# APPENDIX E: ANALYSIS, RESPONSES AND PREFERRED APPROACH TO TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE, PLUS SUMMARIES OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

**ISSUE: TIMELY PROVISION OF INFRASTRUCTURE**

| Total representations: 19 | |
|---|---|
| Object: 11 | Support: 8 |

| OPTION NUMBER | KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION |
|---|---|
| Option 182: Timely provision of infrastructure | • Lots of support for the principle of the policy – getting infrastructure into development early is key;<br>• Feeling that the policy hasn't always been successful / implemented strongly enough in the past and caused congestion issues. |
| **NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT** | |
| No additional options have been suggested. | |

| SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT |
|---|
| The commitment made by this option to provide the infrastructure necessary to meet the needs of new development and regeneration is likely to have a positive effect on identified economic issues including to address pockets of income and employment deprivation and to help maintain Cambridge as one of the UK's most competitive cities. However, without details on the nature of infrastructure, or on the steps taken to ensure that it is sustainable, this option cannot be appraised with any certainty against the other topic areas. The option is partly aimed at improving development related transport (by providing the appropriate infrastructure) therefore positive effects on transport provision could be expected. |

| KEY EVIDENCE |
|---|
| • Peter Brett Associates (2012). Draft Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council Infrastructure Delivery Study;<br>• Cambridgeshire County Council (2011). Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 3;<br>• Cambridgeshire County Council (2012). Draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. |

| CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED |
|---|
| Not applicable |

| ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE |
|---|
| Delivery of new or improved infrastructure (including transport infrastructure) and services to support new development in a timely and phased manner will be an important element in ensuring the appropriate and sustainable implementation of new growth in Cambridge and the Sub region.<br><br>Delivery of infrastructure to support development falls with the core planning |

principles identified in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 17) and the National Planning Policy Framework clearly states that Local Planning Authorities should include strategic policies for the provision of infrastructure (paragraph 156). Option 182 seeks to provide the Local Plan Policy basis for this.

As recognised in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal, this option is likely to have a positive economic effect and help maintain Cambridge as one of the UK's most competitive cities.

In the responses to the consultation, there was general support for a policy like this but there was concern expressed that the timely provision of infrastructure is not something that has always been delivered and that this has led to congestion issues. The provision of infrastructure is a complex issues which is dependent on a number of factors such as the rate at which development comes forward, the level of developer contributions secured towards infrastructure and the level of government funding secured towards new infrastructure. The aim of this policy is to highlight the importance of timely provision of infrastructure and include it as a strategic priority in the Local Plan, in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF. More detailed planning for infrastructure provision is an ongoing process through the development of an Infrastructure Delivery Study (IDS) and partnership working with stakeholders.

| RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH |
|---|
| The recommendation is to pursue Option 182 setting out a positive strategy for the timely provision of infrastructure that builds on guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework. The policy will not be overly prescriptive. |

**ISSUE – PROMOTING NON-CAR MODES OF TRAVEL**

| Total representations: 42 | |
|---|---|
| Object: 15 | Support: 27 |

| OPTION NUMBER | KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION |
|---|---|
| Option 183: Promote non-car modes of travel | <ul><li>Significant support for this option and the range of suggested policies within it;</li><li>Important to support walking and cycling, and this could be strengthened within the option;</li><li>It ignores the need of the motorist;</li><li>Public transport needs to be better and more affordable too;</li><li>Chisholm Trail vital and stronger reference needed in the plan;</li><li>Design in speed reductions in development and other associated highway designs, which dissuade car use;</li><li>Support more sustainable car use (car clubs etc.) and alternatives to travel (home working etc.);</li><li>Plan should do more to protect and enhance designated</li></ul> |

| | rights of way, such as Public Rights of Way, bridleways and National Trails – in line with paragraph 75 of the National Planning Policy Framework; |
|---|---|

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

No additional options have been suggested.

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

This option should bring about positive effects on the uptake of walking, cycling and public transport across the city helping contribute to reducing transport related greenhouse gas emissions (GHG). Ensuring access for any commercial vehicles may help contribute to identified economic issues including ensuring the continued vitality and viability of the City Centre. Ensuring there are non-car options for everyone using the development should help improve access, in particular for those with limited mobility, the disabled and the elderly. This option should help reduce car dependency and increase the attractiveness of the city for greater cycling and walking. A reduction in traffic impacts, such as noise and emissions, may also contribute to ensuring that new developments do not adversely impact local biodiversity. This option is likely to have positive benefits across the whole city.

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- Building Sustainable Transport into New Developments (DfT 2008)
- Manual for Streets (DfT 2007);
- Creating growth, cutting carbon: making sustainable local transport happen (DfT 2011);
- Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 3 (Cambridgeshire County Council 2011);
- Draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (Cambridgeshire County Council 2012).

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Policy 8/1 (spatial location of development)
- Policy 8/4 (walking and cycling accessibility)
- Policy 8/5 (pedestrian and cycle network – safeguarding land)
- Policy 8/7 (public transport accessibility)
- Policy 8/8 (land for public transport)
- Policy 8/9 (provision for commercial vehicles and servicing)
- Policy 8/11 (new roads)

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

A key role for the transport policies in the new local plan will be to facilitate sustainable development. It is likely that some new developments will place increased pressures on a location. It is vital, therefore, to ensure that any travel associated with a new development promotes non-car and sustainable modes of travel. The NPPF states that transport policies need to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes, whilst giving people a real choice about how they travel. There are a number of current policies such as Policy 8/4 (walking and cycling accessibility) and Policy 8/7 (public transport accessibility), which can help achieve

this, and option 183 proposes to continue with the approach taken by these policies, though with modifications to strengthen them where necessary.

The responses to this option and the various policy approaches it proposes to take forward were, on the whole, very supportive. Particular support was given to the promotion of walking and cycling measures at new developments, along with support for good public transport access.

This option is not considered to ignore the requirements for some travel by car and motorised vehicles, as it accounts for the fact that some car travel is desired and necessary (for example for those with impaired mobility, service vehicles etc.). It does however conform to the 'User Hierarchy', which places private car travel below more sustainable modes such as walking, cycling and public transport. In addition, car parking policy options will also account for the needs of those with private vehicles.

The Local Plan and the planning process can support improvement and access to public transport in new developments by favouring new development located close to, or on existing public transport routes. It can also require developers to ensure that if this is not the case, then alternative measures are explored – for example subsidising additional public transport routes to join up with the existing network. However, it has limited influence over the price of public transport.

In response to the representations calling for explicit mention, protection and commitment to the Chisholm Trail, it is considered that having policies that safeguard land for the preservation and enhancement of walking, cycling and public transport networks could help account for this. However, there is a debate as to whether specific routes and/or schemes such as the Chisholm Trail should be referenced within the new Local Plan. Projects may represent significant transport infrastructure investment, and therefore should be addressed by the County Council's Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.

It is considered that having a policy ensuring any development requiring new roads will account for designing in speed reductions in new development, and giving priority to walking, cycling and public transport. This policy could link to the proposed city wide 20mph project, approved in January 2013. Additional detail on ensuring the roads promote highway safety can also help with the promotion of sustainable modes of travel. It is considered that supporting car clubs and alternatives to travel have been also been covered by the car parking and travel plan policies proposed.

Furthermore, the Sustainability Appraisal concludes that this option will have positive impacts on the uptake of walking, cycling and public transport and will contribute to reducing transport related greenhouse gas emissions. It also states that sustainable choices and accessibility will be improved, with reduced car dependency and is likely to have city wide benefits.

It is agreed that additional mention of designated rights of way could be made, and it is proposed to add this detail to the policy that safeguards land for the pedestrian and cycle network.

| **RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH** |
| :--- |
| Given the strong support received the recommendation is to pursue option 183, and develop policies on the following:<br><br>• **Spatial location of development –** It is important that the location of a new development should minimise the need for private car use and maximise the scope for access by sustainable modes of transport. Therefore, this policy would ensure that new development is located in a suitable location in terms of access to existing public transport, walking and cycling routes. For this reason, more central locations will be given preference, as this is where public transport, walking and cycling tends to be a more feasible option for travel.<br><br>• **Walking and cycling accessibility –** Walking and cycling are of high priority, being healthy, affordable and sustainable modes of travel. One of the best ways to encourage these is to fully include them at the earliest planning stage. Therefore, this policy would require all development to be designed to give priority for walking and cycling over cars, to ensure maximum convenience for these modes, to link with the surrounding walking and cycling network and also to ensure that the development is still accessible for those with impaired mobility, wheelchair users and pushchairs. The policy will also incorporate aspects of personal safety, convenience for walking and cycling through designed layouts, traffic calming measures and reducing conflicts between different modes of travel.<br><br>• **Safeguarding land for the pedestrian and cycle network –** Increases in walking and cycling levels in Cambridge are strongly influenced by the expansion of a safe and convenient network of routes. Therefore, it is important to protect identified existing and future routes when areas are developed. This policy would ensure that new developments safeguard land alongside identified routes for the expansion of the walking and cycling network, including Public Rights of Way, as well as requiring developer funding for the high quality provision of the routes. Members' views are sought on the need to reference specific routes/schemes within the new Local Plan, given the role of the County Council's Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire in identifying sustainable transport infrastructure projects. Particular routes and schemes could be identified on the Local Plan Proposals Map.<br><br>• **Public transport accessibility –** Public transport, and buses in particular, have a crucial role to play in meeting the city's transport needs. This is particularly important for urban extensions, so that sustainable travel patterns can be established from the earliest possible stage. This policy would ensure that a new development, especially those within the urban extensions, must be served a high quality public transport within a 400m walk. It would require developers to ensure the provision of such a service from the first occupation where possible, and for a total of 5 years. After this time, it is expected that services will become self sufficient. Potential for provision of demand responsive services will also be covered by this policy. |

- **Safeguarding land for public transport –** Congestion is a major issue, both on the main radials and at key interchanges which serve Cambridge and the sub-region. Priority measures are vital to free buses from other traffic, together with improved enforcement. It is therefore important for this policy to safeguard land for new public transport and prevent development where it would inhibit the expansion of high quality public transport. This includes existing radial classified roads, bus lanes, guideways and junction improvements, existing or potential public transport nodes for improved interchange facilities and along particular public transport routes identified on the proposals map. Members' views are sought on the need to reference specific routes/schemes within the new Local Plan, given the role of the County Council's Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire in identifying sustainable transport infrastructure projects. Particular routes and schemes could be identified on the Local Plan Proposals Map

- **Provision for commercial vehicles and servicing –** Service and delivery vehicles can cause an obstruction to other road users if they are not adequately provided for by the development they are serving. Therefore, this policy would require new developments make suitable provision for any required access and parking by service and delivery vehicles. This will include ensuring that the blocking of pedestrian areas, bus and cycle lanes is minimised where possible. Rail and water freight will also be encouraged to reduce the environmental impact of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) on the highway.

- **New roads –** New roads should make suitable provision for the needs of non-car modes. This includes measures to discourage speeding, so that pedestrians and cyclists can travel in safety without intimidation. This would be in keeping with the Council's proposed approach to implementing a city-wide 20mph scheme, which if adopted will apply to both new and existing development. This policy will therefore ensure that a new development requires new roads to be designed to give high priority to pedestrians and cyclists (including their safety), restricts through access to traffic where possible, minimises additional car traffic in the surrounding area and is acceptable to the Highway Authority. Severance of existing pedestrian and cycle routes will also be avoided, and highway safety will be a key factor in the acceptability of a new road. The policy will require the use of best practice guidance in the design of new roads, for example Manual for Streets and Manual for Streets 2 (and any subsequent updates) to prevent over-engineering.

**ISSUE - APPROPRIATE INFRASTRUCTURE**

| Total representations: 30 | |
|---|---|
| Object: 8 | Support: 22 |

| OPTION NUMBER | KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION |
|---|---|
| Option 184: Appropriate infrastructure | • Good level of support.<br>• New developments should contribute to the improvement of existing routes for non-car modes, as well as creating new ones. |

| | • Option should be more flexible, so that the deliverability of the development is not impacted by the need to provide infrastructure prior to completion where it is not viable. |
| | • Option should be stronger with infrastructure always in place prior to development - remove the "where possible" comment as this allows a get out. |

| **NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT** |
| No additional options have been suggested. |

| **SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT** |
| This option should help reduce car dependency and help facilitate greater uptake in terms of walking, cycling and the use of public transport; thus helping address a number of key transport topic issues and contribute to mitigating the impacts of climate change. The extent to which this option brings about modal shift in all areas of Cambridge is likely to be positive. |

| **KEY EVIDENCE** |
| • Building Sustainable Transport into New Developments (DfT 2008); |
| • Manual for Streets (DfT 2007); |
| • Creating growth, cutting carbon: making sustainable local transport happen (DfT 2011); |
| • Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 3 (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2011); |
| • Draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2012). |

| **CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED** |
| • 8/4 – Walking and Cycling Accessibility |
| • 8/5 – Pedestrian and Cycle Network (safeguarded) |
| • 8/7 – Public Transport Accessibility |
| • 8/8 – Land for Public Transport (Safeguarded) |

| **ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE** |
| Ensuring that new development has the appropriate infrastructure in place is crucial for ensuring the users of the development have real, accessible alternatives to car travel. Option 184 (appropriate infrastructure) strives to ensure this is the case by proposing policies that aim to ensure that new development is served by the appropriate non-car infrastructure, and that this is in place as early as possible.

It is recognised that the viability of a development may be impacted if a development is obliged to provide all infrastructure prior to use, and that also not providing it early enough can impact upon the effectiveness of the infrastructure. It is considered that Option 184 strikes the best balance between achieving viability for the development and also getting sustainable travel behaviour embedded into the site quickly. |

There are strong links between the aims of Option 184 and Option 183, in terms of giving the users of new developments a real choice of non-car modes of travel. Having the appropriate infrastructure in place is vital to enhancing modal choices.

The policies that will develop through Option 184 will also refer to the requirement for major new developments to provide low emission vehicle infrastructure, where this is viable.

Planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy will be used in conjunction with the Local Plan policies, and these will provide funding and infrastructure to help improve existing issues on the transport network, which may in-turn be affected by any new development.

## RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH

Given the strong support received, the recommendation is to pursue option 184, and develop policies on the following:

- **Walking and cycling accessibility** – Walking and cycling are of high priority, being healthy, affordable and sustainable modes of travel. One of the best ways to encourage these is to fully include them at the earliest planning stage. Therefore, this policy would require all development to be designed to give priority for walking and cycling over cars, to ensure maximum convenience for these modes, to link with the surrounding walking and cycling network and also to ensure that the development is still accessible for those with impaired mobility, wheelchair users and pushchairs. The policy will also incorporate aspects of personal safety, convenience for walking and cycling through designed layouts, traffic calming measures and reducing conflicts between different modes of travel. The policy would look to ensure that the infrastructure required to promote walking and cycling at new developments be in place at the earliest possible stage.

- **Public transport accessibility** - Public transport, and buses in particular, have a crucial role to play in meeting the city's transport needs. This is particularly important for urban extensions, so that sustainable travel patterns can be established from the earliest possible stage. This policy would ensure that a new development within the urban extensions must be served a high quality public transport within a 400m walk. It would require developers to ensure the provision of such a service from the first occupation where possible, and for a total of 5 years. After this time, it is expected that services will become self sufficient. Potential for provision of demand responsive services will also be covered by this policy. The policy would look to ensure that the infrastructure required to promote public transport at new developments be in place at the earliest possible stage.

