that this green finger will provide a vista to the chapel is not correct, the trees within the burial ground would screen the view.
- There is an avenue of trees within the middle of 19 acre field which will provide a good vista- it seems unnecessary to extend the avenue with this dog leg.

Storey's Way Residents Association

- Concerned that trees are likely to be felled to make way for the cycle and pedestrian paths that will exit the site into Storey's Way. It would like clarification of works in this area.

Elected Member Representations

One Representation from Cllr Simon Kightley (on behalf of the Castle Liberal Democrats) which is summarised as follows:

- It is essential that all steps are taken to mitigate the impact that the development will have on traffic in the area. Good bus links must be provided to the central train station, the science park and beyond to the possible Chesterton train station.
- The University should approach more than one bus company with regard to the service to be provided.
- Mitigation should be looked at for areas could be safer for cyclists such as Magdalene Street and the crossing at Lady Margaret Road.
- Seek assurance that there should be no motor vehicular entrance or exit onto Huntingdon Road at Girton Gap during construction, nor after residential occupation.
- Concerns regarding the skyline impact when viewed from the eastern edge. Residents will lose amenity and they have yet to see a diagram of the proposed skyline.
- If the playing fields are to be floodlit they would be better placed near other sources of light such as the park and ride.
- Concerns over the green space next to the cemetery, as this may become an exit from the site.
- Reassurance should be given that residents in the Conduit Head Road/Landsdowne Road area of the ward have been consulted.
- Reassurance should be given that no-one shall be displaced by the development and/or that appropriate housing is forthcoming at a similar rate.
- A higher standard of co-operation with local authorities in terms of street lights, drainage and transport is expected. Responsibility and timing of handover is essential and has been a problem on other sites.
- The outline application is predicted on low car ownership- and connection with car clubs is welcomed. We are keen to see the steps the University propose to monitor car ownership on the site. Now is also a good time to evaluate the powers of the motor proctor's responsibility.
- We are interested as to why a P&R at the north of Huntingdon Rd has not been discussed in the planning.

One Representation from Cllr Douglas De Lacey (Girton Ward), which is summarised as follows:

- Major concerns are the very deleterious effect on Huntingdon Road, and as part of the 'gateway to Girton'.
- The gateway needs to be effective and the road layout allows a gateway 'Welcome to Girton' sign.
- Concerns regarding the inability of the current system to cope with the education of the children of early adopters (primary and secondary). A planning condition must secure early delivery of the school.
- County representatives have admitted that multipliers used by County for new communities had been increased, therefore the

figures need to be revised upwards before outline permission is granted.

- There are concerns related to waste management of the site.
- Queries in relation to the height of the CHP chimney and that there should be local comparators to reference.
- Several queries and concerns relating to the noise and air quality modelling- especially the lack of hard data on air quality.
- Concerns that some estimates regarding low water usage are unrealistic, i.e. some people will rip out their low-flow showers. Hard calculations should be based on hard realities, not pious aspirations.
- The cumulative and interactive effects section within the documents makes some incorrect and/or optimistic assumptions, which will be hard to correct and could result in repeating problems at Cambourne and Orchard Park.
- Several questions and concerns have been stated with regard to the drainage and flood risk section of the EIA.
- A critical commentary on the transport assessment including questions and queries relating to assumptions made on cycling, public transport and transport modelling.

APPENDIX E

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

Urban Design

April 2012 Amendment Comments

Although some of their comments from the original submission remain unaddressed (detailed points regarding treatment of existing landscaping, outline junction interfaces, typical/illustrative plans of street sections, block layouts and elevations, proximity of proposed buildings to existing structures, and landscape/drainage corridors), they consider that such matters can be resolved through the design coding and/or reserved matters stages.

Key previous concerns in relation to the design of the primary street and building heights parameters have now been addressed. There is a clear need to ensure that the parameter plans afford flexibility given the scale and build out period of the scheme, and they feel that the parameters as now proposed strike a good balance between the level of flexibility requested and the level of prescription they consider is required in urban design and conservation terms.

As such, they support the scheme, as amended, and consider that it has the potential to create an exciting and high quality new development.

September 2011 Submission Comments

The Design Access and Landscaping Statement (DALs) presents a logical and well considered master plan. The master plan has many points to commend it and its underlying principles are supported. However, they consider that more detail is needed in some key areas and greater assurance required to demonstrate that the large zones of flexibility are workable.

They also have concerns over the parameter plans and statements, in particular those relating to building height. Some of the parameter statements are confusing and need to be clarified. These statements could be reworded whilst still retaining the flexibility that the applicant seeks.

Some of the parameters are likely to restrict the aspirations for the location of landmark buildings, but conversely allow excessive height in other areas. They would welcome the opportunity to discuss with the applicant how to better deliver a more simplified set of parameters in relation to heights.

They have also noted concerns over the illustrative street sections; in particular the widths of the streets, which should be resolved given the aspiration for streets to be limited to no more than 20mph.

In relation to illustrative blocks they believe that more information is required. They would not wish to see the aspiration of green fingers diminished by allowing the parameter plans to reduce the widths to 20m. As previously noted, they do not support the preferred Market Square design.

Subject to all these matters being resolved to our satisfaction, they would hope to be in a position to support approval of this application.

Planning Policy

Overall the application is welcomed and has carefully considered the criteria detailed in the NWCAAP. Whilst most aspects of the development accord with the advice in the AAP, it is noted that a number of suggested uses, such as the Senior Care and Faith Residential units, are not covered within the policy guidance. They have considered both such elements and consider that they will assist in the aims of providing mixed and balanced communities. They go onto assess five key topic areas of the application, as follows:

Senior Care Needs

A few errors exist within the quoted Cambridge Local Plan policy within the application documentation, whilst careful consideration needs to be given to securing the appropriate use class and occupancy restrictions through a S.106 agreement for the scheme. Consideration also needs to be given to meeting the needs of the older part of the community by providing evidence of need at the time of submitting any future planning application for the facility and designing a proportion of the facility to Lifetime Home Mobility standards.

Overall, national and local policy supports Senior Care provision within the University scheme, as being part of the creation of a mixed and balanced new community on the site. The evidence presented by the University suggests that there is a need for this type of use and therefore this is supported by policies NW2 and NW7 of the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan. However, in order to ensure the effective use of the facility by occupiers requiring a level of care, it is considered that this issue should be dealt with through the S106 agreement for the application.

Faith Residential Needs

The arguments for the faith residential provision on the North West Cambridge site have centred on the creation of a mixed and balanced community through the establishment of community cohesion.

As with the Senior Care Needs element of the submission, a few errors exist within the quoted Cambridge Local Plan policy within the application documentation.

Overall it is considered that national and local policy supports housing provision for faith workers within the University scheme, as being an important part of the creation of a mixed and balanced new community on the site. The evidence presented by the University suggests that there is a need for this type of use and therefore this is supported by Policies NW2 and NW7 of the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan.

However, it is suggested that the use of the proposed residential units is conditioned to ensure that they do not become centres for worship, which may have detrimental impacts on the amenity and quality of life of the wider community within North West Cambridge. Furthermore, assurance of the long-term use of the faith residential units should be secured through the S106 agreement to ensure that they do not revert to market units should they not be taken up by a faith worker.

Retail Impact Assessment

The size of store proposed is in line with the IPPG, which has been adopted by both South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council. The indicative amount of additional floorspace within the local centre is acceptable and evidence for the IPPG concluded that there is a need for main supermarket provision in this part of Cambridge and therefore it should be viable. However, units should be designed to be flexible space in case there are problems with viability. The retail proposed beyond the local centre includes a University cafeteria and a number of small individual shops to serve the local population, which would be acceptable. The IPPG should be referred to for further information about the possible use of conditions and other design and development principles relating to the foodstore and the local centre.

Employment

The application varies subtly from the adopted policy position in that it proposes up to 100,000sqm of employment floorspace (as opposed to the AAP which states that there will be 100,000 sqm of such floorspace), whilst at least 60,000 sqm will be academic floorspace (as opposed to the AAP position of approximately 60,000 sqm of such). The scheme therefore allows for less floorspace to be brought forward overall than planned for in the AAP, whilst the overall proportion of academic floorspace could increase if there is a consequential lowering of the research space across the site. This approach is supported as the land was released from the Green Belt to meet the needs of the University, whilst higher education uses directly associated with the

University incontrovertibly meet the needs of the University. The supporting text of the Policy NW10 allows for such a change furthermore.