- **Safeguarding land for the pedestrian and cycle network –** Increases in walking and cycling levels in Cambridge are strongly influenced by the expansion of a safe and convenient network of routes. Therefore, it is important to protect identified existing and future routes when areas are developed. This policy would ensure that new developments safeguard land alongside identified routes for the expansion of the walking and cycling network, including Public

Rights of Way, as well as requiring developer funding for the high quality provision of the routes. Specific routes and schemes will be identified on the Local Plan Proposals Map.

- **Safeguarding land for public transport –** Congestion is a major issue, both on the main radials and at key interchanges which serve Cambridge and the sub-region. Priority measures are vital to free buses from other traffic, together with improved enforcement. It is therefore important for this policy to safeguard land for new public transport and prevent development where it would inhibit the expansion of high quality public transport. This includes existing radial classified roads, bus lanes, guideways and junction improvements, existing or potential public transport nodes for improved interchange facilities and along particular public transport routes identified on the proposals map.

**ISSUE: LOW EMISSION VEHICLE INFRASTRUCTURE**

| Total representations: 13 | |
|---|---|
| Object: 8 | Support: 5 |

| OPTION NUMBER | KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION |
|---|---|
| Option 185: Low emission vehicle infrastructure | <ul><li>Mix of views on this, some say that a specific policy on this is not appropriate, others supporting the principle of it.</li><li>The market will decide when this is appropriate.</li><li>Support for car club and car sharing.</li><li>Could adversely affect viability if this option is made a requirement for smaller developments.</li><li>May not be sufficient demand to have this type of infrastructure in place from the outset.</li><li>Should only apply to major developments and should only require that the development has the 'capability' to install this type of infrastructure, rather than providing it from the outset.</li><li>Incorporate parts of option 185 into other policies, such as option 184.</li></ul> |
| NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT | |
| Incorporate parts of option 185 into other policies, such as policies arising from options that promoted non-car modes of travel, options promoting appropriate infrastructure and options setting the car parking policy. | |

| SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT |
|---|
| The inclusion of low emission vehicle infrastructure has the potential to bring about significant greenhouse gas reduction benefits. Furthermore, it should help change the way people think about personal car usage and indirectly help increase the use of more sustainable transport modes. Electric car infrastructure should encourage greater uptake and help reduce local air pollution. |

| KEY EVIDENCE |
| --- |
| • Creating growth, cutting carbon: making sustainable local transport happen (DfT 2011) |

| CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED |
| --- |
| Not applicable |

| ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE |
| --- |
| The NPPF is clear that new development should incorporate facilities for low emission vehicles. Option 185 covers this, and gives the example of electric car charging / plug in points and car club spaces as the type of infrastructure that new development should accommodate.<br><br>Many of the responses to this option centred around concerns about the viability of electric car infrastructure, given that electric cars only make up a tiny fraction of vehicles in the UK at present. Concerns the impact on the viability of new developments (particularly smaller sites) providing such infrastructure, especially prior to its use, were widespread in the responses received. Although the responses did support car club spaces, the concern about electric vehicle infrastructure is noted, and as such a standalone policy or requiring this type of infrastructure is not proposed.<br><br>Instead, low emission vehicle infrastructure will form part of other proposed policies for car parking, through the policies proposed through option 184 (appropriate infrastructure) and those that come about through option 183 (promoting non-car modes of travel). This would still accord with national guidance, and will also mean that where it is possible and viable to do so – particularly in large new developments – low emission vehicle infrastructure can be sought and provided. |

| RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH |
| --- |
| The recommendation is not to pursue option 185 as a stand alone policy. Instead, it is proposed to include a requirement for larger, new developments to provide low emission vehicle infrastructure where it is viable to do so, by detail on low emission vehicle infrastructure in polices arising from option 184 (appropriate infrastructure) and option 183 (promoting non-car modes of travel) and through the eventual car parking policy. |

**ISSUE: CAR FREE DEVELOPMENT**

| Option 189: Total representations: 15 | |
| --- | --- |
| Object: 6 | Support: 9 |
| Option 190: Total representations: 6 | |
| Object: 3 | Support: 3 |

| OPTION NUMBER | KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION |
|---|---|
| Option 189: Car free development | • Limited support for a 'stand-alone' policy, though support in principle is common.<br>• There are clear environmental benefits.<br>• Will push car parking and transport problems elsewhere.<br>• Would need excellent car free alternatives to work – much better than is currently available. |
| Option 190: Incorporate car free development into existing policy | • Good support.<br>• Would allow for flexibility and considers the impact of individual sites more.<br>• Use of car club spaces in conjunction with this important.<br>• May not be strong enough to deliver any areas of car free. |
| NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT | |
| No additional options have been suggested. | |

| SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT | |
|---|---|
| 189 and 190 | The Car Free Development option is likely to have positive effects on health, well-being and greater use of sustainable transport modes, through the encouragement of walking, cycling and public transportation in all areas. This option would support climate change mitigation efforts. In order to address Cambridge's need to encourage use of more sustainable transport modes a standalone option on car free developments would likely deliver the best performance in terms of identified sustainability issues. |

| KEY EVIDENCE |
|---|
| • Our towns and cities: the future - delivering an urban renaissance (DETR, 2000) |

| CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED |
|---|
| • Policy 8/10 (Off-Street Car Parking and Appendix C) |

| ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE |
|---|
| There are good levels of 'in principle' support for car free development in Cambridge, given that if it is successful, it will have clear environmental benefits. In addition, there is also acknowledgment that development with no, or fewer motorised vehicles associated with it will clearly impact less upon the surrounding network and thus not contribute to the existing congestion issues Cambridge faces.<br><br>However, there is also significant concern in many of the representations as to the feasibility of such a policy, given that car free development can only be successful in areas with excellent public transport provision, walking and cycling access. This is something that it is recognised as not being the case for many parts of Cambridge. It is agreed that implementing car free development in areas of the city where there is no viable, decent alternative to car travel will result in indiscriminate street parking of cars on the areas closest to the site, where there are no parking controls. |

Cambridgeshire County Council will be revisiting the use and areas of controlled residential parking through the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.

It is therefore considered that option 190, where car free development is incorporated within the policy on off-street car parking (arising from options 186, 187 and 188) is most appropriate. This will, as is acknowledged in a number of responses, be far more flexible and will increase the likelihood of such a policy working effectively. The Sustainability Appraisal supports this approach.

| RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH |
|---|
| The recommendation is pursue option 190 and incorporate car free developments within the new off-street car parking policy (options 186, 187 and 188 – currently being consulted on), and not have any standalone policy as was suggested by option 189. |

**ISSUE: MINIMISING THE TRANSPORT IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT**

| Total representations: 18 | |
|---|---|
| Object: 8 | Support: 10 |

| OPTION NUMBER | KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION |
|---|---|
| Option 193: Development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against | • Strong support.<br>• Word the policy more like paragraph 32 of the NPPF – specifically, permit development "where the residual cumulative impacts of development is not severe".<br>• Any policy should state that development would not only aim to mitigate, but also improve the situation.<br>• Distinction needs to be made between 'car congestion' and congestion or increased trips for other, non-car modes – these are not as harmful to the area (e.g. increasing cycle trips shouldn't prevent development due to their specific infrastructure causing more car delays).<br>• Policy should be firmer and only allow development where there is no worsening of congestion. |
| NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT | |
| No additional options have been suggested. | |

| SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT |
|---|
| Option 193, which allows development only where traffic impact is mitigated against or managed, could help contribute to increasing the modal share of cycling, walking and public transport. However, as it is recognised by the option, any development is likely to place some additional pressure on the transport network. |

| KEY EVIDENCE |
|---|
| • Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 3 (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2011); |

- Draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2012).

| CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED |
|---|
| - Policy 8/2 (Transport Impact);<br>- Policy 8/3 (Mitigating Measures). |

| ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE |
|---|

The vast majority of responses to this option agree that it is an absolute necessity to have policies aimed at mitigating any impacts on transport from new development. The NPPF states that all developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or a Transport Assessment. Option 193 is consistent with the existing approach.

The responses which call for the wording of the policy to be aligned more with paragraph 32 of the NPPF are acknowledged. This states that *"Development should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe."* Having this wording helps ensure the policies arising from this option conform with national guidance. This will also help to prevent inappropriate development (in terms of transport impact) whilst also not impacting too heavily on viability.

It is considered that having a zero tolerance policy on development where transport impacts are suffered is unrealistic, and that in many cases, measures can be successfully put in place to mitigate or even improve the current situation.

The responses asking for a differentiation to be made between congestion arising from giving prevalence to more sustainable modes of travel, for example to give bus or cycle priority, as opposed to congestion arising simply through over capacity of the network is noted. It is proposed that a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement should cover and allow for this.

In addition, the policies arising from this option will incorporate the requirement for major new developments (10 dwellings or more, or 1,000 square metres of floor space), or any new development which is considered likely to significantly increase trip rates, to produce Travel Plans.

The policies on mitigation measures and transport impacts will also make mention of having modal split targets for new developments, although no specific city wide target will be stated in the policy. Instead, it is proposed that the specifics of a modal split target be assessed on a site-by-site basis and be covered in greater detail by the County Council's Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, and any Transport Assessment/Transport Statement. The County Council are currently investigating the possibility of procuring a travel plan monitoring tool through funding from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund. This would allow greater monitoring of modal splits and all other aspects of travel plans in place for new developments.

It is considered that pursuing Option 193 is entirely in line with the conclusions in the Sustainability Appraisal.

| RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH |
|---|
| The recommendation is to pursue option 193, and develop policies on the following:<br>• **Transport impact –** It is important that the impact of a new development on the transport network is not severe. This policy will ensure that sufficient information be provided by applicants so that the impacts on the transport network can be demonstrated as part of any application. The policy will state that development will be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are shown to be severe. What is meant by 'Severe impacts' needs be defined through Transport Assessments, after consultation with the County Council. This policy will also seek to ensure that in areas of the city where traffic congestion is already particularly high, a zero increase or even reduction in traffic is sought prior to approval of any development or redevelopment. A requirement for Transport Assessments/Transport Statements and Travel Plans will be embedded within this policy.<br>• **Mitigation measures –** For development likely to place demand on the transport system, suitable mitigation measures will be required. This policy will see that these measures are put in place, and ensure that financial contributions towards the improvements are sought in the wider area affected by the increased development, as well as site-specific measures. This will include support for public transport, cycling and walking as well as travel plans. The method for working these contributions out and the links to Planning Obligations and the Community infrastructure Levy will be referred to. |

| Option 194: Total representations: 3 | |
|---|---|
| Object: 0 | Support: 3 |
| Option 195: Total representations: 2 | |
| Object: 1 | Support: 1 |

| OPTION NUMBER | KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION |
|---|---|
| Option 194: Modal split targets for new developments | • Some support.<br>• Need to be ambitious.<br>• Need to be flexible.<br>• Blanket target not flexible enough, needs to take into account individual circumstances.<br>• Sites differ too much for one target. |
| Option 195: Do not set a city wide modal split target for new development | • Sites in Cambridge differ too much for one target – it seems more logical to base targets on local considerations (i.e. ease of public transport access);Need to be flexible, which is possible with this option.Should be part of the County Council's Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC), not the Local Plan. |

| NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT |
|---|
| No additional options have been suggested. |

| SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT |
|---|
| Option 194, which would set modal split targets would likely result in a shift towards more sustainable travel behaviour across the city, bringing benefits in terms of health, well being, and emission reductions.  Option 195 which proposes a negotiated target on a case by case basis is more difficult to assess, as the potential cumulative effect of case by case allocations could result in an overall increase in car journeys compared to Option 194 but would provide much greater flexibility to address particular site specific limitations. |

| KEY EVIDENCE |
|---|
| • North West Cambridge Area Action Plan (2009); <br> • Atkins for Cambridgeshire County Council (2007). Cambridge North West Transport Study. Final Report <br> • DfT 2011. Creating growth, cutting carbon: making sustainable local transport happen <br> • Cambridgeshire County Council (2011). Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 3; <br> • Cambridgeshire County Council (2012).  Draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire <br> • Smarter Choices: Changing the way we travel (DfT 2005) <br> • The Role of Soft Measures in Influencing Patronage Growth and Modal Split in the Bus Market in England (DfT 2009) |

| CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED |
|---|
| Not applicable |

| ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE |
|---|
| In order to be sustainable, and not impact negatively on the existing road network, new developments should be located and designed to ensure that the modal share of private car journeys is as low as possible. In order to achieve this, options for non-car travel need to be accessible, reliable and attractive. Having Travel Plans and linking the development to, and protecting, high quality public transport, walking and cycling routes can help to achieve this. <br><br> Setting a modal split target for a new development places can help to ensure that developers, land owners and users of a site strive towards the use of sustainable travel. A number of responses to the consultation agreed with the principle of having modal split targets for new developments, and for these targets to be ambitious. However, a number of these responses also questioned the feasibility of setting a citywide target. The need for flexibility in setting a target is highlighted by a high number of the responses to the options. It is agreed that taking a site-by-site assessment of a new development is more likely to result in an achievable and successful modal split target, as each new site for a development is likely to have individual characteristics. The County Council are currently investigating the |

possibility of procuring a travel plan monitoring tool through funding from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund. This would allow greater monitoring of modal splits and all other aspects of travel plans in place for new developments.

It was also argued in the responses to the consultation that setting a modal split target is more of a function for the emerging Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC) from the County Council. This is due to the fact that the County are the highways authority, and advise on the suitability of new developments from a transport perspective. The issue of modal split, particularly its relation to trip generation, is linked to the Transport Assessment (TA). It is agreed that this is a function of the highways authority, however it is felt that having a hook in the Local Plan policies for a target is key to it coming to fruition.

It is therefore proposed that pursuing option 195 – not setting a city-wide modal split target - is the best option. The setting of a modal split target for a new development will be possible, and indeed encouraged through Travel Plans. It could also be required as a conclusion of a TA. The TSCSC is proposed to provide further detail of such a policy.

| RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH |
| --- |
| The recommendation is to pursue option 195 – not setting a city-wide modal split target for Cambridge. This is essentially a continuation of the current approach, however it is proposed that as part of a policy on mitigation of transport impacts from a new development, explicit mention of the possibility of setting modal split targets should be made. This mention of targets is proposed to sit alongside the mention of Travel Plans in the policies arising from Option 193. |

**ISSUE: TRAVEL PLANS**

| Option 196: Total representations: 8 | |
| --- | --- |
| Object: 1 | Support: 7 |
| Option 197: Total representations: 5 | |
| Object: 3 | Support: 2 |

| OPTION NUMBER | KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION |
| --- | --- |
| Option 196: Set a travel plan threshold | • Good support for setting a threshold.<br>• Some agreement that the threshold should be approximately 10 units – this is similar to the 'all major developments' put forward at Issues and Options.<br>• Could be too inflexible.<br>• No need for individual policy, just incorporate into Option 193 (development only where the impact on the network can be mitigated against).<br>• Threshold alone not enough. |
| Option 197: Do not set a travel plan | • Good support for this option also.<br>• This is flexible and takes into account individual site |

| threshold | circumstances. |
| | • No need for individual policy, just incorporate into Option 193 (development only where the impact on the network can be mitigated against). |
| | • All sites should have the presumption of a travel plan, and be required to justify why they don't need one (not the other way around). |
| | • This option would leave too much uncertainty for developers. |
| | • Less travel plans would result from this option, as opposed to 196. |

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

No additional options have been suggested.

---

**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

Setting an appropriate threshold for requiring travel plans across the city is likely to result in a positive effect on the use of more sustainable transport modes, with consequential benefits on health and well being, reduced transport pressures and greenhouse gas emissions.

Option 197, to continue the current requirement only where felt appropriate/stipulated would be likely to have a similar effect to option 196. However, there is some uncertainty for developers. Nonetheless the overall effect of this option is likely to be positive.

---

**KEY EVIDENCE**

- DfT (2011). Creating growth, cutting carbon: making sustainable local transport happen
- Cambridgeshire County Council (2011). Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 3;
- Cambridgeshire County Council (2012). Draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire;
- DfT (2010). The Effects of Smarter Choice Programmes in the Sustainable Travel Towns.

---

**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

Not applicable

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

Currently, using travel plans as a tool for minimising the impact of a new development can be required through Transport Assessments and Transport Statements, if the development is deemed likely to place significant pressure on the existing transport network. The NPPF states a desire for Local Authorities to give far greater emphasis to the use of travel plans as a tool for ensuring new development is as sustainable as possible.

As such, the Issues and Options report asked whether it was appropriate to require a travel plan for any development over a certain 'size threshold' with the aim of making things more certain for developers and Local Authorities. The response to this showed a good level of support for such a threshold, and also for ensuring that this threshold accords with the definition of a 'major development'. In housing terms this is 10 houses or more, and in terms of non-residential development, this is 1,000 meters sq. of floor space or more. The support received for is noted and agreed with, as it will provide the certainty required for developers.

However, simply having a threshold may not be flexible enough, as many developments and their associated travel behaviour will be defined by their local circumstances, location and characteristics. For example, there may be developments below the size threshold that would cause an impact upon the transport network due to being located in areas of already high congestion, which also considerably increase trip rates to and from the site. These would benefit from having travel plans too. Therefore, any policy would need to include the flexibility to cover for these types of instances, as well as having a threshold.

It is considered that travel plans (and any associated threshold) should be incorporated into the policies arising from option 193 (Development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against) rather than being a standalone policy. This also accords well with the Sustainability Appraisal conclusion of the options.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to pursue a combination of options 196 and 197, by setting a threshold for travel plans that accords with the definition of major developments, but to also ensure that such a requirement is flexible enough to account for any instances where the use of a travel plan is appropriate even if the threshold is not met. It is proposed that this lies within the policies arising to ensure that impacts on the transport network from new development are mitigated against (option 193).

Option 198 will be considered in relation to the strategic priorities in Chapter 4 on Cambridge East at a later Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee

**ISSUE: TELECOMMUNICATIONS CRITERIA BASED POLICY**

| Total representations: 28 | |
|---|---|
| **Object: 10** | **Support: 18** |

| OPTION NUMBER | KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION |
|---|---|
| Option 199: Telecommunications criteria based policy | • Agree that consultation should take place before installation near a school or college; <br> • Should prevent masts/sites within an agreed distance (say 50m) of any residential property; <br> • There should be a policy that limits electromagnetic field intensities; <br> • Has the impact of existing masts been assessed locally? <br> • It is insufficient to state that 'significant interference' should be used as a test, a tighter definition should be used. The requirement to consult should not be limited to immediate neighbours of the site; <br> • The provision of telecommunications infrastructure can have a major impact on transport network requirements; <br> • The Council needs to encourage the installation of fibre optics across the city; <br> • The highway authority should be consulted where appropriate |

| NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT |
|---|
| It is insufficient to state that 'significant interference' should be used as a test, a tighter definition should be used. The requirement to consult should not be limited to immediate neighbours of the site. |

| SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT |
|---|
| Criteria based quality standards for the siting, design, appearance, and impact mitigation of telecommunication developments may result in mitigating concerns regarding visual, health and landscape impact concerns. The proposed criteria should also help address issues relating to the quality of the built environment, open spaces and conservation areas across the city. |

| KEY EVIDENCE |
|---|
| • National Planning Policy Framework Section 5 (Supporting high quality communications infrastructure) - particularly paragraphs 43 and 44. |

| CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED |
|---|
| • Policy 8/14 (Telecommunications Development) |

**ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

New communications technology is continually developing and it is important that residents and businesses have the best access to new technology. It is important that the Council supports the growth of telecommunications systems while keeping the environmental impact to a minimum. The National Planning Policy Framework supports this aspiration (paragraphs 42 – 46).

Responses to the consultation were generally in support of this option. There was one suggestion that a tighter definition than 'significant interference' should be used. It is suggested that the wording be changed to 'significant and irremediable interference' to reflect the wording in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 44).

It has also been suggested:

- That a criterion is added to suggest that the highway authority is consulted where works are in the highway, or in or close to the guided busway. This could be included as one of the criteria when a policy is developed;
- That the policy should include reference to the need for new development to provide industry standard ducting for high speed broadband. This could be accommodated within the criteria for this policy; and,
- That the policy should deal with electromagnetic field intensities. According to the National Planning Policy Framework, it is not the responsibility of the Local Planning Authority to consider further health aspects if a proposal meets the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines for public exposure.

The aim of this policy is to guide and support telecommunications development while keeping the environmental impact to a minimum. The proposed criteria based policy may result in mitigating concerns regarding visual, health and landscape impact concerns and help address issues relating to the quality of the built environment, open spaces and conservation across the city.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH**

The recommendation is to pursue Option 199 to produce a criteria based policy for communications development that supports the growth of telecommunications development while keeping the environmental impact to a minimum. This approach would include reference to the need for industry standard ducting or equivalent provision for high speed broadband within the supporting text.

**ISSUE: MULLARD RADIO ASTRONOMY OBSERVATORY, LORD'S BRIDGE – CONSULTATION AREAS**

| Total representations: 18 | |
|---|---|
| Object: 2 | Support: 16 |

| OPTION NUMBER | KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION |
|---|---|
| Option 200: Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lord's Bridge – Consultation Areas | • It is an important site of international importance and should be protected;<br>• Add the proposal to re-open the Oxford-Cambridge rail link, it used to run through this site.<br>• It could rule out important sites. |
| **NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT** | |
| No additional options have been suggested. | |

| SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT |
|---|
| Without details of the location or nature of proposed development it is not possible to effectively appraise this option. However, it is unlikely that this option would have any significant impact on the sustainability issues. The only possible impact could potentially be against the economy sustainability theme, in particular the issue relating to Cambridge's position as a competitive city. This is because it might be necessary to have mitigation measures associated with certain types of industrial processes or telecommunication systems, or in extreme cases prevent development from being permitted, where they could affect the operation of the Observatory. However, this impact is unlikely given that the Observatory is outside the city boundary. |

| KEY EVIDENCE |
|---|
| • National Planning Policy Framework Section 5 (Supporting high quality communications infrastructure) particularly paragraphs 43 and 44. |

| CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED |
|---|
| • Policy 8/15 (Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lord's Bridge) |

| ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE |
|---|
| The Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory contains radio and optical telescopes, which are of international importance. The telescopes are highly susceptible to many forms of interference including electrical waves, microwaves, light pollution and mechanical vibration.<br><br>This policy option proposes to carry forward a Local Plan 2006 policy which relates to the observatory. Although the Observatory falls within the administrative boundary of South Cambridgeshire District Council, there are two consultation areas under Local Plan 2006 Policy 8/15, which fall within the city boundary.<br><br>Option 200 proposes to take this policy forward and there has been majority support |

from respondents in favour of doing so. One respondent made reference to a proposal to re-open the Oxford-Cambridge railway line, which used to go through this site. Whilst it is not considered appropriate to include this matter within the policy on the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, it is recognised that this issue could be one of the long-term aspirations addressed by the County Council's Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire.

| RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH |
|---|
| The recommendation is to pursue Option 200 to carry forward a policy which requires that any development which could impact on the operation of the observation be subject to consultation with the University of Cambridge. It would be similar to the approach taken in Local Plan 2006 Policy 8/15. |

**ISSUE: PROVISION OF INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES**

| Total representations: 40 | |
|---|---|
| Object: 10 | Support: 30 |

| OPTION NUMBER | KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM CONSULTATION |
|---|---|
| Option 201 – Provision of Infrastructure and Services | • Green Infrastructure and open spaces provision could enhance biodiversity and it is therefore welcomed; <br>• Improvements and provision for infrastructure would need to be proportionate and related to the scale of development proposed taking account of the developments own impact on local infrastructure whilst not providing infrastructure to make up existing deficiencies; <br>• All new developments need infrastructure and services; <br>• Developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure; <br>• It is important to ensure policies are robust so that they cannot be challenged by developers; <br>• Support and note that the list in Option 201 is 'not exhaustive'; <br>• Planning obligations/CIL are one of a number of essential sources to deliver the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy and the 2006 Nature Conservation Strategy; <br>• New developments usually generate traffic and other problems, which create costs to existing users; it is not acceptable for a developer to offload these externalities onto the taxpayer, and so the CIL/S106 payments ensure that these costs are properly accounted for; <br>• Infrastructure must be in place before any development is occupied; <br>• Major developments should meet their own |

| | infrastructure needs and this provision should be completed before the overall scheme is complete; |
| | • The policy should ensure developer contributions to non-vehicular infrastructure should be encouraged; |
| | • The Plan should provide a realistic and deliverable strategy, which identifies the key infrastructure constraints and highlights how any constraints will be overcome. It is essential that the development strategy can be delivered and implemented with reasonable confidence; |
| | • Any policy should ensure that contributions from developers should only be sought where necessary to make a scheme acceptable in planning terms and should be fair and reasonable in both scale and kind. The level of contributions sought should strike a balance between the need for funding and the impact on the viability of development; |
| | • There is no statement about how the policy will be monitored and enforced; |
| | • There is a lack of transparency and a democratic deficiency with regard to how S.106 monies are collected and spent. |

**NEW OPTIONS ARISING FOLLOWING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

No additional options have been suggested.


**SUMMARY OF INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

This option is likely to contribute to positive effects across multiple sustainability topics and thematic areas. Health, leisure and community facilities can contribute to wellbeing. Improvements to water, and flood protection infrastructure can also bring benefits. Green infrastructure and open spaces provision could enhance biodiversity. Furthermore this option should help maintain cultural facilities and improve the quality of the open and built environment citywide. The sustainability benefits of this option on the transport and renewable energy sustainability topics will depend on the nature of the infrastructure and services provided and therefore it is difficult to appraise them with any certainty at this stage.


**KEY EVIDENCE**

- National Planning Policy Framework;
- Peter Brett Associates (2012) - Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Joint Infrastructure Delivery Study (2012).


**CURRENT POLICY TO BE REPLACED**

- Policy 8/18 (Water, Sewerage and Drainage Infrastructure);
- Policy 10/1 (Infrastructure Improvements)

| ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES AND OFFICER RESPONSE |
| --- |
| National guidance requires local planning authorities to plan positively for development and infrastructure required in the area (National Planning Policy Framework – paragraphs 156 and 157). Option 201 proposes to develop a policy that requires that new development is supported by the provision of infrastructure and continues the policy of seeking funding from developers for infrastructure requirements related to new developments. This will be by means of planning obligations and/or a future Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). <br><br> This option has the potential to contribute to positive impacts across many areas. For example (and the list is not exhaustive): transport infrastructure; affordable housing; education; Health, leisure and community facilities; improvements to water and flood protection; waste recycling facilities; cultural facilities and provision for green infrastructure and open spaces can bring social, economic and environmental benefits. <br><br> The majority of respondents were in favour of this policy option to continue to seek funding from developers for infrastructure requirements related to new developments. Some concerns were raised about the monitoring and enforcement of this policy and also that there is a lack of transparency with how S.106 monies are collected and spent.  In accordance with the Council's Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document, the level of S.106 contributions required is set out in the delegated or committee report relating to each planning application. Consistent processes are in place for the collection of the S.106 monies and the expenditure of a significant proportion of these monies is determined through the four Area Committees.  Further information on the process of collecting and spending developer contributions is available at www.cambridge.gov.uk/s106 <br><br> The policy proposed would be an overarching strategic policy, which would be supported by a CIL Charging Schedule and a Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document. Details of how the CIL works, including monitoring, enforcement, collection and spend is laid out in regulation.  Details of how S.106 will work alongside CIL will be laid out in a new Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document. |

| RECOMMENDATION FOR PREFERRED APPROACH |
| --- |
| The recommendation is to pursue Option 201 to continue to seek funding from developers for infrastructure to support new development. |

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.1 |
|---|---|

### 7939   Object

**Summary:**

I dont believe there is a well developed public transport network. It is misleading & unrealistic to ignore the car.
The car is an attractive and popular mode of travel and should be part of a integrated transport policy.   The large buses(tourist and local) cause damage to the environment and congestion especially within the citycentre & historic core.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.1 |
|---|---|

### 14444 Support

**Summary:**

Cycling infrastructure ought be a much bigger part of the plan.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.1 |
|---|---|

### 14937 Object

**Summary:**

We support this principle.

However, despite much positive work by dedicated individuals, there is too much complacency about cycling levels in Cambridge. People continue to cycle despite often poor infrastructure or poor development decisions. With tens of thousands of people moving into the new developments who are unfamiliar with Cambridge's cycling culture, overall levels of cycling will fall, unless stronger polices to favour cycling are in place.

22% is high for UK, but is well below the level achieved in genuinely cycle-friendly cities such as those in many places in the Netherlands. Cambridge should be aiming for 40% of trips by cycle.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 15763 Object

**Summary:**

This paragraph belies a tone of complacency over cycling and walking, and public transport. Cycling might be high for the UK, but low compared to many European cities, especially those with equivalently flat landscapes. I also strongly beg to differ that the public transport network is well developed: it has poor integration, and almost all routes are radial. If you want to go anywhere near Cambridge, you have to go *in* to Cambridge. And after the recent cuts in bus subsidies, many services have either become too infrequent to be useful or disappeared entirely.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 16619 Object

**Summary:**

The first paragraph presents a rather rosy pciture of the present situation. The truth is in the last sentence.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 18256 Object

**Summary:**

Paragraph 12.1 describes the current travel profile. Although Cambridge has a lower than average car usage (41% travel by car to work), CAA would welcome policies that significantly reduce the use of cars. Why accept 41% travel by car to work as acceptable. 25% would be better. By the same token increasing bicycle travel to 50% would be a reasonable target.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.2 |
|---|---|

## 7183   Object

**Summary:**

The Local Plan 2006 initiatives to stimulate modal change should not now be, automatically, consolidated in the 2031 Plan - there is no evidence it has worked; despite the promotion of cycling and public transport, the dedication of a minority pursuit, is inconsistent with the realities of modern living and a modern Economy, lacking futurity in a Long Term Plan (extending to 2031). There should be a return to road sharing, proper engineering for flow and enforcement of regulation. The real outcome has been delinquency and inefficiency within the existing road networks.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.2 |
|---|---|

## 14945 Object

**Summary:**

We support this principle. However, in practice the internal arrangements for delivery need review.