The Planning Statement and the Design, Access and Landscape Statement make reference to commercial employment floorspace (Class B1(b) and sui generis research uses) and academic employment floorspace (Class D1), but they do not make reference to the special need to be located close to the University of Cambridge or the national interest. However this can be controlled through the use of a section 106 agreement; this agreement is a requirement of section 2 of the policy and can be used to ensure that these policy requirements are met.

Therefore, subject to the issue of demonstrating need and phasing, and a section 106 agreement being signed that controls the occupiers of the employment and academic research institute uses to those with a special need for a Cambridge location, for a period of 10 years from the first date of occupation, the proposal is accordance with Policy NW8: Employment Uses. This should be agreed at outline application stage.

Policy NW30 sets the context for considering proposals for any uses other than residential use, where the case for early provision was accepted as part of the AAP preparation. Therefore for all other uses, including employment, there is a need for any application to satisfactorily demonstrate the need for the development and that it cannot reasonably be met elsewhere. This would take into account factors such as viability, the demand for various uses, land availability, ownership, location, accessibility and suitability.

No evidence of need to provide employment provision immediately has been provided, and needs case will be required as part of any reserved matters application in the future to provide this usage.

Hotel

The assessment includes a comprehensive a range of evidence in support of the development of a mid range,130-bed hotel within the University's development located within the district centre. It is evident from this that there is no other provision planned within the northwest quadrant of the city, which would meet the university's needs. The sequential assessment has proved that there are no city centre sites, which are sequentially preferable to the application site. The food store, a hotel and the senior living accommodation are all put forward as enabling development additional to those put forward in the AAP to secure additional capital and revenue funding for the proposed development. These are valid arguments that support the application and are in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.

The assessment, however, is not entirely convincing in the quantification of the future demand for hotel bedrooms in section 2.5 of the assessment. Further evidence is needed to support the applicant's calculation of 23% market growth by 2018 and what this represents in terms of bedrooms. On receipt of this officers would be able to assess whether the scheme would be likely to prejudice other planned and consented provision elsewhere in the City centre and inner city area given the level of future provision for new hotel accommodation. It is not possible to achieve this without adequate future quantification of demand.

Strategic Housing

Having worked with the University over a period of time, they support the principles of allocations, key worker housing characteristics and clustering proposed.

They wish to see support mechanisms employed to assist key workers settling into new job/area as well as home.

They welcome the Senior Care Facility, as it will assist in creating a mix community, but consider that location close to shops and other facilities to be key.

They require monitoring arrangements to be secured through S.106 and require further discussions with University around performance information to be monitored.

Ecology and Biodiversity

The Ecology and Nature Conservation Environmental Statement (the ES) concentrates on existing habitats (e.g. Washpit Brook, veteran trees, hedgerows and ponds) and species (e.g. farmland birds, great crested newts and badgers). Careful design in the masterplan has sought to retain, protect and enhance these features, particularly with regard to the western edge green corridor, although there are specific comments within the ES that are challenged, such as the impact of additional visitors on the Coton Countryside Reserve, the importance of providing retained landscape features with sufficient space and appropriate settings, as well as protection during development, whilst it is unclear how the partial loss of a row of mature trees along Madingley Road is to be mitigated.

Officers support the proposals overall, including the proposal to mitigate the needs of arable dependent species off-site, but feel-increased emphasis on habitat creation should be sought within the built environment of the site. Little reference has been made to the provision of biodiverse SuDS features and landscaping within the public realm of these spaces, whilst they query the level of potential

being sought from the green fingers within the development, including challenging the minimum width of such spaces.

They request that more detail be given as to how design guides and detailed drainage, landscape and planting proposals will be informed by, or relate to, the statement.

With regard to the Biodiversity Strategy, officers are again broadly supportive of the details contained therein, although comments are made to seek clarification of some of the detailed components within the strategy. One element that is not supported, except as a last resort, is netting off trees to prevent birds from nesting, whilst local community involvement in habitat management is welcomed, although queried as to how it would be achieved and whether cost implications have been factored in by the applicants.

Drainage and Flood Risk

The proposed scheme will provide a significant downstream reduction in flood risk of between 10-25%, by utilising a control device in the Washpit Brook, alongside the proposed attenuation of surface water run-off and use of SuDS within the development. The modelled information has been verified by the Environment agency and the approach is fully supported.

The use of a number of methods to control the surface water discharge will also improve the quality of the water entering the Brook, and is also supported.

Given the nature of the proposals to date, further information will be required to be submitted in respect of the following:

- The flow control structure in the Washpit Brook (prior to any construction on site)
- Access provision for the maintenance of the Brook
- A detailed surface water strategy to outline how attenuation on site will be achieved, and provide a framework for each individual plot Phasing of surface water infrastructure alongside construction (the EA have also recommended such a condition).

Further to the above, the new development will place increased demands upon the maintenance of the Washpit Brook by SCDC's award drain team. The cost has been estimated at a total of £24,267 and can be recovered either through the S106 for the scheme, or through the necessary Land Drainage Byelaw approval.

Informatives regarding the need for Byelaw approval, maintenance strips for the Washpit Brook and details of any structures within the watercourse and byelaw strips are also requested.

Disability Panel

Generally commented that they recognised the outline status of the application and look forward to further presentations in the future regarding more detailed work. They did, however, make comments regarding a number of areas, as follows:

- Internal site access and parking. The Panel noted that junction layouts would not be submitted as part of this outline application, which would be likely to follow through reserved matters applications as the details were being worked through. The submitted Transport Assessment, however, does specify the number and type of car parking spaces. On-street parking will be provided to allow the disabled to access the central space. The overall strategy includes 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling (market housing) with a smaller figure designated for student accommodation.

To allow the safe movement of public transport, pedestrian and cycle movement through the central space, measures such as movable bollards to prevent cars, as well as changes to surface texture should be included.

The Panel note the maximum speed throughout the site will be 20 mph.

- Central spaces - These are often inaccessible to the disabled, with many likely to travel to the centre of Cambridge for their shopping. Thought should be given to this during design work.
- Crossing points - These are particularly important to the partially sighted as a method of route finding as well as crossing the road. The Panel would welcome detail on these areas when possible, but in the meantime would urge the design team to liaise with Camsight <http://www.camsight.org.uk/> during the design stage. Merely making the site a 20mph zone does not negate the need of crossing for disabled people of any disability.
- Accessible rooms - The Local Plan 2006 specifies that 6% of student rooms should be accessible. Further detail on the student accommodation as well as the other key facilities such as the care home and hotel, would be of interest to the Panel once these have been worked through.

Quality Panel

The panel highlighted a number of areas to commend the application, notably the energy policy for the site, including the intention to build to Code 5 homes and proposals for the energy centre. Whilst the inclusion of the local centre in Phase 1 and the proposals for character areas were also welcomed, as they would give a sense of place across the site and would enable navigation. The panel also welcomed the use of topography and the well thought out use of building heights across the site.

However, they also concluded that there needs to be careful consideration given to the social fabric of the site considering the two occupancy groups and the likely different tenure and length of stay.

There should be full integration of the site with surrounding areas including the university west Cambridge site and existing and proposed residential areas to the north and east, whilst facilities should be available to the whole community living and working on the site.

Consideration should also be given to cycling uses and needs across and within the site and also linkages to the city centre and university uses to the south. In connectivity terms it is also important that greater consideration is given to the park and ride and interaction with the site. This will be a strong desire line and would help viability of the local centre in the first development phases.

The Panel were also concerned about the indicative separation of the cycle way and local centre. They did not accept the need for separating the proposed 'fast' cycle lane from other uses. Cycle access across to the NIAB site was also considered important particularly for secondary school children.

At present they consider there to be a lack of detail to understand how the spine road will work and how traffic will be slowed.

In terms of the green spaces around the site, the Panel were encouraged by the proposals for the western edge, but consider that thought needs to be given to the ambition of certain spaces, particularly the 'Girton Gap' to help define a character.

Continuing that theme, the Panel were also concerned that there will be a challenge in getting the relationship between the parts of the local centre right, with particular concerns about what is 'front' and 'back' and how this will work as a place. Delineation of spaces and where and how parking, including drop-off spaces for the school, is accommodated has the potential to have a negative effect on townscape if not correctly addressed.

Environmental Health

April 2012 Amendment Comments

The comments made previously are substantively unchanged. The Environmental Impact Assessment and associated Environmental Statement are in the main robust and acceptable. Accordingly, on balance, officers do not object, in principle, to the application, subject to the imposition of conditions, informatives, and S106 obligations to mitigate the impact of the development as outlined previously.