The need for an internal advocate for cycling and walking within the City Council is greater than ever. The existing 0.6 officer is clearly overwhelmed, and we have seen no indications that the planning department is suddenly more cycle-friendly.

We believe 2 Cycling Officer posts should be the minimum for the City Council if the aspirations in the Local Plan are to be approached. Far more active scrutiny and pro-active improvement of every planning application, particularly large applications, are needed, to help avoid future congestion.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.2 |
|---|---|

## 17117 Support

**Summary:**

Engineer some good family walks, its really hard to go for a good walk and move beyond the city boundary without having a car.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.2 |
|---|---|

## 17524 Object

**Summary:**

The Guided Busway may become a commercial failure in the future. A proper rail link is needed to Felixstowe to reduce traffic on the A14. You need to improve the A14.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.2 |
|---|---|

## 18255 Object

**Summary:**

CAA recognise the difficulty the Local Council have in coordinating and implementing strategies in conjunction with the requirements of the Highways Department. We encourage the council to develop a vision for street improvement on an area by area basis as a means for improving the streetscape and public amenity. This could be achieved through consultation and collaboration with various local academic, commercial and voluntary groups working in these areas.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.3 |
|---|---|

## 7182   Support

**Summary:**

Any transport policy, 'management of demand', should review whether the current plan has been effective, in the light of the polarised attitudes and antagonisms it has created, including large scale delinquency. A return to regulation, road sharing, eradicating  inefficiencies of dedicated space for public transport, with continuing protection for cycling (on the basis of acceptance of all aspects of the Highway Code). The elimination or deliberate reduction of a class of traffic ignores the futurity of a Long Term Plan requires and non polluting fuels in future; investment in roads is vital to the Modern Economy/Growth Equation purposed.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.3 |
|---|---|

## 14942 Object

**Summary:**

Agree with this principle. Infrastructure must go in first as it affects travel patterns as people move in.

The 2006 Local Plan stated in paragraph 8.14 that paths should be in place by first occupation. However, in practice this does not always happen and so should be given much more robust emphasis in the new Local Plan.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.3 |
|---|---|

## 15358 Support

**Summary:**

Disagree strongly with the assertion of another commenter that cars are being eliminated from the city.

Huge tracts of land are taken up for car parking or queuing cars. Getting either Local Authority to remove either of those for other uses is difficult or rare, despite the clear inequity in terms of balance of space against other uses.

By way of example, almost every bit of road space in the terraced area of Romsey is taken up by car parking, with even pedestrian pavements officially stolen for private car owner use; by contrast there is barely a single cycle parking space.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.3 |
|---|---|

## 16620 Support

**Summary:**

Developing the infrastructure before development begins is essential. The residents of Cambourne and Orchard Park had to wait a long time for some of their essential infrastructure.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.4 |
|---|---|

## 10902 Support

**Summary:**

Chisholm Cycle Trail.

The area for this should be included in the updated plan in such a way that developers cannot appropriate any part of it.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.4 |
|---|---|

## 11643 Support

**Summary:**

I support a dedicated cycleway along the Chisholm trail to help cyclists travel from north to south more safely and more quickly. This land must not be used for building developments.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.4 |
|---|---|

## 11931 Support

**Summary:**

The Chisholm Trail strategic cycle route from the Science Park to Addenbrooke's hospital was included in the last Local Plan and should be included as part of new infrastructure provision plans to further promote cycling.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.5 |
|---|---|

## 17590 Object

**Summary:**

I welcome all 12 "bullet points" describing the Cambridge 2031 Vision. However, I question whether the spirit of this vision is matched in the subsequent report. I cannot see that sufficient creativity has been applied in the overall and detailed proposals. If it were, then the "Transport Strategy" would not have been the last chapter. A clever, laterally thought through approach would have started with a "Transport Strategy" and worked out from this. The proposed vision does not grip this with anything like the boldness that is essential for Cambridge to rise to its current challenges let alone those in 20 years time.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 182 - Timely provision of infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 8137  Support

**Summary:**

This is vital. Possibly the most important paragraph within the entire issues and options document.However, it must not be assumed that with good planning unlimited development can be achieved.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 182 - Timely provision of infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 8634  Support

**Summary:**

I am in support of the "Chisholm Trail". Also I wouldn't object to a congestion charge in Cambridge!

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 182 - Timely provision of infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 8950  Object

**Summary:**

In general we support since sustainability,co-ordination and timeliness are essential if there is any new development. They should also be applied to meet the needs of the exisiting built areas.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 182 - Timely provision of infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 12195 Support

**Summary:**

I consider that Strategic priorities, option 60 (p. 136), option 67 (p. 150), option 121 (p. 218), option 163 (p. 260) and option 182 (p. 284) are the correct ones

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 182 - Timely provision of infrastructure |
| --- | --- |

## 12678 Support

**Summary:**

One of the most important factors in the growth of this city.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 182 - Timely provision of infrastructure |
| --- | --- |

## 13226 Object

**Summary:**

Although we support the principle that where development takes place, infrastructure should be provided in a sustainable, co-ordinated and timely manner, we would prefer this paragraph was worded less in favour of development.  So for example;
"Ensure that where development in Cambridge takes place, infrastructure is provided in a . . ."

Making sure community facilities and other infrastructure is in place in a timely manner and as sustainable as possible is crucial for successful new communities - but CCF are opposed to significant new development around Cambridge.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 182 - Timely provision of infrastructure |
| --- | --- |

## 13242 Support

**Summary:**

The Local Plan should require infrastructure to be provided at an early stage of any development. The transport infrastructure should also be improved for existing areas.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 182 - Timely provision of infrastructure |
| --- | --- |

## 13540 Object

**Summary:**

this statement needs strengthening so that it calls for infrastructure to be provided prior to the development being in use wherever possible. We have seen several delays in the provision of agreed infrastructure. Other countries seem to get this right, why can't we?

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 182 - Timely provision of infrastructure |
| --- | --- |

## 14735 Support

**Summary:**

We believe that Option 182 should be supported, but that 182 should clearly aim to alleviate the existing congestion and improve traffic flow within the City and further that 182 should not be implemented in isolation, but should  include consideration of surrounding villages in the City and SCDC, so that those villages and communities are not adversely affected by this strategic priority

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 182 - Timely provision of infrastructure |
| --- | --- |

## 14949 Object

**Summary:**

- Agree strongly with this principle, but in practice the equivalent existing policy has still led to poor quality infrastructure in terms of walking and cycling.

- 22% by bike is far too low. Cambridge should be aiming for 40% of trips by cycle. Any other policy will lead to substantial congestion given the scale of housing growth.

- The headline requirement that we think it essential that the Local Plan adopts, as a major new policy, is that new developments must be planned to Dutch standards of provision for cycling and walking.

- Gallery and definition of Dutch-style infrastructure at: http://www.cyclestreets.net/galleries/212/

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 182 - Timely provision of infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 15284 Support

**Summary:**

This is a desirable aim and is a strategic priority, pity it doesn't often happen.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 182 - Timely provision of infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 15687 Object

**Summary:**

We believe that Option 182 should be supported, but that 182 should clearly aim to alleviate the existing congestion and improve traffic flow within the City, and further that 182 should not be implemented in isolation, but should include consideration of surrounding villages in the City and SCDC, so that those villages and communities are not adversely affected by this strategic priority.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 182 - Timely provision of infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 16382 Object

**Summary:**

We believe that Option 182 should be supported, but that 182 should clearly aim to alleviate the existing congestion and improve traffic flow within the City, and further that 182 should not be implemented in isolation, but should include consideration of surrounding villages in the City and SCDC, so that those villages and communities are not adversely affected by this strategic priority.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 182 - Timely provision of infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 16588 Object

**Summary:**

Doing more:
More yellow lines on one side of congested roads to stop "canyoning" e.g. Davy road where commuter park.
Put camera enforcement of advanced stop-lines at traffic lights/junctions. to increase safety for cyclists.
Increase/Provide new cycle parking in the City Centre Multi-Story car parks

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 182 - Timely provision of infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 16622 Support

**Summary:**

Strongly support. But there is also a need to improve the existing infrastructure.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 182 - Timely provision of infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 16823 Object

**Summary:**

I am concerned that there is too strong a belief that people will easily abandon their cars and that we do not give enough attention to the realities of traffic congestion.
And that an increasing population will cause the A14 to be even more congested.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 182 - Timely provision of infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 17652 Object

**Summary:**

We remain concerned about the implications of new developments in the Southern Fringe for Traffic volumes and consequent congestion along the Trumpington Road. The key facts box states that traffic has remained stable, but this does not accord with our experience, or the increase in population. We would like to see the evidence for these estimates.
Trumpington Road is already overcongested especially at peak times. It needs to be acknowledged that the current state of congestion and how new development will affect this.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 182 - Timely provision of infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 18173 Object

**Summary:**

Car Park Charging and City Centre Accessibility
USS has an ongoing concern about the rising cost of car parking in the City Centre. We recommend that the City Council take the opportunity revisit car park charging within the City Centre (and indeed in out of centre locations) as part of this emerging planning strategy or as part of a revised transport strategy for the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire area.
In addition to the above, we note that the City Council is exploring ideas for making Cambridge a more pro  actively car free place to help reduce traffic congestion and pollution, improve the quality of the environment and encourage yet more travel on foot, by cycle and by public transport. We are broadly supportive of this approach but urge the Council to fully investigate the implications for the City Centre in promoting this type of scheme.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 182 - Timely provision of infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 18207 Object

**Summary:**

make sure the infrastructure of services from water supply, sewerage, and school, and waste disposal are adequately provided for

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Key Facts |
|---|---|

## 12736 Object

**Summary:**

I would argue with this first point which is far too broad - certain areas such as Newmarket Road have experienced large increases in traffic in the time since 1996 due to the opening of the various retail parks along its length, which is acknowledged elsewhere.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Key Facts |
|---|---|

## 12742 Object

**Summary:**

Only percentage of car journeys to work are mentioned - what about for non-work purposes and how do these statistics compare to other cities?
Some of these data are based on 2001 figures and are therefore hugely out of date?

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Key Facts |
|---|---|

## 12743 Object  (W/drawn 2012-11-27)

**Summary:**

Some of these data are based on 2001 figures and are therefore hugely out of date?

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Key Facts**

## 14956 Object

**Summary:**

We are pleased that 26% cycling rate for work has been achieved, but this should go much further.

As noted above in our response to 12.1, the level of cycling is too low compared with what could be achieved. In particular, new developments should be designed to ensure a larger proportion of travel for work journeys by bicycle than 26% and a reduction from 41% for work journeys by car. Otherwise vehicle traffic will make the city roads even more congested than at present.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Key Facts**

## 15733 Object

**Summary:**

Cambridge has the highest modal share of journeys by bicycle within the city of any town or city in the UK. But this share is rather poor compared with mainland European cities.

This should be stated, to make it clear that the City Council though it is pleased, is not complacent about its transport statistics.

All new development is bound to add to the existing flows, in all modes. The Council must make it clear that all new development must be designed so as to achieve good continental levels of cycling (40%+), walking and public transport use.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Objectives**

## 8951   Object

**Summary:**

In general we support. This is essential infrastructure. However, need to specify that criteria should also be applied to existing built areas where there is a shortfall. This includes situations in which buses are already full when they arrive at stops in city suburbs, especially at rush hour.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**12.6**

## 8953   Object

**Summary:**

In general we support para 12.6 as essential. Bullet point 5, add: improve operation of local transport network so that it is efficient and reliable.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**12.6**

## 11639 Support

**Summary:**

I would champion more cycle paths along the main roads entering cambridge to stimulate cyclist of neighboring villages to commute to town by bike

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**12.6**

## 12690 Support

**Summary:**

There needs to be a radical overhaul of the transport network in and around Cambridge. Even though a large percentage of people use bus/cycle/walk the city is congested. To even sustain this level of congestion during future growth of the cuty is simply not enough- we need an innovative approach to this to dramatically reduce the number of cars inthe city.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**12.6**

## 14957 Support

**Summary:**

Informative: We will be responding to the County's consultation. We will be making the point that only cycling can facilitate high levels of housing growth in a compact city, if high levels of congestion are to be avoided.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.6 |
|---|---|

## 15669 Object

**Summary:**

"Robust assessment" is a transport engineers' phrase for high predictions of traffic generation, intended to ensure that streets and junctions provided by a development will cater for the highest peak flows it could be foreseen to create, in any future scenario.

The use of robust assessments produces oversized junctions which are difficult for pedestrians and cyclists to negotiate using the footways (for example by requiring several separately-called crossings and waiting times) and threatening for cyclists to negotiate using the carriageway.

"Require the accurate assessment..." would be better wording - plus a new clause requiring developments to encourage the green modes.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.6 |
|---|---|

## 16605 Object

**Summary:**

"Doing more" At railway station
- Bullet Point 2
Include a full-facility long-distance coach-station in the railway station re-development (To have Booking Office/Waiting Room/Toilets)
Provide much more cycle parking

Provide an Eastern Bypass/Relief Road From A14 Stow-Cum-Quy interchange down to Babraham Park and Ride site roundabout. To reduce traffic on Eastern ring roads

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.6 |
|---|---|

## 16623 Object

**Summary:**

Bullet point 2 is rather vague; bullet point 5: I would add 'and improve' to this point.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.6 |
|---|---|

## 16667 Object

**Summary:**

Glebe Road's road infrastructure is incapable of sustaining the increases in traffic and parking demands.
In term time the road as a car park is full.
When I challenged the validity of a plan for development I was told that the Highways Authority had been consulted and considered the road infrastructure suitable for the extra traffic. Two years ago the County Council considered taking up congestion charges in the City to cope with the traffic chaos.
This raises yet again the need to test the accuracy of predictions used by Councils to validate/test planning proposals.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.6 |
|---|---|

## 17607 Object

**Summary:**

Many "satellite" developments around Cambridge were/are designed to provide overspill accommodation for Cambridge. Poor transport accessibility results in these "satellites" not really doing a proper "dormitory" job and this is borne out in the dramatic house price differential. In Cambridge this is particularly marked because existing poor transport links create real challenges for people needing to travel either into or across Cambridge to get to work. If the Local Authorities could create some super high speed links from the existing "satellites" then I believe the housing situation would be relieved because more people who are currently wedded to City Centre dwelling would cast their search wider.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.6 |
|---|---|

## 18268 Object

**Summary:**

Residents enjoy the benefit of accessibility to city centre shops, business and leisure facilities, but they experience the disamenity of the pollution and noise created by through traffic. The City Council should:
-a- require the co-operation of the County Council (as recommended in the NPPF) in re-assessing the principles on which the circulation of traffic in the central area is based;
-b- undertake a full transport survey;
-c- produce alternative draft proposals for closing off King Street at the intersection with Belmont Place following the original proposals for this part of the central area, and
-d- include the outcome of these studies in the next stage of public consultation.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.7 |
| --- | --- |

## 6860 Support

**Summary:**

People in Cambridge need to be persuaded to use Public Transport of all kinds-be it Bus, Train or Cycle so I agree with what is said here.
I do not, however, agree with extending the Guided Busway-the Guided Busway was, in my opinion,a mistake-and it shouldn't be taken as read that this system can offer more things than the conventional Train or Bus can when they can offer a good alternative-particularly with the opening of new Railway Stations.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.7 |
| --- | --- |

## 18217 Object

**Summary:**

Close co-operation with the County Council on the above and other matters should be a matter of first principle

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.7 |
| --- | --- |

## 18582 Support

**Summary:**

In matters of transport it is vital that Cambridge works closely with South Cambs and other planning authorities to ensure that developments minimise the use of the private car and maximise walking, cycling and the use of public transport. This has multiple benefits in reducing carbon dioxide emissions, congestion levels, and boosting air quality, "liveability" of communities, and health.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.7 |
| --- | --- |

## 18583 Object

**Summary:**

Not surprisingly, the majority of Chamber businesses are not rushing to respond to these consultations. Generally they feel that if the area is to achieve the desired economic growth and prosperity the plans need to be coordinated and to cover a much larger area than Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, ideally in one single plan. For consultation to deliver any meaningful conclusions there needs to be much closer collaboration across local authority areas and much better connection between different issues. For example, the question of how many homes should be built in and around Cambridge is quite obviously linked to how will the growing population get around? Realistic answers to these questions can only be made if major road and rail infrastructure developments, as well as walking, cycling and use of public transport are part of the consultation.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.8 |
| --- | --- |

## 9585 Support

**Summary:**

There have been massive mistakes in developments in the past. These have included houses that back onto each other that have a long walk to get from one to the other. This must not be repeated, but pedestrian and cycle permeability must be made easy.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.8 |
| --- | --- |

## 9861 Support

**Summary:**

agree

---

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **12.8** |

## 10475 Support

**Summary:**

There are well evidenced health benefits from 'active ' and sustainable travel that incorporate walking and cycling including public transport. Benefits include an increase in physical activity and improvements in mental wellbeing. Walking and cycling are an effective way of integrating physical activity into everyday activities with little personal or societal cost. Increased vehicle and car use is associated with air and noise pollution, and increased risk of road trafic crashes. Busy roads can sever communities and prevent social cohesion. Areas of deprivation are disproportionately affected.
See recent BMA report: Healthy Transport = Healthy Lives, July 2012

---

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **12.8** |

## 12877 Object

**Summary:**

Public transport costs are prohibitive for many (e.g. some train ticket prices from Cambridge have risen over 280% in fifteen years, whilst salaries have not; bus travel is usually in excess of £4.30 for a day return within Cambridge itself) so we need to not only stop costs rising, but actually reduce them. We need to promote green transport and public transport, and make them more affordable for all.

---

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **12.8** |

## 14404 Object

**Summary:**

All major developments should involve very significant investment in dedicated strategic cycle routes, which cost almost nothing compared to other highways schemes, and deliver dramatically bigger benefits. The Chisholm Trail should be hardwired into the local plan so developers cannot build on it. Similar strategic cycle routes should be a requirement of all future developments.

---

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **12.8** |

## 14960 Support

**Summary:**

Strongly support this. Cycling certainly offers huge benefits for health, social inclusion, and economic efficiency of the city. Cycling must be seen as a priority for transport infrastructure.

---

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **12.8** |

## 15675 Object

**Summary:**

The final sentence here is the important one. The wording of the others, if retained, would allow developers to ignore it. All future development must be REQUIRED to encourage walking and cycling, and minimise car use, for the reasons given in the final sentence.

---

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **12.8** |

## 18257 Object

**Summary:**

It would be very helpful to provide a definition of what is meant by sustainable transport. Personal transport is going to change enormously in the next 20 years. It is difficult to second guess how it will evolve, but there are many possibilities. Does sustainable include :
Taxis, Rickshaws, electric bikes, electric cars, disability mobility?
Some of these could well bring their own planning challenges.
Does the definition of sustainable preclude personal transport methods? Or just the petrol/diesel engine?

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

### Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel

### 7184   Object

**Summary:**

This ignores the majority interest, is counter to the needs for adequate communications in a Modern Economy and the catastrophic lack of investment in the present network. It is a retrogressive approach to an engineering problem, of how to maintain 'flow', while adopting the Growth Equation.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

### Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel

### 8955   Object

**Summary:**

We support this option in general.  However, these points need to be applied to existing developed areas, not just new developments. Final paragraph: need to state criteria by which "good quality public transport" is assessed. Much of the existing public transport is not good quality; buses are often late, too crowded at peak times, and too infrequent in the evenings and at weekends. A good quality service needs to be frequent during the day, evenings and weekends; it also needs to have sufficient capacity and to run on time.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

### Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel

### 9523   Object

**Summary:**

Promotion of non-car means of travel is OK, but the needs of the motorist should not be ignored. The balance has swung too far against the motorist.  Car ownership is legal, and for many aspects of modern life essential.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

### Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel

### 9586   Support

**Summary:**

These policies sound sensible.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

### Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel

### 9671   Object

**Summary:**

Some independence for car travel must be encouraged; many part-time occupations rely on it for flexiblity. Such travel, if priced out, would stifle the economy and purposeful education.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

### Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel

### 9776   Support

**Summary:**

The LAF support all policies that actively support walking and cycling.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

### Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel

### 10833 Support

**Summary:**

Vital

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

### Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel

## 11088 Support

**Summary:**

There are too many cars in Cambridge.  Car traffic must be actively discouraged, as well as other modes of transport encouraged and improved.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel |
|---|---|

## 11529 Support

**Summary:**

Yes, please

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel |
|---|---|

## 11622 Support

**Summary:**

Less car use can only improve the city.
Less polution, less traffic jams, more people on the bike and on foot will improve the physical health as well.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel |
|---|---|

## 11650 Support

**Summary:**

I am in favour of encouraging travel on foot, by bicycle and by bus where possible, and the use of Car Clubs when not possible.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel |
|---|---|

## 12453 Support

**Summary:**

A greater investment in cycling infrastructure to connect villages or towns in the Cambridge area to Cambridge would reduce traffic congestion and enable the city to increase its employment base.  For example, a high-quality cycleway from Cambourne would enable more people to cycle into and out of Cambridge.  Similarly the proposed development at Waterbeach should be connected to the Science Park by a high-quality, Dutch style, cycle way.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel |
|---|---|

## 12572 Support

**Summary:**

A long-overdue emphasis. Cars are the biggest blight affecting quality of life.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel |
|---|---|

## 12591 Support

**Summary:**

The promotion of non car options relies on good public transport if it is not to discriminate against the old and less able. This may mean transport subsidies and city centre shuttle buses. If publicised these would be used, previous centre shuttle was not publicised sufficiently and consequently poorly used and withdrawn.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel |
|---|---|

## 12704 Support

**Summary:**

Could not agree with this more. Absolutely agree with shifting the focus away from cars- even if it does make it more difficult for those forced to use a car. BUT- this has to be matched by a step up in the public transport system. The ultimate aim is for non-car transport to be a truly viable option for the majority of people, this is a long way off currently. This should also stretch to connections with the existing villages on the fringes of Cambridge - public transport from these should be drastically increased.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel |
|---|---|

## 12748 Support

**Summary:**

Strongly supportive of this but words do need to be backed up with strong implementation, especially where developers are involved.  Also believe that disincentives as well as promoting (stick as well as carrot) are key, otherwise good intentions are doomed to fail.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel |
|---|---|

## 12860 Support

**Summary:**

The Chisholm cycle trail MUST be supported for good safe cycling between the North and South of the city. It is a no brainer.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel |
|---|---|

## 12923 Support

**Summary:**

I fully agree that Cambridge should aim steadily and systematically towards a less-cars city. Therefore, other alternative modes of travel, walking, cycling and public transport should be improved and promoted. Bus services in Cambridge are of poor quality; electronic panels are a significant step forward.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel |
|---|---|

## 13236 Support

**Summary:**

The impact of new developments on traffic levels, air quality and CO2 emissions must be mitigated by promoting alternatives to car travel. Road transport is responsible for 20% of UK carbon emissions.   A compact city like Cambridge should encourage non-car modes of transport for every development.

Cambridge should remain a compact city surrounded by green belt, where sustainable transport options are always viable.  We would like to see more development of employment prospects in towns and villages outside Cambridge giving more opportunities for people living outside the city to work near where they live.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel |
|---|---|

## 13613 Object

**Summary:**

I am disappointed at the weak reference to the Chisolm Trial strategic cycle route in the proposal.  The development and introduction of this dedicated cycle way alongside the railway tracks from the science park to addenbrookes would make cycling quicker when travelling from north to south and would enable cyclists to avoid busy junctions in town, thereby increasing safety.  References to this development need to be firmly and strongly set out in the plan to counter any perception that it is an optional extra.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel |
|---|---|

## 13917 Support

**Summary:**

This is an under-developed area of focus at present.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

## Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel

### 14374 Object

**Summary:**

The Chisholm Trail must be given greater weight in the Local Plan. It must feature as an example in the main document. It must be entrenched in the plan so that developers must deliver it, instead of building on it. The Trail must be defined as the ideal route. We must inflexibly insist on it being delivered in this form.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

## Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel

### 14462 Support

**Summary:**

I support the objectives all of which are laudable. However there appear to be no proposals yet on the table to achieve the aims and it is critical that these should be addressed.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

## Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel

### 14739 Support

**Summary:**

We support that developments should give priority to walking, cycling and public transport over cars, but do not agree that this should favour development where there are existing walking, cycling or public transport routes. Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular, paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injry to community and commuting pedestrians and cyclists is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

## Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel

### 14912 Object

**Summary:**

I object to the assumption that cars are not 'sustainable development'. Cars can be fuelled by biodiesel or cleanly-generated electricity. I also object to new roads being of 'low design speed'. That is not progress. Improved automotive engineering and highway design should permit higher speed limits, not lower. Higher speed limits would also improve traffic flow and relieve congestion. Remove the anti-car slant.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

## Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel

### 14968 Object

**Summary:**

Support in principle. But needs to be much stronger.

- New developments should require Dutch-quality levels of infrastructure as we define in Option 182, to avoid congestion from tens of thousands of new residences. See http://www.cyclestreets.net/galleries/212/

- High-profile target needed of 40% levels of cycling for all trips in Cambridge.

- On-road space for cycling (not poor-quality shared-use) must be actively favoured, even if short-term congestion results before people shift to cycling.

- The Chisholm Trail must be afforded high levels of protection against development proposals.

- Servicing vehicles: Policy must prevent cases of new large lorry unloading from blocking roads like Mill Road etc.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

## Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel

### 15152 Support

**Summary:**

Support

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel**

### 15176 Support

**Summary:**

Support

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel**

### 15285 Support

**Summary:**

Need a policy that recognises that the concentration of employment activities into small areas increases demand for car use in the absence of adequate, or indeed any, public transport from the places where employees live

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel**

### 15690 Object

**Summary:**

We support that developments should give priority to walking, cycling and public transport over cars, but do not agree that this should favour development where there are existing walking, cycling or public transport routes. Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular, paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injury to community and commuting pedestrians and cyclists is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments.

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel**

### 15691 Support

**Summary:**

Chesterton Science Park station will attract large numbers of cars: these need to be well managed, and impact on the surrounding residential and office areas must be mitigated. Non-car access must be encouraged and supported: the station must be well linked in with the bus network and encourage cycling with sufficient provision of safe well-lit bike parking.

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel**

### 15766 Object

**Summary:**

I mostly support this, however: Many existing walking/cycling/public transport routes are already inadequate, and the wording here would allow developers to dodge obligations in providing truly viable improvements to the transport networks. Therefore instead the focus should be on developments which have the ability to *improve* any existing walking/cycling/PT networks if anything.

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel**

### 15951 Support

**Summary:**

The roads of Cambridge and Cambridgeshire already carry much too much traffic. It's high time to get more people and goods out of cars and trucks and onto public transport and trains, passenger or freight. It's also high time to rethink this outmoded road-based strategy - it's like a bad dream from the 1970s - and instead re-establish an efficient rail link inland from the container ports.

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel**

## 16159 Support

**Summary:**

Re: Chisholm Trail Cycle Route - Very important to have a safe cycle route across the city. Keeping cycles off the pavements, reducing accidents with other road users and generally encouraging cycling is really important, especially if it links to the splendid guided busway cycle paths.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel |
|---|---|

## 16385 Object

**Summary:**

We support that developments should give priority to walking, cycling and public transport over cars, but do not agree that this should favour development where there are existing walking, cycling or public transport routes. Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular, paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injury to community and commuting pedestrians and cyclists is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel |
|---|---|

## 16591 Object

**Summary:**

removal of segregation (cycle lanes/pedestrian space)
- Frightening for:-
Elderly/vulnerable
Children
Parents with infants

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel |
|---|---|

## 16624 Object

**Summary:**

Bullet point 1: add 'and improvement' after the word 'development'. Bullet point 3: Yes, but make sure that the disabled, the chronically ill, special-needs people, and the elderly are also well-catered for.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel |
|---|---|

## 16779 Support

**Summary:**

A policy is needed to promote use of sustainable transport modes. The Council might want to consider whether a "Boris bike"-style scheme might be useful or workable in Cambridge. Otherwise it is key to increase cycle-free paths for pedestrians, cycle-ways and public transport. The bus system remains expensive and unreliable.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel |
|---|---|

## 16904 Support

**Summary:**

We would strongly support a policy that promoted non-car modes of travel in new developments both within the city and beyond. Apart from the environmental benefits this would bring we believe that it would help to reduce the pressures on the local road network and for on-street parking near the city centre. It clearly requires a similar policy to be adopted in South Cambridgeshire, backed by the new County transport strategy.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel |
|---|---|

## 17773 Support

**Summary:**

Every effort should be made to increase the opportunity for travelling safely around the city and suburbs by foot and bicycle, and to limit the increasing traffic congestion.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

### Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel

### 18070 Object

**Summary:**

Parking:
Militate against car use not ownership.
Parking barns, "chimney pot park"
Car sharing, streetcar etc

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

### Option 183 - Promote non-car modes of travel

### 18259 Object

**Summary:**

What about highway design which dissuades private car use?
What about keeping speeds down?
Does this include electric cars? - see query about different modes of personal transport attached to Question 12.2.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

### Question 12.1

### 7139   Support

**Summary:**

Yes

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

### Question 12.1

### 7341   Support

**Summary:**

Yes, policy needed. Traffic congestion in Cambridge is often substantial at present, and there is inadequate parking for all visitors, residents and workers, if they use their car, so improvements in infrastructure, and facilitation of non-car modes of travel (public transport, cycling and walking) is clearly essential if Cambridge is to prosper and develop.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

### Question 12.1

### 7503   Support

**Summary:**

The more the City Council can do to promote safe cycle routes the better. I'm particularly keen to see the long-planned Chisolm Trail strategic cycle route brought into full existence asap.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

### Question 12.1

### 7712   Support

**Summary:**

Policy is required to ensure that development takes transport needs into account.

A long term vision for the transport network around Cambridge must be developed so that it is clear what needs to be safeguarded.

Policy should include the need to safeguard land for new roads if required as well as for public transport/cycle as walking.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

### Question 12.1

### 8129   Support

**Summary:**

Need policy.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.1**

**8502   Support**

**Summary:**

yes

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.1**

**8957   Support**

**Summary:**

Yes

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.1**

**10281 Support**

**Summary:**

Yes we need to promote non-car travel

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.1**

**10390 Support**

**Summary:**

Yes and at a sufficient level of detail that it can't be misinterpreted.