September 2011 Submission Comments

Artificial lighting

The ES assesses the likely impact on existing residential properties and new residential properties within the site. Artificial lighting should provide an adequate level of lighting for safety and security without compromising amenity or at worst causing a statutory light nuisance.

The assessment of artificial lighting impact on residential sensitive premises is generally comprehensive, robust and adequate. However, there is no reference to section 2.9 of the North West AAP, and, although there is a qualitative description/ review of existing lighting, the ES doesn't include quantitative objective measures in terms of lux levels to characterize the ILE Guidance Notes (2005) District Environmental Zones E1 to E4 stated for identified receptors. In order to benchmark the existing levels of lighting on and in the immediate vicinity of the site, illuminance readings (light spill/trespass) should have been taken and recorded at representative sensitive receptors/monitoring locations.

If carefully designed in accordance with the mitigation measures proposed, the artificial lighting proposed should not have an adverse impact. Conditions are suggested to require lighting scheme for reserved matters submissions, and the impact of construction lighting should be controlled through a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP). Design codes (or similar) should include a section on artificial lighting.

Soils and Geology

The review of historic maps and the site walkover recorded potential sources of contamination including laboratories, former gravel and quarry pits and above ground fuel tanks. Some of these areas have been investigated and others have not.

A total of thirty-nine boreholes were undertaken and thirty-three soil samples were collected and tested for a variety of contaminants. The investigation did not record any significant contamination, however further testing on site should include areas of the former and existing buildings, in the areas of the proposed gardens and made ground. Further ground gas monitoring around the areas for highest potential for ground gas generation is also recommended.

A condition is suggested to cover the outstanding contamination issues above.

Noise

Following the ES assessment officers are on the whole satisfied with approach taken to assess the significance of impact and the approach and methodology used for impact evaluation, prediction (nature, extent and magnitude of noise impact) and mitigation measure identification. It should be noted that the noise assessment is based upon inputs from a satisfactory traffic assessment.

The noise assessment is robust and comprehensive and considers the potential impacts, including the suitability of the site for the proposed

mixed-use development. It also assesses construction noise and vibration effects as well as the future impact of operational road traffic noise, and operational noise generated by the proposed uses of the site itself.

The assessment approach detailed and topics covered are comprehensive. The methodology proposed is generally in accordance with best practice and guidance for undertaking a significance of impact / effect noise assessment and ultimately the consideration of mitigation measures to avoid, reduce or remedy any significant adverse impacts as necessary.

For each phase of the proposed development, it is stated that detailed method statements based on the Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) will be provided and appropriate methods will be implemented to avoid, reduce or manage any disturbance due to construction noise and vibration. The best practical means detailed to mitigate construction noise and vibrations are welcomed and acceptable. The CEMP should be conditioned.

As the final layout and footprints of residential premises are not currently finalised and are detailed design issues it is, therefore, recommended that a phased noise insulation scheme condition for proposed noise sensitive residential premises be imposed to provide an adequate level of protection internally and externally against traffic noise associated with the M11/A14, Huntington Road and the internal primary road routes.

In terms of the energy centre and fixed plant further quantitative noise assessment with detailed specifications are only likely to be available at the detailed design stages and, therefore, a noise insulation type condition is required for buildings and plant / equipment.

On balance it is their view that acceptable engineering noise mitigation measures are achievable for residential and can be implemented to provide an adequate level of protection internally and externally against traffic noise associated with the M11/A14, Huntington Road and the internal primary road routes. A condition is recommended to secure the necessary information at the detailed stage. Conditions are also suggested for construction noise and vibration, and demolition.

Some additional clarification should be provided on the significance of impact caused by two of the new primary accesses to the site which run parallel and close to the existing residential properties.

The open spaces within the western edge are considered acceptable providing that the landscaping on the western edge is conditioned or designed into the scheme.

Several conditions are suggested in relation to the local centre and the uses proposed such as the foodstore to protect the future amenity of local residents.

Air Quality

The air quality modelling presented in the ES shows that, as a result of this development, air quality in the Cambridge City and SCDC air quality management areas (AQMA) is contrary to policy.

Development could be designed to lessen the impact on air quality, or mitigation could be proposed to minimise further the negative air quality impacts. The proposed development already has a significant number of such design and mitigation features- although there are some areas where further measures should be considered and integrated into the development proposals to overcome the negative impact on air quality.

There are some limitations to the model provided, however, it generally shows that air quality deteriorates within the Cambridge Air Quality Management Area as a result of the first phase of development Victoria Road is the worst affected. Air quality also deteriorates within the Cambridge Air Quality Management Area as a result of the second phase of development.

Air quality deteriorates within the South Cambridgeshire Air Quality Management Area as a result of the first phase of development. The worst affected area is on Huntingdon Road, close to the boundary with Cambridge City. In addition, air quality deteriorates within the South Cambridgeshire Air Quality Management Area as a result of the second phase of development.

Going forward the emissions reduction measures suggested within the application are welcomed should be secured along with making sure there are no trip attractors on site, making sure NIAB has its own facilities and that the community hubs proposed here are established early on in the development. A low emissions strategy should also be conditioned.

Waste

Both City and SCDC have a number of concerns with regard to waste provision on the site. The proposal of the underground communal bins (UCBs) at this stage cannot be supported, as there are a number of outstanding issues that need to be resolved before they can be accepted by the waste collection authority.

The developer's preferred waste management option, UCBs, could potentially present the WCA with additional operational and financial risks when compared with the WCA baseline wheeled bin service.

There is insufficient detail in the business case for a whole site UCB solution, particularly for low-density and medium density residential housing, to support the strategy's assertion that this represents the best waste management solution.

Insufficient information is contained within the strategy in relation to proposals for the student accommodation and arrangements for assisted collections for houses on the site. Information has not been included in the waste strategy regarding phasing and how this will be managed, ensuring that the collection authority does not incur additional costs, over phased baseline costs; this is required in advance.

The Site Waste Management Plan should aspire to high standards of reuse and recycling by segregating all waste types on site through the operation of a 'site waste management station' with 'reuse store' for off cuts and surplus items.

The Sustainable Resource and Waste Management Strategy makes reference to travel distances for residents to waste storage points. The districts do not support any proposal for these distances to be extended beyond 30m to 50m as permitted by the Code for Sustainable Homes. Equally the districts do not support the proposal for street widths to be less than 5m.

Odour

The ES does not appear to consider the impact of possible odour generation. Any proposed non-residential uses such as academic research, dry cleaners, food premises and the proposed in-vessel composting arrangements have the potential to generate odour. Conditions to cover this are therefore suggested.

Health Impact Assessment

The scope and content of the report within the ES is acceptable. There is a recommendation in section 10, which suggests that further HIA work may be required as the scheme progresses. This is agreeable but it is recommended that the scope of this further work be agreed as the scheme progresses and submitted for approval in due course.

Conservation/Heritage

The Design, Access and Landscape Statement is a comprehensive document, and the commitment within the documents to high quality is welcomed along with many of the design cues quoted.

The analysis of views into and out of the area is supported, there are no dramatic views of the City Centre from the site or the M11, however the importance of the wider setting is still relevant. The impact on the

adjacent Conservation Areas and listed buildings, as well as undesignated heritage assets (such as the former Country Centre – now the Hotel Felix) will depend very much on detail and things such as the quality of materials proposed.

There is some concern over the height of the buildings proposed in the Storey's Field section of the site as this will have an impact on Churchill College and the West Cambridge Conservation Area. The design of the buildings in this area and any 'landmark' building proposed will need to take the sensitive surroundings into account. The strategic gap could be improved with the removal of the sports pitches that could detract from the green corridor effect.

Landscape

April 2012 Amendment Comments

As before, they consider that the landscape proposals have been thought through thoroughly and are of good quality. However, a number of detailed points remain of concern that will need to be addressed through the reserved matters process.

These are:

- Street sections – space for trees and surface water drainage.
- Street parking – over dependence on this will mean large competition for space in street scene and may undermine broader landscape principles being promoted if not properly addressed.
- Green corridors – additional width welcomed, but would wish to see stipulation that at least 30m will be required where these spaces are providing for a combination of paths, surface water management, tree planting, play areas between buildings above 3 storeys.
- SuDS sections – these will be dry most of the time. As such, details should reflect their impact upon visual amenity. Depths and gradients of swales will be required, alongside any additional features such as retaining walls.
- Western edge – this proposed landform will have to provide a number of functions and will form a prominent part of the site and approach to the city when viewed from outside of the site. As such, its detailing will be very important. Gradients greater than 1:3 for public areas and landscape purposes cannot be supported, as anything steeper will be difficult to either walk on, plant or maintain. They understand that the western edge will be provided in phases and that height of bunds will potentially vary by +/- 2.5m, depending upon degree of cut and fill required within the development site. Given that this could create significant variation in heights, regard should be had to condition that gradients will not exceed 1:3 over 95% of the area open to public access and that bunds in these areas shall not vary in

height by more than +/- 1.5m. The northern part of the western edge should have a rural grassland/meadow character rather than lawn.

- Flood plain – the concept proposals offer an exciting opportunity for landscape, water management, ecology and aesthetics. They look forward to seeing detailed design proposals.
- Earthworks – full details will need to include: phasing, types of material to be excavated, haul routes, sections through the proposed landform on western edge, sections through watercourse enhancements for ecology, explanations of temporary states of landforms and transition arrangements, construction details and specification of landforms.
- Veteran Oak (and Ash Tree) – concern that the Ash Tree is not shown on plans as retained, and that sufficient space for Oak is allowed for to protect its root zone.
- Access to open space – this needs to be explained, particularly in respect of phased access during construction.
- Protection of existing vegetation – standard planning condition required.
- Potential for advance planting – areas should be investigated, together with details for delivery and protection.
- Allotments – further detail required in respect of number, layout, management etc.
- New highways junctions – they appreciate the level of detail provided to date, but are concerned that not all vegetation to be removed has presently been identified. They require further information ahead of works, particularly in respect of Madingley Road west junction. Also, they are not convinced that the indicative landscape proposals are suitable – this will require further engagement and submission of details.
- Parameter plans 05, 06, 07 – they would appreciate a simpler way of calculating building heights.
- Ridgeway – need to consider impact upon large trees adjoining – root zones, construction methodology etc.
- Street lighting – they do not support path lighting in the western edge – this should be omitted.
- Existing Chestnut Avenue – buildings are shown hard against this avenue. Apart from root zone protection, they would also question whether this is a satisfactory approach, given long-term maintenance implications of crown spread etc.
- Courtyard landscapes and private gardens – minimum sizes should be calculated using the BRE report to ensure these are useable and allow sunlight into them. Spaces around buildings must be able to accommodate large tree species to reflect design aspirations in masterplan.
- Bin collection – underground bins are generally supported, but further work needs to be undertaken to incorporate these with other street and landscape functions successfully.

- Site Wide Management – this should be expanded upon in the DALS to explain how future management will work across the whole site, in conjunction with individual land parcels given impact and success upon long-term design and appearance.
- Spaces for Teenagers – spaces currently indicatively shown as being located in isolated areas. This should be avoided as an approach going forward.

September 2011 Submission Comments

Landscape officers consider that the documentation is generally comprehensive and the proposals for this important edge of the City are exciting and full of potential.

With regard to the western edge it is going to be very important to calculate correctly the cut and fill and the parameter plans will need to be looked at again to ensure that this is achieved especially in relation to the Washpit Brook. Further information should be sought in relation to advanced planting, which is in principle supported.

The strategic gap needs to function well and details such as ball stop fencing, high level lighting, service buildings etc. need to be well thought out at the detailed stage to avoid harming the gap. The green corridors that run across the site are strategically supported, however, they need to be at least 30 metres in width in order to accommodate SuDS, cycle and pedestrian path, tree planting etc., 20 metres would not be wide enough.

There is concern over the sections shown in the Design, Access and Landscape Statement for the roads within the development. They do not show enough distance from adjacent buildings and could lead to future pressure to reduce the size/crown. The solution would be to move the cycle way adjacent to the footpath and have the planting between the cycleway and the road to help visually narrow the road and give room for the planting. There is also concern in relation to the loss of tree planting around the new junctions particularly the one on Madingley Road and an alternative solution for the Park and Ride to use this access (and remove the P&R access, and replant the frontage) should be investigated.

Various elements of detail, and possible conditions have been highlighted which can be followed through either as a condition at this stage or necessary detail at the reserved matter stage.

Community, Sports and Open Space

The scheme meets the standards for outdoor sport, informal space and community provision in the outline application, however the application is lacking in detail which will be needed at the reserved matters stage.

There is a general need to agree details on the management of facilities before agreement of the application.

The University will need to clearly demonstrate that the proposed community provision is appropriate for the projected demographic, both in the early years of the development and long term. The proposed design consultation, flexibility and adherence to a national body's design guide are welcomed but will need further development.

In terms of indoor sport, the balance of indoor sports hall provision across the NW Quadrant maybe met via the NIAB development and, if the plans go ahead, at the West Cambridge Site (subject to a good level of public access). If this is the case then there is scope for dialogue on how best to provide for indoor sport on this site.

We would require full details of how the proposed 450sqm will work, and ensure that there is no duplication with the proposed community space. There would be no scope for on-going revenue support so any business plan would need to be robust.

The provision of the Community Centre is supported, which could be co-located with indoor sport. Early provision of this facility is essential to the development and it must act as an early focal point to the development. The facility must be available to the full community on the site.

Provision of allotments on the site is supported and a joint allocation policy would need to be agreed. The application demonstrates that pitches can be sited on the open space, however the details shown do not show detail in terms of buffer strips, alignment, size etc.

The standards for outdoor on-site sports provision cannot be met without the provision of an all weather pitch, therefore one would be expected at reserved matters stage. The application makes adequate provision for informal open space and play areas.

Public Art

Overall the submission of the Public Art Strategy ('PAS') is welcome and has much to commend it. The strategic themes and community engagement proposed as part of the commissioning are also welcomed. However, there are a few areas where clarity/additions are requested:

- Public Art principles in Section 3 that inform the strategy are unclear. The PAS should identify how art will contribute to place making, and the creation of a distinctive local identity, but fails to make this clear at present. This clarification is required in relation to a number of strands in the PAS.
- Clarification of the term 'Major Commission'

- Concerns that the education strand is being driven by the needs/desire of the University, rather than by the development itself. It would fail CIL tests if not directly related to development needs.
- Unclear how the applicants will deliver the aims of the PAS on the ground throughout the scheme. – Questions over management and delivery of programme through individual development phases, particularly where land ownership may change and individual developers may seek to restrict access to sites. More information is needed as to mechanisms that will be put into place to secure long-term cohesion and delivery of strategy on the ground.
- The engagement with the Local Planning Authorities needs to also address their role prior to artist commissioning and detailed project development.
- PAS needs to address the aspiration to work with the County Council to deliver public art within the school.
- No direct phasing or contextual details regards PAS across the site.
- No methodology has been provided to understand how the individual budgets have been allocated to each strand within the PAS. This should be provided.

Sustainability

April 2012 Amendment Comments

Original comments still stand, although the applicant has provided greater information in respect to the implementation of green roofs within the development and the phasing of the CHP and community heating network.

The information regards the use of green roofs provides some comfort to officers, although they would still continue to encourage the applicant to pursue the use of such technology wherever possible.

In respect to the phasing of CHP, the information provided allowing for localised connections to individual plots as required provides the clarification that officers required, and is supported.

September 2011 Submission Comments

Fully support the way in which the University and its development team have embraced the NWC AAP for this to be an exemplar development, and the detailed and comprehensive level of information that has been presented. Equally supportive of the proposal to incorporate a district wide energy network, and appreciate the need for a modular system to reflect long-term nature of development.

Clarity from the University that the necessary utilities infrastructure will be provided from the outset for the district heating network would be welcomed.

Encourage the University to establish baseline of exemplar sustainability standards for designs, construction techniques and materials through testing and monitoring. An example may be to develop some units to particular exemplar standards.

Encourage the University to reconsider the approach to the use of green roofs. Contrary to claims in the application, such roofs can complement solar thermal and pv solutions. They note previous compatibility issues with rainwater harvesting, but also consider that technological advances would serve to overcome these.

Cycling and Walking Officer

April 2012 Amendment Comments

Whilst a number of changes within the application are welcomed, notably in respect of changes to the Huntingdon Road west junction; the retention of the on-road outbound cycle lane within the Huntingdon Road east junction; and the reconfiguring of the Madingley Road east junction, a number of significant concerns exist with regard to the detailed designs proposed for the new junctions, summarised as follows:

Huntingdon Road East junction includes a left turn vehicular lane, reducing priority and safety of cyclists and pedestrians. A redesign to two lanes would make the junction safer for both categories of user.

The link to the NIAB cycle/pedestrian orbital route is welcomed but needs further detail, which should be conditioned. Consideration should be given to the inclusion of a raised table within the design.