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.1**

**10472 Support**

**Summary:**

There is definitely a need for a coherent policy to develop cycle and pedestrian routes across Cambridge, which would decrease vehicle traffic levels and result in a healthier and happier population. In particular, plans to construct the 'Chisholm Trail' should be explicitly put into the plan to ensure the idea cannot be jeopardized by other developments on land it would require.

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.1**

**10521 Support**

**Summary:**

Yes. Non-car modes of transport need much stronger support if we are to achieve a more sustainable city.

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.1**

**10834 Support**

**Summary:**

Very necessary - roads already overcrowded

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.1**

## 11252 Support

**Summary:**

St John's College would support policies which would be consistent with those already contained within the current 2006 local plan and we would support such an approach being undertaken in a local plan review.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 11663 Support

**Summary:**

A key thing that makes Cambridge special is that it has not been completely ruined to put car travel first.
I would like to see the council do everything possible to promote walking, cycling and quiet un-obtrusive public transportation whilst still helping people with mobility problems to travel in Cambridge.
I would be delighted to see the council go further. Could they experiment with car-free days across the whole city?
I think the council should introduce cycling corridors that allow cyclists to travel across and around the city with *no* contact with cars. Such corridors must be safe for children to cycle along.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 12711 Support

**Summary:**

An absolute essential for sustainability and quality of life

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 12752 Support

**Summary:**

Yes, and it needs to be a courageous one that is rigorously implemented e.g. see London centre as an example.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 12942 Support

**Summary:**

Yes. An obvious example of this would be the Chisholm Trail, which would be valuable not only in itself but also due to connecting existing sections of cycle routes

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 13081 Support

**Summary:**

Yes. Proliferation of shared use footpaths has made walking much less attractive for pedestrians, especially the elderly and those with young children, this is because cyclists approach at speed and without care and warning.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 13241 Support

**Summary:**

Yes, policies are needed to maximise non-car transport provision in new developments.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 13258 Support

**Summary:**

Yes. Transport strategy should be planned in connection with county and other local authorities.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 13411 Support

**Summary:**

Policy would be consistent with objectives of the University Travel Plan, which has objectives to manage the demand for travel by car and to increase travel options by non-car modes.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 13852 Support

**Summary:**

Yes - I strongly support improving infrastructure for cyclists and pedestrians - but it must be high quality and well designed - unlike much existing inftrastructure.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 14310 Support

**Summary:**

Yes. Non-vehicular traffic should be given priority in all cases.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 14432 Support

**Summary:**

Congestion is such a waste of valuable time. Investment in non-car modes is always the most cost effective means to improve traffic flow.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 14546 Support

**Summary:**

There is a need for a policy addressing and managing transportation issues.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 14740 Support

**Summary:**

We support that developments should give priority to walking, cycling and public transport over cars, but do not agree that this should favour development where there are existing walking, cycling or public transport routes. Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular, paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injury to community and commuting pedestrians and cyclists is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 14771 Support

**Summary:**

I fully support the cycle way alongside the railway.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
| --- | --- |

## 14963 Support

**Summary:**

Yes, but it should go further than current policy, as we note in detail for Option 183.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
| --- | --- |

## 15498 Support

**Summary:**

Option 183 includes very desirable objectives and there needs to be a policy to address these issues. These would improve air quality but must also improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians which is essential in encouraging growth in these modes.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
| --- | --- |

## 15689 Support

**Summary:**

There is a need, but the policy must be worded more strongly in favour of sustainable and active travel modes than the bullets points imply. The final paragraph is ill-advised. It stirs conflict where none need arise. If a development is designed throughout in a way which makes walking and cycling the obvious and natural travel choices then the relatively few people who choose or need to use a car will have an unimpeded journey.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
| --- | --- |

## 15692 Object

**Summary:**

We support that developments should give priority to walking, cycling and public transport over cars, but do not agree that this should favour development where there are existing walking, cycling or public transport routes. Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular, paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injury to community and commuting pedestrians and cyclists is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
| --- | --- |

## 15765 Support

**Summary:**

Yes there should definitely be a policy advocating sustainable transport.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
| --- | --- |

## 15874 Support

**Summary:**

There is certainly a need to promote non-car use and so we would support Option 183 in principal

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
| --- | --- |

## 16388 Object

**Summary:**

We support that developments should give priority to walking, cycling and public transport over cars, but do not agree that this should favour development where there are existing walking, cycling or public transport routes. Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular, paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injury to community and commuting pedestrians and cyclists is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 16625 Support

**Summary:**

Yes, absolutely.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 16869 Support

**Summary:**

Yes - support.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 17619 Object

**Summary:**

There is a pressing need in Cambridge for a more robust and innovative Transport Policy which would include the promotion of non-car modes of travel. There have been attempts to improve things but people are far from relinquishing their cars with many households needing at least two cars in order to get everyone from A to B effectively. This is borne out in the appalling congestion which occurs across the City particularly at peak times.

I would suggest that Local Authorities adopt a more radical approach which should be modelled on the best public-transport friendly city centres, eg London.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 17656 Object

**Summary:**

The proposals for promoting alternative to the car are laudable but their cumulative impact is likely to be small. There are questions as to how car-free zones would be enforced.
We would support the development of more park and ride options e.g. on Barton or Histon Road, but bus only lanes would be needed to help bypass congested traffic.
School traffic is acute in the Trumpington Area, some schools run minibus services from the park and ride, but more could be done on this matter. In the school holidays traffic flows more freely.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 17661 Support

**Summary:**

We support Option 183, there does need to be realism about car ownership and traffic generation in areas of new housing development and what can be realistically achieved in encouraging use of alternative modes such as buses, cycling and walking.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
|---|---|

## 18138 Object

**Summary:**

Definitely, but should not be anti-car so much as pro-alternatives; closing areas to traffic simply puts more burden on other routes or areas; trying to pretend that people will give up cars is pointless; offering better alternatives is more likely to change behaviour.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.1 |
| --- | --- |

## 18488 Support

**Summary:**

The County Council supports the promotion of non-car modes of travel, and agrees there is a need for a policy addressing these issues. The wording of option 183 should be amended slightly so that it is clear that priority is given to all sustainable travel modes and to make it clear that any new roads or transport infrastructure are designed to give high priority to sustainable modes and do not promote additional car usage.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.2 |
| --- | --- |

## 7859   Support

**Summary:**

Something needs to be done about the pedestrian vs. cycle problem in Cambridge city centre. Pedestrians are stupid and careless, walking mindlessly on roads without regards for cyclists needing to USE the road. This causes many problems for both parties.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.2 |
| --- | --- |

## 8959   Object

**Summary:**

Yes, need to specify that existing developed areas of Cambridge should have improved bus services (see under option 183). Impact of any new development on existing services needs to be considered. Cost to users of public transport needs to be kept down.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.2 |
| --- | --- |

## 9524   Object

**Summary:**

Motorists have valid needs too. They must not be ignored.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.2 |
| --- | --- |

## 10284 Support

**Summary:**

Safe cycle-to-school routes are particularly important. Also pedestrians should be considered as well as cyclists.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.2 |
| --- | --- |

## 11156 Object

**Summary:**

The policy should recognise different modes of transport have different impacts when considering the need for mitigation.  At present a vehicle trip is considered in terms of cost to have the same impact as a non-vehicle trip.  The Council seek to encourage non-vehicle trips as a fundamental part of sustainable development policy.  A car free development generating almost all non-car trips should not be considered to have the same impact on the transport network as a development with vehicle parking facilities.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.2 |
| --- | --- |

## 11580 Support

**Summary:**

Support, but consider the disabled.  'Blue badge' criteria are very strict - eg 'can't walk 60m in 2 minutes'.  If you don't qualify for a blue badge the transport choices are often stark: bus or taxi.  Many places are inaccessible by bus without long walks and long waits, and taxis are prohibitively expensive.

If this policy is imposed, perhaps allow a finer gradation of 'disability' - for example an additional badge scheme which doesn't allow  parking on any double-yellow line nationally (which is often overkill) but does allow access to areas where car use is discouraged.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.2 |
|---|---|

## 11664 Support

**Summary:**

Am I right in thinking that this option only covers new developments?
I'm keen to see improvements for cyclists and pedestrians to existing infrastructure as well.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.2 |
|---|---|

## 11951 Object

**Summary:**

Public transport within the city is substandard and there is a need to rectify this as quickly as possible. To this end I suggest:

(a) All new major residential developments should be required to have public transport 7 days a week including evenings from the day the first house is sold.
(b) Non-residential developments that are expected to attract people from beyond the immediate neighbourhood should be required to be within easy walking distance of public transport and to be accessible by walking and cycling with minimum use of roads that are heavily trafficked or have high design specifications for motor traffic. Also, visitors should not be required to walk across large car parks -- where these exist they should be sited discreetly at the rear.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.2 |
|---|---|

## 12753 Support

**Summary:**

City Council should play a lead, decision-making role in integrating the local plan with the county transport plan.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.2 |
|---|---|

## 13283 Object

**Summary:**

This option covers new developments but the promotion of non car transport should be required in Local Plan policy for existing areas. In historic areas such as Newtown where there has been considerable development there is little/no evidence of promoting other transport modes. Restricting parking permits does not provide infrastructure of safe cycle lanes, improved bus services. These should be required as part of the Local Plan. Transport needs to be planned as a whole with consideration of the historic fabric of the city. Transport provision should be a priority for the whole city not just for 'new' developments.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.2 |
|---|---|

## 13382 Support

**Summary:**

The separation of cyclists and pedestrians is important.  With so many students (esp language students) and tourists, people wander while enjoying the view.  However, some of the poorest and most inconsiderate cyclists I have seen are common on Cambridge streets and, more particularly, pavements.  Cyclists commonly use pavements rather than designated lanes.  Proper cycling provision and protection of pedestrians is important.
This is another area for the Council to work with the universities - too many students ride without lights and helmets.  Colleges should fine students who cycle in dark without lights.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.2 |
|---|---|

## 13389 Support

**Summary:**

There may be much to learn from Oxford, a larger city but one with similar issues. Oxford is very effective at deterring in-centre car use and also provides a very effective bus service.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.2** |
|---|---|

## 13681 Support

**Summary:**

Consider improvements to infrastructure may be required some distance from a development.

Motor vehicle access is needed across the city to make Cambridge a practical place to live.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.2** |
|---|---|

## 13808 Support

**Summary:**

I fully support the prioritisation of pedestrian and cycling traffic over cars. However I notice that many recent developments (Orchard Park, The Quills) presumably came under the existing plan, that also prioritised walking and cycling - yet they are unpleasant places to walk or cycle to, and due to a lack of car parking, public space and footpaths are mainly used as car parking.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.2** |
|---|---|

## 14551 Support

**Summary:**

There should be an executive councillor for Sustainable Transport. National planning guidelines for transport infrastructure should be adapted to local circumstances. A policy is needed that prevents the development of large blocks. The policy should promote and require a full integration of modes used locally.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.2** |
|---|---|

## 14554 Support

**Summary:**

"Cycle Lane Suspended" permits are to be issued only for a maximum of 24 hours during a 7 day period, and must not be allowed during morning and afternoon rush-hours

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.2** |
|---|---|

## 14741 Support

**Summary:**

We support that developments should give priority to walking, cycling and public transport over cars, but do not agree that this should favour development where there are existing walking, cycling or public transport routes. Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular, paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injury to community and commuting pedestrians and cyclists is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.2** |
|---|---|

## 14977 Object

**Summary:**

OBJECT

As we note above, the policy should go further, principally with the requirement that:

- New developments should require Dutch-quality levels of infrastructure as we define in Option 182, to avoid congestion from tens of thousands of new residences. See http://www.cyclestreets.net/galleries/212/

- High-profile target needed of 40% levels of cycling for all trips in Cambridge.

Both of these require specific, strong policies.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.2 |
|---|---|

## 15286 Support

**Summary:**

Need to recognise that for many people a car is a necessity in the absence of integrated public transport provision and adequate real time information on where to find it and when to expect it to arrive, e.g. at Cambridge Station or in St Andrew's Street rather than the Central Library.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.2 |
|---|---|

## 15693 Object

**Summary:**

We support that developments should give priority to walking, cycling and public transport over cars, but do not agree that this should favour development where there are existing walking, cycling or public transport routes. Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular, paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injury to community and commuting pedestrians and cyclists is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.2 |
|---|---|

## 15697 Support

**Summary:**

Yes, see 12.1.The Council's policy should require development to be designed so that walking, cycling and public transport are the easy and obvious ways to travel.

This might mean providing "selective permeability" (walking and cycle routes more direct than motor routes), and by providing cycle parking places more conveniently located in use than car parking places. This can be achieved in private houses as well as in flats, shops, entertainment, education and workplaces.

Cycle "storage" in a shed in a house's rear garden must be ruled out. Cycle parking for residents and visitors should be next to the usual exit.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.2 |
|---|---|

## 15767 Support

**Summary:**

There should be a mention of safeguarding all facilities required for the Chisholm Trail. And to indicate the level of quality of cycle provision required, some reference ought to be made to other countries with high quality cycle infrastructure such as the Netherlands or Denmark.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.2 |
|---|---|

## 15875 Support

**Summary:**

The policy requires an efficient transport system, which is not the case at present. Buses do not turn up on time, public transport needs to be available for longer periods. The cost is also prohibitive for younger people and those with children.
Existing cycle routes in the North need improvement. It is confusing to know whether you are allowed to cycle on some pathways or not and there are many obstructions.
It must also be recognised that private transport can be essential especially for the disabled.

## 16391 Object

**Summary:**

We support that developments should give priority to walking, cycling and public transport over cars, but do not agree that this should favour development where there are existing walking, cycling or public transport routes. Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular, paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injury to community and commuting pedestrians and cyclists is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments.

## 16626 Support

**Summary:**

Ensure that any new roads and pavements are built before housing is occupied.

## 16870 Support

**Summary:**

We support Option 183 to promote non-car modes of travel, including walking and cycling. For Romsey, the future development of the Mill Road depot, the Travis Perkins site and the Ridgeons' site should be seen as an opportunity to improve permeability between Romsey and Petersfield, by providing one or more pedestrian/cycle bridges across the railway tracks.

## 16876 Support

**Summary:**

On the business front it is interesting to note that Mitchams Corner is one of the 3 District Centres in the City and yet park and ride won't stop here! The document ignores the big issue of business rates which is a central government tax and is a serious disincentive to start ups. The City has little interest in negotiating 'rate free periods as landlords do with rent as they do not get the money. The obsession with preserving A1 retail use is based on the past...England is no longer a nation of shopkeepers...it is still a nation of small business based on a little footfall but very much on service and the internet!
Provision for developing a river walk on the north bank of the Cam.

## 17105 Object

**Summary:**

I am deeply cynical of traffic planning that allows huge, sometime double articulated lorries to move around an historic city centre. I speak as someone whose house shakes at night as these extra-ordinary vehicles enter our city boundaries.

Having satellite car parks as we do now there is no reason why pallets cannot be transferred to smaller vehicles for serving shops outside closing hours. However as we wait to see if we might have our 40mph restriction moved up to Girton - at least commensurate with the city boundary, I'm not holding my breath over sensible traffic planning.