The new Madingley Road west junction poses a significant detrimental impact to cyclists given the realignment of the cycle route to include a significant off-set against the obvious desire line and passage through a 2-stage junction. This will serve to lengthen and dis-incentivise the route to cyclists, given the likely increase in vehicular traffic along the road as a result of the development and where a west-bound, in-carriageway solution doesn't exist or would be considered safe given the need to cross the M11 slip-road. Mitigation should be provided, with a number of potential solutions available, including changes to the existing Park and Ride junction, and an upgrade to the Coton footpath route to divert cyclists away from these busy traffic areas.

Link to Girton should be controlled by condition to secure additional detail necessary to ensure the safety of the link/crossing of Huntingdon Road.

Existing accesses in the proximity of the new link with Storey's Way should have give-way markings at the junctions with the cycle/pedestrian route.

Further to the above comments, there is also concern that, although the application sets out an aspiration for a 20mph speed limit, given the attractiveness of the site as a through-route from Huntingdon Road to Madingley Road, achieving this limit will prove to be a challenge. Further detail of controlled crossings of the primary streets will be required to ensure safe passage around the site. Similar concerns with regard to control of speeds within secondary and tertiary streets exist given indicative street sections at present.

The 2m wide cycle lanes and indicative street sections for the primary streets are welcomed and supported. Crossing of side roads should be designed to ensure pedestrian/cycling priority.

The pinch-point in the road near to the WCMC building has the potential to be hostile to pedestrians. Consideration should be given to the removal of this vehicular link, given potentially more attractive links elsewhere in the site.

The indicative location for cycle parking within residential plots poses potential access issues. Detailed design consideration will need to be given to resolve concerns that such facilities will go un-used and result in a proliferation of adhoc cycle parking in the street.

S.106 contributions should be sought for provision of city cycle maps, amendments to cycle network signage and subsidised cycle training for new residents and employees.

September 2011 Submission Comments

Whilst welcoming the inclusion of 2m wide cycle lanes on the principle streets within the development, the officer raises a number of concerns about principle design elements across the site, and specific elements of the various junctions and streets within the scheme. In summary, concerns are as follows:

Although roads are to be designed to 20mph across the site, the indicative straight nature of some of the roads is likely to encourage higher vehicle speeds and rat running, whilst junction designs make vehicular movements too easy, to the detriment of pedestrians.

Location of cycle lanes needs to be carefully considered to avoid potential conflict with car doors opening and allow for priority when crossing junctions/side roads and create connectivity.

Concern that pedestrian crossings across principal streets to green fingers will be difficult to incorporate safely given dominant vehicular flow.

Connectivity of the Ridgeway to Huntingdon Road and across to Girton Road and at its southern end to Storey's Way should be provided, in combination with how crossing principle streets will be achieved.

The orbital cycle route is welcomed, as is the one-stage toucan crossing connecting the NIAB site. Further consideration should be

given to how this will cross Whitehouse Lane and the open spaces to the cycleway.

Design of JJ Thompson Avenue/Madingley Rise, Huntingdon Road East and West and Madingley Road West junctions all present potential issues regarding priority and ease of accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists. A number of suggestions are made as to how the junctions could be improved to resolve such concerns.

The Madingley Road cycle improvements are welcomed and should be funded by the University.

Any combined cycle/pedestrian path must be a minimum of 3m width.

The indicative details of the tertiary streets and locations for cycle parking are disappointing and would not be welcomed at the detailed design stage.

The Travel plan is welcomed and should include contribution towards cost of printing and design of cycle maps.

APPENDIX F

NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS

4 All Souls Lane	8 Landsdown Road
10 All Souls Lane	Illyria, 12 Landsdown Road
3 Ascham Road	7 The Lawns
Bakers Field, Dry Drayton	Flat 8, 41 Madingley Road
140 Brandwood Rd, Kings Heath, B'ham	19a Madingley Road
1 Bunkers Hill, Girton	34 Madingley Road
30a Cambridge Road, Girton	36 Madingley Road
Avalon, 69 Cambridge Road, Girton	1 Marion Close
68 Canterbury Street	6 Marion Close
87 Castle Street	Camboro Farm House, Oakington Road, Girton
10 Church Lane, Girton	4 Oakington Road, Girton
7 The Crescent, Storey's Way	14 Oxford Road
Clements End, Conduit Head Road	38 Oxford Road
Conduit Rise, Conduit Head Road	58 Oxford Road
Conduit Head and Conduit Tail, Conduit Head Road	112 Oxford Road
Cobbers, Conduit Head Road	10 Pepys Court
Shawms, Conduit Head Road	15 Pettitts Close, Dry Drayton
14 Conduit Head Road	23 Priory Street
18 Conduit Head Road	5 Richmond Road
22 Conduit Head Road	95 Richmond Road
42 Conduit Head Road	32 Selwyn Gardens
St John's Innovation Centre, Cowley Rd	3 St Christopher's Ave
3 Croft Close	Mason's Garden, St Peter's Street
42 Dodford Lane, Girton	27 Sherlock Close
30 Eachard Road	6 Sherlock Court
8 Girton Road, Girton (x2)	16 Sherlock Road
38 Girton Road, Girton	45 Somerset Road
74 Girton Road, Girton	3 Sterndale Close
143 Girton Road, Girton	5 Storey's Way
3 Hale Avenue	7 Storey's Way
Girton Corner, Huntingdon Rd, Girton (x2)	32a Storey's Way
Huntingfields, Huntingdon Road, Girton	34 Storey's Way
New Hayes, Huntingdon Road, Girton	54 Storey's Way
West Acre, Huntingdon Road, Girton	30 Suez Road
143 Huntingdon Road	Dept of Pharmacology, Tennis Court Road
145 Huntingdon Road (x2)	12 Thornton Close, Girton
147 Huntingdon Road	19 Thornton Close, Girton
151 Huntingdon Road	20 Thornton Close, Girton
161 Huntingdon Road	33 Thornton Close, Girton
163 Huntingdon Road	8 Thornton Court, Girton
165 Huntingdon Road	25 Thornton Court, Girton
177 Huntingdon Road	48 Thornton Court, Girton
179 Huntingdon Road	45 Thornton Road, Girton (x2)
183a Huntingdon Road	127 Thornton Road, Girton

184 Huntingdon Road	43 Thornton Way, Girton
Flat 1, 197 Huntingdon Road	8 Trinity Close, Balsham
Flat 3, 197 Huntingdon Road	Bidwells, Trumpington Road
199 Huntingdon Road	153 Wellbrook Way, Girton
UNEP WCMC, 219 Huntingdon Road	59 Windsor Road
1 Landsdown Road	60 Windsor Road
3 Landsdown Road (x2)	111 Windsor Road
Trinity Farm, Huntingdon Road	51 Woodlark Road
4 Landsdown Road	

Principle of Development

- The proposal is an example of urban sprawl, and unacceptable the loss of green spaces (lungs).
- Is the development necessary and do we need all the new facilities?
- It is both surprising and disappointing that an area just a few years ago regarded a significant Green Belt should be developed.
- The development (along with Northstowe) will destroy Girton as a village.
- The proposal is contrary to the sentiment of parliament leading up to their localism bill- it is the duty of the local authority to hold a referendum into the desirability and need for development of this nature.
- The development in this area is an unfair burden for residents of this part of the City to bear.
- Degradation of existing Green Belt around Cambridge and continual erosion of boundaries between Cambridge and Girton.
- The proposal is a reversal of half a century of planning policy aiming to preserve Green Belt land in the area.
- Public opinion has turned against development driven primarily by economic benefit at the expense of the environment.
- Appreciate the need for post- graduate accommodation, however, concern over the other development to be built.
- There has been no evidence for the need for this and other developments other than Cambridge needs more houses. Are there enough employers wanting to move to Cambridge - a lot of existing office space elsewhere remains unused.
- Overall a disappointing vision for the development- the development should be in bite size sites across the city.
- The scale of the development is too large and these developments (inc. NIAB site) no longer respect the character of the existing area.
- The Green Belt serves as the lungs of the city and it should be prioritised.
- The short sighted economic benefit should not be at the cost of a sustainable development.
- There is very weak justification for the development.
- Does the University really need this development- what it needs is good quality staff paid at a competitive level of remuneration- not a large village including a care home.

- Has the impact on the environment been assessed?
- This will destroy the rural feel of the city.
- Has the impact of doubling the city's physical size been considered in terms of facilities and resources?
- The development results in the loss of 125ha of agricultural land.
- Support for the necessity of the research development proposed, however, objections to the use of the Green Belt for residential development.
- This seems like a very exciting and cutting edge development.
- When looking at the map of Cambridge this fills in an awkward gap next to the M11.
- I like it, please go quickly.
- Manifestly the University needs space to expand if it is to maintain its status and Cambridge should do all it can to support the University- the general principle is therefore supported.

Urban Design Principles, Scale and Visual Impact

- The proposal will destroy one of the best gateways into Cambridge.
- The development is out of scale and is a new town in its own right.
- If the development has to go ahead then it should be reduced by at least an order of magnitude in order to preserve some of the green space.
- Zones P and Q, at a height of 15 metres will be too dense, and visible and will overshadow the Huntingdon Road properties.
- The scheme should be a much more modest proposal of University uses and private accommodation.
- The design of the site should be of the highest quality (like Accordia).
- The proposal cannot be considered as respecting the character and context of the site and the surrounding area.
- The character of the buildings should be imaginative and local people should be able to express opinions on design.
- The submission is too prescriptive and heights given here could be undesirable, but not able to be refused at the detailed stage.
- The low density housing will require articulation.
- Some changes to the layout of the local centre could add more interest and work much better and connect better to the open space.
- The character of Girton will be lost as this development is very large and will result in the loss of the boundary between Girton and Cambridge.
- The proposal should not be overly vast or overly dense- which at the moment it isn't, but any additional increase would not be sustainable.
- Any landmark buildings greater than three storeys high should be located away from the development.
- Going forward the design stages should involve public consultation and interaction.
- The density of the development needs to be seriously revised.
- The houses must be in character with the area.

- Cambridge is losing its character and this will erode it further.
- Student accommodation should be in 13 storey apartments.
- The concept of the development is good.
- The proposals, as far as they can be judged at this stage, offer the prospect of a functional and attractive urban environment.
- Support for the low density housing adjacent to the Huntingdon Road properties and All Souls Lane properties with a limit of 10 metres in height and 20m back gardens.

Residential Amenity

- The Ridge and Furrow field should have limited public access to ensure that there is a protection of amenity for Landsdowne Road properties.
- The buildings in zones S, P and Q will overshadow, overlook and cause a loss of privacy to properties along Huntingdon Road.
- Zone S is only 20 metres away from the Huntingdon Road properties and 10 metres high. It is considered that these should be reduced in height and have longer back gardens to protect amenity.
- Zone R on the parameter plan proposes buildings at 15m high which is too high and will have an impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties in Conduit Head Road as well as the Conservation Area. Steps should be taken to reduce this down to 10 metres and set back from the boundary (along with planting) to protect amenity.
- Concern expressed over the space adjacent to the burial ground - will impact the amenity of that space.
- The cemetery area is a quiet place and the avenue adjacent to it should be removed to retain the tranquillity, and there should be no access through.
- The avenue up to the cemetery will create a short cut from the development and will be vandalised, losing a special part of Cambridge.
- There is no justification for the view of the Cemetery, as the view is very restricted. This element should be removed and replaced with houses.
- The plans need revising to increase the separation of the development from surrounding properties and a reduction in the general density of the site.
- Conditions should be imposed:
 - To link any reserved matters submission to the information provided in the outline submission with regard to layout drawings of the neighbourhoods.
 - So that only detached dwellings can be erected adjacent to properties on Huntingdon Road with rear gardens backing onto the gardens of adjacent properties.
 - That the dwellings (backing onto Huntingdon Road) shall not exceed 10 metres in height and a minimum of 30 metres back garden and have no rooms in the roofspace).

- To establish landscaping treatment along the shared boundary including landscaping bunds.
- To remove permitted development rights to stop the above points being undermined.
- No footpaths or roads should be created at the back of the gardens for the low density housing backing onto Huntingdon Road/All Souls Lane.
- No wind turbines or large solar panels should be provided to the houses on the edge of the site.
- The lighting for these houses should not impinge on the amenity of neighbouring properties.
- Limits to noise for construction should be imposed.
- The impact of noise from roads on Conduit Head Road will impact on quality of life.
- Concern over the height of the development, which will not be in character with the surrounding properties. Buildings similar to botanic house are not appropriate to the area.
- The local centre and access road will be in close proximity to Conduit Head Road harming amenity.
- The impact on properties in Conduit Head Road has been ignored.
- The large University buildings adjacent to properties on Conduit Head Road should be reconsidered.
- What assurances will residents have that the proposals here will be followed through at the detailed stage?
- Properties should have some defensible space next to the road, however small and show a clear public and private side. This is largely the case shown here.
- Support for the low density housing on the edge of the site providing that the 20m back gardens are retained and the dwellings are only 10m high.

In addition to the above a request was received for a Development Control Forum in relation to the following issue

- The green strip of land adjacent to the Ascension Burial Ground could easily be the beginning of using the cemetery as a short cut into the city. Damage could then be caused by vandalism etc.
- The burial ground is a quiet place for reflection, but is also culturally important and this green space could simply become a thoroughfare.

Open Space and Recreation

- The development will result in the destruction of one of the few remaining green areas of the City- it is short sighted and unjustifiable.
- The Ridge and Furrow field should have limited public access to ensure that there is a protection of amenity for Landsdowne Road properties.
- The Girton Gap appears to be a mere nod to the Green Belt rather than a physical separation.

- There is not enough separation with Girton- the Girton Gap is not really in Girton is it?
- There should be swimming provision on site, not simply contributions off site- are residents expected to use Chesterton or Parker's Piece?
- Houses and gardens should back onto the burial ground.
- Opportunity should be taken here to plant some new woodland, readily accessible to the public.
- Concern over how the ridge and furrow field will be maintained, and concerns over potential illegal squatting.
- The green link past the school playing fields (where there is a pinch point) should be expanded with a change in the school playing field shape. The movement of the northern pitches would also help the green space.
- Some of the common internal landscaped areas should be limited to a through route only.
- The open space next to the M11 will be very noisy and there may not be sufficient open space as a result.
- Grazing on the ridge and furrow field should be encouraged.
- The open space next to the burial ground should not be a noisy use and should have a strong and impermeable boundary.
- Careful consideration needs to be given to existing features such as hedgerows on the site.
- The open space should be adopted by the City Council or the University and home owners should not be expected to pay double council tax.
- The neglected hedge between Conduit Head Road and the ridge and furrow field should be re-established.
- The central open space should be widened and made bigger as the western edge is unusable.
- The western edge has been handled well.
- Retention of the ridge and furrow field is supported, the access from Madingley Road could go through the P&R to help its preservation.

Affordable Housing and Dwelling Mix

- Cambridge is becoming a city for the rich, more social housing should be provided.

Education

- Surprise at the lack of secondary school provision and lack of library facilities.
- No secondary school which means people will have to access schools off site which has been a problem elsewhere.

Community Facilities/Local Centre

- The cultural, economic, political and social implications have been given limited consideration, and the impact on local infrastructure and facilities are not clear.
- This site represents adding 20% to the population of the city.
- There should be space set aside for faith within the community centre.
- The University should continue to consult with faith representatives during this process and going forward.
- What benefits will I see as a Cambridge resident?
- Cambridge City Centre is not big enough to cope with all the additional people.
- The school, health centre and community facilities should be built first as existing facilities are stretched.
- Concern that the supermarket will increase in size and attract too much traffic.
- The University must be required to contribute to the quadrant wide infrastructure such as secondary school, library, Police touchdown space.
- The area should be more alive outside of working hours- sufficient social venues should be provided so that the atmosphere at West Cambridge is not replicated.
- There is concern that there could be separation from the University and the rest of the city- efforts need to be made to ensure enclaves are not created within the development.
- Key worker housing will be bad for university staff whose home will be tied to their job, removing flexibility.
- Pleased to see that fostering the community is a high priority.
- Pleased to see that the community facilities will be accessible to the existing community.
- Support for the 4 dwellings to be set aside for faith representatives.

Sustainable Construction and Design

- Is the energy centre an alternative name for a power station? If so how is it powered?
- Concern that the district heating proposals won't be regulated, driving up cost with lack of competition.
- Code level 5 homes is to be applauded.

Drainage and Flood Risk

- The back of Huntingdon Road properties flood in winter due to the water table- concern that the houses that are backing onto these properties will exacerbate the problem.
- We are already in a drought area and there will be a greatly increased need for water as a result of the development.
- Extra pressure on water resources is a problem- Cambridge is semi-arid.
- Increased water demand adds further strain to the sustainability of water suppliers.