## 17504 Object

**Summary:**

We object to the lack of effective integration of major site and transport planning and object to consultation on whether or not to support major sites without any proper transport assessment of the sites.We are enthusiastic supporters of shifting more journeys to non-car modes, we are concerned at complacent statements that Cambridge does not have increasing transport problems, and we believe the draft transport strategy is inadequate without additional measures including increasing the switch from central car parking to park and rides particularly at peak congestion times, greater intervention in bus service provision including new routes and better interchanges and facilities, particularly for bus passengers, and wider measures to assist pedestrians, cyclists and also motorcycles

## 17557 Object

**Summary:**

Cyclists need to obey the law and not ride on footpaths, money should not be spent on encouraging cyclists. 20mph spped limits are unenforceable and should be abandoned. Cyclists and pedestrians should be kept separate so the elderly do not have to be worried about being knocked over.

## 18023 Object

**Summary:**

We should enhance the existing, varied qualities of the main arterial roads, with new or renewed soft landscaping and sensitive adaptation and improvement of the streetscape to improve their appearance and to support better pedestrian, cycling and public transport access and supplement this with a counter-network of rapid and reliable off-street busways (and related foot/cycleways) - connecting to park and ride sites, the major growth areas (as already established) and areas of major employment to the north, south, east and west, with a new parkway station at the heart of the network and with the latent boulevards of Newmarket Road and Hills Road reconfigured as treelined approaches to the historic city centre providing a congestion free access loop to the city centre from the busway system.

## 18146 Object

**Summary:**

Should not seek development simply because good for non-car transport (Option 183.1); choose good development with good transport facilities (which may include good car facilities, if it moves cars to right place).
183.2 suggests giving 'priority to walking, [etc] over cars' - it is not clear what this means; no point ruining a decent development because of dogma; should prefer developments which support non-car transport better;
183.3 is a much better way of putting the same thing, so
suggest drop 183.2 183.6 'restrict through access for general motor traffic' - why? It will simply put more load on other routes and make gridlock more likely;

## 18258 Object

**Summary:**

The chapter does not seem to mention:
Bus stations, Rail stations, Park and ride, Residents parking, River transport or Cycle bridges.
There is no consideration of how transport relates to Conservation issues:
Road design, Footpaths, Parking on footpaths, Signage, Roundabouts, Trees
How does the transport policy relate to the current road system?
What is the "air quality" policy?
What about road closure and shared surfaces - London is doing some interesting stuff here.

## 18273 Object

**Summary:**

The preparatory work for the Local Plan should include a thorough re-evaluation of transport. The main issues are:
-a- the central area has now neared its capacity for accommodating buses; it will not be possible to increase passenger use at the same rate as in past years;
-b- the site of the central bus station was first proposed in the Holford Plan of 1948. Whilst described as a 'hub' in the Issues and Options the notion of a single centralized 'hub' needs to be seriously questioned as a valid concept for an already overcrowded city;
-c- a critical examination of the inter-relationship of different modes of transport needs to be undertaken (ie train/bus/taxi/ car/bicycle) before any proposals for the years up to 2031 are formulated.

## 18382 Object

**Summary:**

A key issue that needs to form part of the approach to promote non-car modes
of travel is to address the long standing issue of how to ensure that buses are able to get through traffic to access the City centre. South Cambridgeshire District Council wishes to continue cooperating with the City Council and County Council to develop an appropriate approach to this issue.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.2 |
|---|---|

## 18489 Support

**Summary:**

The policy could also support more sustainable use of the car, such as car clubs and carsharing, and low emission vehicles.
The policy could also support the promotion of alternatives to travel (ie facilities which allow people to travel less, such as home working space/facilities).

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.2 |
|---|---|

## 18579 Object

**Summary:**

Regarding traffic issues, it is important that the Council should aim to reduce the modal share of car journeys within (and where within its power, in the surroundings of) Cambridge, and maximise the share of walking and cycling - aiming for a cycling share of at least 40%, and providing the necessary cycle routes and convenient parking at all journey origins and destinations.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.3 |
|---|---|

## 7306  Support

**Summary:**

A more radical review of transport arrangements is needed that takes account of options other than extra buses.  As an example, Barrington has a redundant quarry with a rail connection into Cambridge.  Use of the railway with housing in the quarry area would release pressure of existing infrastructure.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.3 |
|---|---|

## 11665 Support

**Summary:**

Is it reasonable to ask for cycling routes through and around Cambridge that are completely segregated from cars?

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.3 |
|---|---|

## 13322 Object

**Summary:**

Areas such as the Hills Road and Lensfield Road junction are particularly unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists. Consistent cycle routes should be provided and roads made safer for cyclists and pedestrians. Bus stations should be sited near to rail stations or other transport hubs such as the park and ride and not in the centre of the city. Large buses should be replaced by smaller shuttle sized buses in the historic centre and surrounding areas.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.3 |
|---|---|

## 14380 Support

**Summary:**

The Chisholm Trail should be given prominence in the Plan.  If it isn't, and developers succeed in building on any of it, the Local Plan will have failed.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.3**

## 14549 Support

**Summary:**

The language of the policy which promotes non-car modes-of-travel needs to be revised in order to make very clear that infrastructure and policies which support non-motorised travel ultimately and directly benefit those who need a car to make their trip. Promotion of non-car modes must be presented as a solution for current high levels of congestion on our streets.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.3**

## 14742 Support

**Summary:**

We support that developments should give priority to walking, cycling and public transport over cars, but do not agree that this should favour development where there are existing walking, cycling or public transport routes. Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular, paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injury to community and commuting pedestrians and cyclists is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.3**

## 14971 Object

**Summary:**

As we note above, the policy should go further, principally with the requirement that:

- New developments should require Dutch-quality levels of infrastructure as we define in Option 182, to avoid congestion from tens of thousands of new residences. See http://www.cyclestreets.net/galleries/212/

- High-profile target needed of 40% levels of cycling for all trips in Cambridge.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.3**

## 15076 Object

**Summary:**

On sustainable transport and cycling, I feel there should be a specific
policy aspiration not only for cycleways wherever possible but for these to
be segregated / dedicated so as to separate cyclists from other footpath
users traversing public open spaces as well as from other modes of
vehicular transport on roads.

This might also help to get s106 or CIL monies to enable the segregatation of existing footpath/cycleways as well constructing new ones in this fashion.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.3**

## 17621 Object

**Summary:**

Introduce a central Cambridge congestion charge which acts as a strong disincentive to those who could, quite easily, cycle, walk or hop on a bus to the shops, the theatre etc. The revenue could be ploughed directly back into
improving public transport and other non-car modes of travel.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.3**

## 17622 Object

**Summary:**

The bus service needs to be more attractive to a wider range of users so it becomes the default means of transport for short and longer distances when neither walking nor cycling would be suitable. At the
moment, the bus seems unattractive because it has had a bad press, it is grubby, noisy and services are not sufficiently reliable or frequent. All buses should be electric vehicles so that they are clean and quiet. Bus lanes should be improved/extended and, where dual carriageways are available, bus lanes should be active during the morning/evening rush hour. It should be an honour for a bus company to have the franchise in Cambridge.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.3 |
|---|---|

## 17623 Object

**Summary:**

Much more needs to be done to create a pedestrian friendly Cambridge by e.g. creating signed routes through which people can traverse the City easily without having to endure the noise and pollution of the arterial roads or getting struck down by cyclists. Contrary to many London boroughs, pedestrian crossings in Cambridge force the pedestrian to wait several minutes before it is possible to cross - these should be "on demand" so that the pedestrian is rewarded in favour of the car user.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.3 |
|---|---|

## 17624 Object

**Summary:**

Prior to Beeching cuts Cambridge Railway Station used to be the hub for seven railway lines - the ones lost were to Mildenhall, Sandy/Bedford and Haverhill/Colchester. These were never replaced with viable alternative services and this legacy continues in Cambridge's poor transport infrastructure. I would advocate line improvements and opening of stations along existing routes. The Cambridge to lpswich line suffered station closures at Fulbourn and Six Mile Bottom. If stations were re-built and the line improved, this would improve public transport along the A14/A11. Opening a new station at Cherry Hinton would improve things further and it may be time to consider reinstating the Cambs to Bedford line?

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.3 |
|---|---|

## 17625 Object

**Summary:**

One factor which would help ease traffic congestion is to encourage people to work flexibly so as to avoid the morning and early evening rush hour peaks. If shops in the City Centre were to stay open until later, it would not only help to reduce pedestrian congestion but smooth out the rush hour peaks.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.3 |
|---|---|

## 17629 Object

**Summary:**

Marshalls' is an important and thriving organisation which continues to create the best employment opportunities, especially its apprenticeships for young people who may not have the academic aptitude or money to go to higher education.

The time has come to embrace the fact that Cambridge has its own "City Airport" capable of providing a strong competitor to Stansted. It has some very well equipped transport infrastructure which could easily whisk people to other UK cities much more quickly than is currently the case. Any expansion could be carefully measured and monitored to ensure that it does not interfere with people's quiet enjoyment of life.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.3 |
|---|---|

## 17775 Support

**Summary:**

There needs to be a realistic transport policy which delivers improved public transport, such as the guided bus, from the developments in and around the City. The City has reached saturation point on most of the major arteries into the City and adding further car movements will only exacerbate a terrible state of affairs. I am therefore opposed to any further development in the southern edge, Newnham and the Quarter to Six Quadrant, since the transport infrastructure for these areas cannot accommodate further loads.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.3 |
|---|---|

## 17806 Object

**Summary:**

The Plan should address the need to protect and enhance designated rights of way such as PRoW, bridleways and National Trails. Development should seek to protect and enhance designated paths as far as possible, with reference to the local ROWIP, and we believe the Local Plan should address this in order to comply with paragraph 75 of the NPPF.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.3 |
|---|---|

## 18010 Object

**Summary:**

A public transport diagram would flow naturally from the identification of the urban centres. We suggest that it would be very advantageous to move most or all of the Drummer Street bus station to the railway station area, creating a comprehensive central public transport hub. Excellent public transport would then be provided from this hub to the historic centre, and to each of the designated urban centres.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.3 |
|---|---|

## 18150 Object

**Summary:**

Try a 'sunshine policy' rather than simply stymying car traffic; encourage 'good' transport - penalising 'bad' transport usually has unintended consequences elsewhere with others paying the price for such externalities.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.11 |
|---|---|

## 7185  Support

**Summary:**

These are straight forward principles but which, tested against reality, shows the County Council and its policies of 'getting people out of cars' is selective, with subsidisation for out of towners driving to Park and Ride sites, the greater part of journeys with a consequential effect on CO2 emissions. The City provides these subsidies, now through direct taxation of a class of citizenry, with only tangential benefits. The real problems of the School Runs have not been addressed, because it is again the county's electorate accessing schools in the City; market forces have not been allowed to influence outcomes.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.11 |
|---|---|

## 15350 Support

**Summary:**

Agree with another commenter that Park & Ride is an imperfect policy whose environmental status is questionable. Its main role is an economic one to increase the number of vehicles that can access the city:

http://www.lucas-smith.co.uk/dissertation/

Disagree with the other commenter that market forces (by which I presume unrestricted car access is meant) as these do not take full account of the externalities of congestion, pollution and other costs to society.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.12 |
|---|---|

## 7186  Object

**Summary:**

The Local Plan 2006 should be reviewed and the planned consolidation of a failed policy 'to restrict private motoring' exposed as retrogressive and lacking futurity.

The experience of the failure of the Highway Authority to handle timely improvement of all the networks and introduce new modes of public transport suggests secession by the City from its control.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.12 |
|---|---|

## 15347 Support

**Summary:**

Disagree with another commenter.

A policy to "restrict private motoring", which in practice has merely seen the mild reduction in the freedoms of motorists to take up massive areas of public space, is entirely appropriate public policy for a compact city.

There is simply not enough space for the volume of demand, and so the use of space to encourage other modes of transport is far more effective public policy.

Wasteful car parking space should be given over to walking, cycling and public transport usage on key transport routes to encourage the efficiency of transport for the general public rather than private motorist.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 6982   Object

**Summary:**

Sort out and improve "existing" cycle routes into the city centre. So the new developments feed into these. Everyone wants to shop in the centre so let us get there safely and sustainably and healthily - NOT buses.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 7557   Support

**Summary:**

As a regular cyclist/pedestrian with small children I strongly support the development of alternative routes (especially the Chisholm trail). At present I cycle  whenever possible but feel compelled to use my car when reaching certain areas of the city due to a lack of safe routes and crossings. Given safer routes I would cycle everytime.

Additional strategic cycle routes have the potential to make cycling the quickest way around the city, remove significant numbers of vehicles from the roads, and improve the well being of everyone.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 8961   Object

**Summary:**

We support, but there is a need to clarify meaning of "protecting sustainable transport routes near the development" (penultimate paragraph).

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 9488   Support

**Summary:**

As a commuting cyclist I strongly support building further cycling infrastructure. Specifically, I believe the Chisholm Trail project to be highly worthwhile.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 9587   Support

**Summary:**

I agree with these policies.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 9777 Support

**Summary:**

The LAF support all policies that actively support walking and cycling.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 10133 Support

**Summary:**

I support the above proposals as I travel daily by cycle and on foot around Cambridge and would like to see an overall improvement in the infrastructure. Specifically, I cycle to the Business Park for work and would like to strongly express my support for the proposed Chisholm Trail.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 10480 Support

**Summary:**

Ensuring that sustainable infrastructure is in place from day 1 for the new residents is important because this is when behaviours are established. It is more difficult to get a shift of behaviour to cycling and walking if a pattern of car use has already been established.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 11034 Object

**Summary:**

Bidwells suggests that additional flexibility should be incorporated into the policy to ensure that deliverability is not adversely affected by the provision of infrastructure prior to the development being in use. Therefore the text should be amended to read "...and for this to happen prior to the development being in use where possible, unless this is not viable."

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 11531 Support

**Summary:**

I find cycling infrastructure very inadequate - lanes just end, they are too close to cars, etc. etc. That does not mean we need to build huge cycle bridges....I do not want to see 'land safeguarded' (rather euphemistically put) for guided bus if it messes up our green spaces (Ditton Meadow, Stourbridge Common).

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 11625 Support

**Summary:**

Especially promoting foot paths and cycle routes will stimulate people to walk and cycle more.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 12708 Support

**Summary:**

Strongly agree with the idea to promote a shift in travel behaviours away from the private car.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 13247 Support

**Summary:**

The necessary infrastructure for sustainable transport must be in place in new developments prior to their use. Significant academic research has shown that the best way to encourage use of public transport and walking/cycle routes is to make them available to residents right from the start. When people move house they reassess their transport choices. This is the critical time, not months after people have moved in.

We understand the final comment about the costs and practicality of this approach, but we believe all efforts should be made to make sure these issues can be overcome.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 13286 Object

**Summary:**

There is a need for a reliable frequent bus service that runs till late to avoid wasting people's time. This applies to the Park-and-Ride service leading to central Cambridge terminals. We also need a frequent cross central Cambridge bus service - both a north/south and an east/west service.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 13857 Support

**Summary:**

I'd suggest that the Plan should incorporate the best practice from abroad. The Netherlands does an excellent job of prioritising people (pedestrians and cars) in their infrastructure - we should learn from their experiences - not re-invent the wheel.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 14043 Support

**Summary:**

Support

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 14745 Support

**Summary:**

Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injury to community and commuting pedestrians is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 14984 Object

**Summary:**

Support in principle. However:

- The use of "where possible" will need clarification.