- Where is all the surface water going to go and stop flooding in Girton.
- Flooding from Beck Brook at the Oakington Road end of Girton is important and could do with better maintenance- this end of Girton should not be forgotten.
- The drainage data in the application gives concern that the strategy in place will not account for the slow build up of water downstream- it is not clear how the water retention system empties completely so that the preceding days water doesn't compromise the efficiency of the system.
- The significant tarmac areas will increase the flooding downstream.
- The development will cause flash flooding in Washpit Brook.
- The proposed weir should be supplemented with an adjustable flood gate so that the height of the weir can be increased.
- If the developers are confident in their modelling then they should underwrite any damaged caused by flooding for houses at the bottom of Dodford Lane and along Oakington Road.

Transport

Transport Assessment

- The proposals cannot accord with planning policy unless the transport infrastructure can cope with the increase in traffic that the proposal will generate.
- Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road will not be able to cope with the traffic generated by this development.
- Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road are already congested at peak times, this development will make the situation worse.
- Cambridge traffic is already at saturation point and building all the new development will mean that the City will be gridlocked.
- It is not accepted that traffic along Huntingdon Road may fall as a result of this development.
- There will be uplift in use of the A14 as a result of this development.
- Have realistic assumptions been made with regard to the traffic assessment especially the level of car ownership and car usage?
- It is naïve to think that that people on this site will not use their cars.
- Journey time will be increased for existing residents.
- Concern that it will outrun the +1% estimate on which the project relies.
- Various planning consultants including the 2010 food study of North West Cambridge consistently under estimate the amount of traffic demand.
- The proposed supermarket will generate significant traffic to the site.
- Concerns over the increase of traffic through Windsor Road and Oxford Road.
- Increase in traffic will arise from the extra uses such as hotels, leisure facilities etc.
- School, medical centre and research space will all add to the traffic generation.

- The proposal for further toucan crossing on Huntingdon Road will create further backing up of traffic (already starting to happen on the back of the NIAB junction)- minimising the number of controlled crossings is suggested.
- The junctions will cause delays in the traffic flow meaning that the traffic could back up to the A14.
- All 8,500 people on this site will want to use Cambridge City centre at some point.
- The A14 is notorious for bad congestion- and the government has recently withdrawn the proposed improvements- a new report is expected in 2012, and no development should be considered until that has been published.
- The development should be conditional on upgrading the A14 and M11 junctions.
- The traffic impact seems to rely on hope and expectation in the solutions proposed.
- The notion that the car use can be reduced and the A14 can be made less problematic appear to be pipe dreams.
- The aim of 40% of residents to travel to work by car is an estimation, even 39% will have an unacceptable impact on the road network.
- The other uses on the site such as hotel, employment space and supermarket will create a large number of HGVs to and from the site.
- The traffic lights at the 'car wash' end (Murkett's Corner) will be a complete bottle neck.
- Transport modelling needs to consider live-in partners- where will they work and how will they get there.
- The speed limit on Madingley Road should be limited to 30 mph.
- The exit opposite Thornton Road will cause delays for people exiting this road.
- The impact of all these developments will result in more traffic accidents and gridlock on the surrounding roads.
- Any increase in traffic along Oxford and Windsor road is considered undesirable and will conflict with Mayfield School.
- It is not realistic to assume people will live and work on this site.
- No account has been made in the transport assessment of NIAB2, which, although doesn't have consent, is an allocated site with certainty of coming forward.
- Some of the transport trips allocated to the employment use would not use the Huntingdon Road access as indicated in the assessment but instead would use the Madingley Road access point.
- The CSRM model should be re-run with the above new information.

Cumulative Impact

- When combined with NIAB there will be too much traffic on Huntingdon Road, which will be congested.
- The impact including NIAB 1 and NIAB 2 will create significant traffic and pollution problems. Pollution problems in Girton are already high due to the proximity of the A14.

- Girton will be swamped by both this and Northstowe without any A14 upgrade. North Cambridge cannot assimilate such a massive project on the networks.

Road linkages

- The new roads through the development will create a new ring road- will there be measures to reduce speed and avoid the impact from HGVs.
- A lot of the traffic pressure on Huntingdon and Madingley Road would be relieved if the M11 junction has northbound access.
- The development should have its own slip roads to the A14 and M11 in both directions to allow residents to use the ring roads rather than go through town.
- Residential roads should be enclosed to stop rat running.
- Bollards at the end of Storey's Way (Huntingdon Rd) end should be considered if the development proceeds.
- The rat-run through the site should have traffic calming pinch points rather than sleeping policeman which can be quite noisy.
- The 20mph limit should be controlled through good road design.
- Suggest that all traffic on Madingley Road should be diverted into the West Cambridge site (follow the Uni 4 bus route) leaving the intervening stretch of Madingley Road as 20 mph/local traffic and cycles only to encourage use of the P&R.
- This route through the site will allow traffic to cut through from Madingley Road to Histon Road (through NIAB)- this should be cut off.
- The A1307 north bound must be linked to the A428 West bound leading to the M11.
- A limitation on cut through of the site (like Addenbrooke's) should be imposed.
- There is a missed opportunity here to link up key A14 and M11 junctions to aid access without having to go into the city. Two slip road junctions on the M11 (northbound) would aid accessibility into this site.
- Potential to connect the Huntingdon Road access with the eastern side of the A14 would provide better access to this site, and linking Huntingdon Road with the M11 would also be beneficial.
- These works should be carried out at the cost of the developer.
- A bridge or subway ought to be considered to assist with crossing Madingley Road.
- Encouraged that there is no rat run down Madingley Rise.
- Support for the 20mph limit within the development.
- The impact on the Huntingdon Road Access will be less than predicated as people will not pass through Histon/Oxford/Windsor Road to get to the site from the A14 they will go to the M11 and turn at J12 and enter the site from J13/Madingley Road.

Detailed Junction Designs

- The P&R junction and the proposed Madingley Road junction must be linked.
- When considering the design for Madingley Road Access point light pollution and privacy issues should be considered with respect to Landsdowne Road properties.
- The proposed junctions are inappropriate with the character of the roads. The NIAB junction is an example of this and could have been avoidable.
- Sightline on exiting Landsdowne Road is hazardous at the moment.
- A short window within the lights should allow for exit from Landsdowne Road.
- Small roundabouts should be explored; if not possible then the new junction designs should be softened with tree planting where possible.
- Tactile rather than audible aids for partially sighted users at junction should be imposed to reduce noise.
- The toucan crossing in between the NIAB and University junctions on Huntingdon Road needs to be looked at to help with junction capacity.

Public Transport

- Local public transport cannot be relied upon as an alternative to motor car usage and the Guided Bus does not pass close to the development.
- There needs to be greater clarity with the proposed bus routes. Bus routes to the Railway Station may increase parking in the area.
- There is concern in relation to the word 'possibly' when referring to the bus link through to the station- this site must be linked to the station.
- Lack of public transport service for the Storey's Field area of the site.
- Transport links to the city are important to avoid the feeling of isolation on the site.

Cycling

- The cycleway from the development into the City centre is inadequate-funnelling cyclists through Storey's Way is irresponsible, as it is already dangerous for cyclists.
- How will the planning authority be able to enforce cycle use rather than the car?
- The cyclists must be able to get into the City centre safely with improvements to Murkett's corner and Northampton Street all the way to Kings College.
- Cycleways in Cambridge must be improved.
- There must be signed and dedicated cycle ways along Huntingdon Rd and Madingley Road from the development.
- The cycleway along the south side of Huntingdon Road possesses some merit however there are concerns relating to the lack of detailed design namely: impact on TPO trees, impact on street furniture and visibility for properties exiting their properties on Huntingdon Road.

Further information should be provided including a safety audit and identifying any impact on trees.

- There should be no creepage of boundary or cycle path along Madingley Road.
- The cycleway along Madingley Road should be completed and improved.
- The proposed internal cycleways should be moved adjacent to the footway, they could be brought back adjacent to the highway next to road crossings.
- A demand activated crossing should be proposed at the Avenue of trees to allow cyclists to cross Huntingdon Road and travel safely into the City.
- Concern that the proposals make too many 'safe provisions' for cyclists. Cycling is a life skill and they should be fully integrated with cars so that they both have to consider each other. There is a danger that if roads are so cycle friendly, cyclists don't have to think while cycling. Safe riding is the key, not safe roads.
- The Huntingdon Road is currently safe for cyclists and segregation is not the answer. The solution to safer cycling is education.

Countryside Access

- At the northern end of the site please provide a cycleway through the underpass on the M11 connecting to Madingley Hill and the American Cemetery.
- This connection would allow for residents and students to use the countryside and workers to connect from nearby villages.
- There should be greater/enhanced access from this site into the surrounding countryside under the M11 underpass- work should be progressed with Trinity College to upgrade some of the existing footpaths.
- There should be an upgrade of the Madingley Road (Cambridge Road Madingley) which is a hazard for many cyclists. It would be used for residents of this site also.
- There should be opportunity taken to enhance the sustainability of this site/proposals and enhance access to the countryside.
- Links to the Coton Countryside Reserve have been overlooked.

Car Parking

- There must be adequate car parking spaces to avoid overspill of parking onto nearby streets.
- Reduced car parking on this site will cause residents to park in the adjacent streets like Thornton Close.
- Concerns for overflow of students parking in Conduit Head Road.
- The University fails to live up to its obligation to control parking such as the overspill of the West Cambridge site onto Clerk Maxwell Road.
- Overflow parking could park at Churchill Court requiring residents to put up gates.

- While understanding the University's commitment to discouraging the use of the car, the plan needs to be tempered with realism.
- Larger units must have more than 2 spaces and 0 spaces for small fats is unrealistic.
- The reduction in parking on site will cause greater problems for the surrounding existing residents.
- Forward planning is essential here and a controlled parking area appears to be a good solution.
- Support for residents' parking control in surrounding streets.
- Parking for the low density housing should be at the front of the house and not in the back gardens.
- Parking surveys before, during and after development are suggested.
- The high density areas should include underground parking- although this should be semi-basement to avoid a hostile area.
- All car parking should be underground.
- The use of on street parking is welcomed, and has the benefit of calming traffic.

Construction Impacts

- The Council should impose stringent conditions controlling the impact of development during construction.
- There should be controls on the days and hours of construction, phasing of external works, routing of construction traffic, dust and noise levels etc.
- Construction traffic should use Huntingdon Road as there will be far less impact on trees and shrubs from the access point.

Other Transport issues

- The Madingley Road P&R is already full so could not be utilised by the residents of this development.
- Lights at the Storey's Way junction must be considered as it is already hard to get off the road onto Huntingdon Road in the peak times.
- The 30mph limit (currently outside Sherlock Road) should be extended all the way past both proposed access points making entering and exiting the road much safer and reducing the risk to cyclists and pedestrians. New traffic cameras would also help enforce this.
- A quieter tarmac should be used to reduce noise (the quieter tarmac is being used by the Highway Agency).
- Roads should be adopted, parking enforcement and street lighting ought to be functional before residents move in.

Ecology and Biodiversity

- Attention must be given to the predictable loss of wildlife habitats in the area.

- The provision of the back gardens at the back of the Huntingdon Road/All Souls Lane properties should serve as a strong ecology corridor/ buffer.
- The ecology/conservation in general around Conduit Head Road will be impacted by the proposal.
- The existing biodiversity (badgers, grey partridges and skylarks) will decline further.
- Significant wildlife uses the 'small wood' close to Conduit Head Road. Development should be diverted around this feature including a buffer zone.
- The hedgerow along the northern edge of 'The Drift' should be retained as it is important for wildlife. In addition, native tree species if planted adjacent to this hedgerow would be welcomed.
- The ridge and furrow field is important to wildlife and care must be taken to help retain as much of this as possible.
- The environmental assessment is very comprehensive however there is concern over the reduction of several species, and in the case of hares disappears all together.
- More should be done to protect amphibians on this site.
- The University should be required to carry out the enhancements for hares and farmland birds promised.
- Commitment to ensuring that building construction will take into account the needs of declining species is welcomed.

Noise and Vibration, Dust, Fumes and Odours

- The development will result in an increase in noise, pollution and crime in this part of the City.
- The Madingley Road access should consider the impact of light pollution from the P&R on Landsdowne Road properties.
- An access point further towards the M11 should be investigated. If this is not possible then serious planting needs to mitigate the impact from the access and the existing P&R.
- Noise pollution from the pedestrian crossings should be considered.
- There will be significant noise and disturbance from the development including lighting.
- Landscaping next to M11 needs to reduce noise pollution from the M11.
- New access on Madingley Road needs to be designed so that the noise and light pollution from the access and the P&R is minimised (from Landsdowne Road).
- New tree planting along the new access road and timing on the P&R lights will help reduce light and noise pollution from the access.
- Something needs to be done about the A14 noise particularly on the south side adjacent to Wellbrook Way.
- Traffic calming limiting the development to 20mph should be imposed to help minimise noise.
- Noise barriers/ trees and shrubbery should be used to shield Conduit Head Road from the noise.

- Using spoil as a noise barrier is supported, can this be extended further along the M11- or low noise surfacing in the areas where there is no barrier.
- Noise disturbance to the Institute of Astronomy.
- Measures to reduce the noise for this development from the M11 should be strengthened- a bank should be provided enhanced with trees, mostly conifers to provide year round protection.
- The buildings along the western edge should be commercial rather than residential.

Other Issues

- The main cycle access into Storey's Way needs to take into account of the trees and preserve them.
- The application is not clear with regard to the boundary of the development and is not clear on what works highway will be happening outside certain properties. This should be made clearer.
- The centre of Cambridge cannot cope with additional people; it is already choc-a-bloc on Saturdays, December, half term etc.
- Concern that elements such as the school and the roads will be owned by the University, not the local authority – this will create a modern version of Saltaire or Borneville.
- Details in relation to how the statutory tests have been met with regard to the S106 Heads of Terms should be provided.
- The employment cannot be in the first phases, which does not support the argument about building for the workers on the site.
- Concern regarding the development should it morph into a massive commercial site.
- The University (or other developers) should not be able to acquire properties on Huntingdon Road or All Souls Lane for the purposes of creating additional access points into the site.
- The value of houses in the area will be diminished.
- Residents must have competitive options for the provision of broadband.
- The University's proposed tenancy conditions ought to be considered, so that tenants have their rights protected.
- The permission ought to be conditional on the development of the West Cambridge site sports centre and ice rink which should be publicly accessible.
- No retaining wall should be constructed between Landsdowne Road and Conduit Head Road (it is appreciated that none is shown).
- Can the University carry through on such a project over the proposed timescale? The West Cambridge development doesn't give grounds for confidence. Clarification regarding responsibility for the upkeep of Bunkers Hill and whether this will pass to the developers (University)? rather than is presently the case, (currently on a pro rata basis for the upkeep of Bunkers Hill with residents). The question is posed, and very important, in light of the intention for Bunkers Hill to become a pedestrian/bicycle route

April 2012 Amendment Comments

- Welcome developer's willingness to work with Oxford/Windsor Road residents to overcome potential traffic problems. However, suggested plans will require modification – concern re. access for emergency vehicles, refuse vehicles, large removal lorries and delivery vans; loss of parking for existing residents; safe cycling provisions; and landscaping.
- Despite application aspirations, achieving sustainable transport aims will not prove to be an easy task, given numerous potential impacts e.g. Government funding withdrawal of A14 capacity enhancements.
- Grateful for intentions in relation to massing and buildings, and general intended amenity relationship between existing neighbouring buildings and proposed buildings/uses. Would be useful to understand intended boundary treatments on site fringes, and any architectural impressions/plans of adjoining buildings to afford visual impression of intended relationships.
- There is currently a lot of undeveloped land at the University's West Cambridge site. This should be fully developed first.
- Do not believe there is a need for another chain hotel.
- The proximity of new junctions on Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road to existing junctions will have a negative impact on these arterial routes, which are already at breaking point.
- Too many homes are already being built around the Cambridge fringes – believe that there isn't currently a need for such a number. Delivery should be staggered, rather than be all in one go.
- Believe that the University are using the guise of research facilities to build 3,000 homes.
- Unclear whether proposed cycleway on south side of Huntingdon Road will adversely affect trees the subject of a Tree Preservation Order. Question whether this cycleway is needed at all or could be incorporated into existing cycleway on north side of Huntingdon Road.
- Also appears that visibility splays for only two existing driveways affected by the cycleway have been assessed – all affected driveways should be assessed. Similarly a safety audit of all driveways should be undertaken.
- Minimum back garden lengths of 30m backing onto existing properties on Huntingdon Road, and the removal of permitted development rights for any new properties in this location should be stipulated to prevent unacceptable harm to existing residents.
- Note that construction impacts can be controlled by condition of consent.
- Query the clarity of some application drawings, where some information shown as contextual, in respect of overall access proposals, where it could be argued that they should be included at this stage.
- Also query what appear to be clerical errors where the application boundary appears to stray into the property of adjoining dwellings, or

where 'junction works' appear to be severed by the application boundary. Query whether the appropriate notice has been served on all properties, as a result.