- We welcome the requirement that cycle (and public transport) infrastructure must be in place prior to occupation of houses. Without this, people will move into a development and may form potentially car-wedded travel patterns that result in increased congestion into the long term.

- We welcome the statement regarding safeguarding of land, particularly in relation to the proposed Chisholm Trail.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 15153 Support

**Summary:**

Support

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |

## 15287 Support

**Summary:**

Yes, as stated at 12.2 above provision should be made with the needs of the traveller uppermost. There is little evidence that this is the case at the moment.
Safeguarding land is necessary where there is general agreement on the need for a specific development and a prospect of delivery within a short timescale. Otherwise it is to be avoided as it may inhibit alternative developments that better meet the needs of travellers.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |

## 15426 Support

**Summary:**

Totally support this. The Chisholm Trail should be safeguarded too.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |

## 15694 Support

**Summary:**

Fen Road and Water Street in Chesterton are affected by antisocial driving and heavy industrial vehicles. Residents on the City side of the railway have expressed very strong opinions that the current infrastructure is not suitable, and that an access road should be built so that traffic from beyond the level crossing does not need to travel over the crossing and along Fen Road.  In the meantime, the existing traffic calming measures along Fen Road / Water Street are not working and need to be replaced by effective measures.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |

## 15698 Support

**Summary:**

Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular, paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injury to community and commuting pedestrians and cyclists is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |

## 15800 Object

**Summary:**

Infrastructure must always be in place beforehand, not "where possible".

More emphasis on infrastructure quality needed. Reference specific infrastructure standards such as Local Transport Note 2/08. (LTN 2/08). Aspire to cycle infrastructure quality level found in other countries such as the Netherlands.

Land should be reserved for potential future routes, not just immediate ones.

Should require a positive contribution to the transport network. Avoids developers merely providing an access route, when what we want is e.g. a permeable network of cycle routes through the development.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |

## 16393 Support

**Summary:**

Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular, paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injury to community and commuting pedestrians and cyclists is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 16627 Support

**Summary:**

Why is it difficult to get the appropriate infrastructure in place prior to the development being used?

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 16781 Support

**Summary:**

Support

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 17653 Object

**Summary:**

Although Trumpington Park and Ride has helped reduce traffic to the city there has still been substantial growth in traffic.
What measures do the City - with the County Council - contemplate in tackling growing congestion and delays? Are traffic conditions in the city monitored on a regular basis.
Northstowe and Waterbeach have been made contingent with an A14 upgrade. The situation in the City is more limited. Why not consider a congestion charge for the city?

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 18260 Object

**Summary:**

The focus is all on new development. What about regeneration/improvement of existing infrastructure?
Safer cycling - removal of roundabouts and proper assessment of cycle lanes - not just using them to control cars?

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 184 - appropriate infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 18487 Support

**Summary:**

The County Council supports this policy and sees this as important in helping to ensure that new developments in Cambridge can be integrated with the sustainable travel network and that where possible and appropriate sustainable transport routes can be protected in support of sustainable development and helping to promote travel behaviour change away from the private car.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 185 - Low emission vehicle infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 8962   Support

**Summary:**

Support when timely.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 185 - Low emission vehicle infrastructure |
|---|---|

# 11035 Object

**Summary:**

Bidwells considers that the requirement for infrastructure for low emission vehicles could adversely affect viability of smaller developments. Furthermore, there may not be sufficient demand to justify the provision of infrastructure from the outset, and there may be technological changes in the future. Therefore, the policy should only apply to major developments, and should only require that there is capability to install the infrastructure in future, rather than providing it at the outset.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 185 - Low emission vehicle infrastructure |
|---|---|

# 11651 Object

**Summary:**

Although I recognise that electric cars do not generate air polution in cities, they should not be promoted as an environmentally-friendly means of travel. The electricity has to be generated somehow and in the foreseeable future this will not be done in an environmentally friendly way.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 185 - Low emission vehicle infrastructure |
|---|---|

# 13255 Support

**Summary:**

We would reorder this section to first deal with low-emission vehicles and then car clubs.

We agree that low emissions vehicles will be important in years to come, but take up so far for electric cars in the UK has been slow, with only 1082 purchased in 2011. We would prefer that initial investment went to walking, cycling, public transport and car clubs, perhaps with space left for charging points to be installed in the future, as the need arises.

We note the success of car clubs. They should be in place in all new developments.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 185 - Low emission vehicle infrastructure |
|---|---|

# 14744 Object

**Summary:**

We do not believe a policy is required in this respect, and rather that well planned shared social spaces, safe, pleasant walking a cycling paths are a much better option to reduce congestion and improve community life. We believe this Option is contrary to a sustainable community, as it continues to encourage the use of cars, which are still the leading cause of accidental child mortality.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 185 - Low emission vehicle infrastructure |
|---|---|

# 14989 Object

**Summary:**

No comment either way on this, other than to support car club and car-sharing spaces.

We note that the bicycle is the ultimate low-emission vehicle, much more so than electric vehicles which simply shift the emissions away from the roadside to power-stations.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 185 - Low emission vehicle infrastructure |
|---|---|

# 15288 Object

**Summary:**

These are not appropriate subjects for a planning document as these are things the market will provide as and when demand justifies it. Car clubs already exist and some are very successful. Electric cars still suffer from the technical drawbacks that have inhibited their use since the days when Camille Jenatzky set the world land speed record in one in 1899.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 185 - Low emission vehicle infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 15425 Object

**Summary:**

Electric cars don't do anything to reduce congestion (they're still cars after all) so I do not support that part of the option. Car clubs, can, of course be useful.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 185 - Low emission vehicle infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 15702 Object

**Summary:**

We do not believe a policy is required in this respect, and rather that well planned shared social spaces, safe, pleasant walking and cycling paths are a much better option to reduce congestion and improve community life. We believe this Option is contrary to a sustainable community, as it continues to encourage the use of cars, which are still the leading cause of accidental child mortality.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 185 - Low emission vehicle infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 15771 Support

**Summary:**

There should be cycle parking next to car club spaces so that people from further afield can cycle there and use the car.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 185 - Low emission vehicle infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 16401 Object

**Summary:**

We do not believe a policy is required in this respect, and rather that well planned shared social spaces, safe, pleasant walking and cycling paths are a much better option to reduce congestion and improve community life. We believe this Option is contrary to a sustainable community, as it continues to encourage the use of cars, which are still the leading cause of accidental child mortality.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 185 - Low emission vehicle infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 16628 Support

**Summary:**

Bullet point 2, yes encourage the car club option.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 185 - Low emission vehicle infrastructure |
|---|---|

## 16782 Support

**Summary:**

Support

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.4 |
|---|---|

## 7140  Support

**Summary:**

Option 184 is absolutely essential. Bus routes must be well planned and have priority over cars. Cycling facilities need to designed in consultation with cyclists.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.4 |
|---|---|

## 7393  Support

**Summary:**

Yes, policy needed. Low emission vehicles help solve pollution problems on well-used roads, and car clubs and car share places help to reduce traffic levels.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.4 |
|---|---|

## 8503  Support

**Summary:**

yes

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.4 |
|---|---|

## 8964  Support

**Summary:**

Yes

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.4 |
|---|---|

## 9941  Support

**Summary:**

I especially support the Chisholm Trail proposal which i'd suggest should be used in this policy as an example of land that must be safeguarded for cycling infrastructure.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.4 |
|---|---|

## 10285 Support

**Summary:**

Yes we need a policy for transport infrastructure and support for low emission vehicles. However, car club spaces are more important than charging points.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.4 |
|---|---|

## 10473 Support

**Summary:**

Yes, I strongly support Option 184. It should go beyond requiring cycle/pedestrian/bus infrastructure for new developments, to include developing routes through existing areas. One such example I think should be explicitly put in the plan is the 'Chisholm Trail' cross-city cycle route. Land required for this route should be earmarked to prevent it being jeopardized by other developments.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.4 |
|---|---|

## 12728 Support

**Summary:**

Option 184 is important and its philosophy has implications for existing locations. Infrastructure for walking often seems neglected in comparison with motor vehicles and even cycles (despite pedestrians being at the top of the notional transport hierarchy) in terms of budgets, maintenance, imagination and promotion.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.4 |
|---|---|

## 12758 Support

**Summary:**

Yes, a bold and courageous policy to solve our endemic chronic congestion is needed.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.4 |
| --- | --- |

## 13405 Support

**Summary:**

Support 184 and 185.  But recognising that occasional car journeys are very desirable even for those living in the city centre, then car sharing schemes should be encouraged strongly as these will minimise the demand for parking locations and encourage people to consider more carefully when and why they would wish to make a car journey.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.4 |
| --- | --- |

## 13422 Support

**Summary:**

Yes support these options but policy in the Local Plan should also require that cycle/pedestrian/bus and rail infrastructures are planned for the existing city as a whole. Local historic area needs should be recognised such as Hills Road Lensfield Road junction and the Station area where provision should link to wider transport hubs. For example the use of smaller buses in the city centre would help to reduce congestion while larger national buses should run from rail or out of town park and ride options. These routes should provide planned sustainable links to the surrounding areas.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.4 |
| --- | --- |

## 14048 Support

**Summary:**

Policy to ensure the land is not developed. An excellent example to provide safe cycling.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.4 |
| --- | --- |

## 14313 Support

**Summary:**

Yes, I support Option 184.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.4 |
| --- | --- |

## 14455 Support

**Summary:**

Cambridge should be supporting the adoption of low emission vehicles. Public charging infrastructure will help to give people confidence in adopting electric vehicles but the majority of charging should be at home, overnight when there is spare capacity on the grid.

This may mean that properties with garages are most appropriate for electric car use so that plugged in vehicles are protected from vandalism.

On the other hand higher density development nearer the centre will favour the use of car clubs since parking space is at a premium.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.4 |
| --- | --- |

## 14478 Support

**Summary:**

Yes - transport links should be developed in close conjunction with other authorities and the county council.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.4** |

## 14746 Support

**Summary:**

Yes. We support Option 184.
Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injury to community and commuting pedestrians is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.4** |

## 15128 Support

**Summary:**

Yes, support.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.4** |

## 15699 Support

**Summary:**

Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular, paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injury to community and commuting pedestrians and cyclists is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.4** |

## 15710 Support

**Summary:**

Yes, for Option 184.

Option 185 is not a priority: Low emission vehicles translocate their emissions to the factory (where their more elaborate construction generates more emissions) and the fuel source. Their use has the same local effect on personal safety, traffic congestion and health as a conventional vehicle's.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.4** |

## 15768 Support

**Summary:**

Yes, otherwise developers would be unlikely to provide anything off their own bat to help car sharing etc.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.4** |

## 16396 Support

**Summary:**

Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular, paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injury to community and commuting pedestrians and cyclists is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.4** |

## 16629 Support

**Summary:**

Yes.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.4 |
| --- | --- |

## 16663 Object

**Summary:**

There should be a policy developed to ensure developers are not able or allowed to build on the route of the Chisholm Trail, which is cycling infrastructure that must be delivered.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.4 |
| --- | --- |

## 18158 Support

**Summary:**

Certainly - infrastructure will not develop unless supported by policy, and infrastructure developments need to be coordinated

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.4 |
| --- | --- |

## 18211 Support

**Summary:**

Transport infrastructure should be at the heart of development plans.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.4 |
| --- | --- |

## 18490 Support

**Summary:**

The County Council agrees there is a need for a policy addressing the provision of appropriate sustainable transport infrastructure including low emission vehicle infrastructure and supports option 184 and 185. We would suggest that car club and carsharing spaces/facilities are included in option 184 rather than in option 185 as car club/carsharing vehicles are not necessarily low emission vehicles.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.5 |
| --- | --- |

## 10459 Object

**Summary:**

A comment again not objection or support.

I see insufficient evidence that the planner are addressing the need for better cycle parking almost everywhere in the City. Go to the city centre on Saturday afternoons.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.5 |
| --- | --- |

## 11157 Object

**Summary:**

The Council should be taking the lead in the use of low emission vehicles by replacing its fleet and investing in the infrastructure necessary to enable this to happen.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.5 |
| --- | --- |

## 11953 Object

**Summary:**

I do not feel that merely providing for car clubs is enough -- people should be actively encouraged to use them in preference to owning their own cars. This would considerably reduce dead space in new developments, while in existing developments it would free up space for essential parking (e.g. builders working on houses) which is often a major problem at present. Why does a resident's parking permit cost (per day) only just over 1/10 of a visitor's permit which is what builders will be using?

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.5 |
|---|---|

## 14429 Support

**Summary:**

The council could encourage a "big switch" to zero emission vehicles and zero emission delivery (zed) by making this a factor in its procurement process.  This would create an incentive for companies to switch to zero emission delivery early.

The council could also try to encourage ZED on the "last mile" of city centre deliveries.  Big suppliers could fund their own Zero Emission Delivery.  For other companies, depots could be set up outside the city and a ZEV company could deliver the "last mile".

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.5 |
|---|---|

## 14747 Support

**Summary:**

We do not believe a policy is required in this respect, and rather that well planned shared social spaces, safe, pleasant walking a cycling paths are a much better option to reduce congestion and improve community life. We believe this Option is contrary to a sustainable community, as it continues to encourage the use of cars, which are still the leading cause of accidental child mortality.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.5 |
|---|---|

## 14748 Support

**Summary:**

Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injury to community and commuting pedestrians is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.5 |
|---|---|

## 14990 Support

**Summary:**

Car club spaces should have cycle parking adjacent to them. This increases the coverage area.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.5 |
|---|---|

## 15129 Support

**Summary:**

Option 184 most realistic.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.5 |
|---|---|

## 15701 Support

**Summary:**

Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular, paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injury to community and commuting pedestrians and cyclists is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.5** |

## 15720 Support

**Summary:**

Option 184: the travel habits of users or residents of a new development will be set by what they are aware of and can use on their first use or occupancy.

Thus bus services must be fully operational from first occupancy and walking and cycle routes must be open, clean and visually obvious from the start.

These "green" modes should be clearly illustrated in sales literature, and explained in a new-resident or new-employee pack, given with explanations before or at first occupancy or employment.

All this must be required by policy.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.5** |

## 16399 Support

**Summary:**

Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular, paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injury to community and commuting pedestrians and cyclists is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.5** |

## 16681 Object

**Summary:**

the largest and single element that is missing in a ward which has both high density housing from a previous generation and housing from a modern generation - is that areas like Queen Edith's Estate e.g. Godwin Way, Gunhild Way etc. have no means of transport other than a car - or have to walk (if you can) some distance to get a bus on Cherry Hinton Road, Queen Edith's Way or Wulfstan Way - that is neither sustainable, fair or helpful to the wider environment. Need to encourage:
Alternative community transport scheme e.g. Dial-a-Ride or Shuttle mini-buses
Another Transport Provider - which would give people a wider choice and a fresh approach to looking after small communities.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.5** |

## 16710 Support

**Summary:**

Transport perhaps smaller buses should be used not double deckers. Bus routes should cover the whole city, not everyone has a good route. Perhaps another pPark and Ride in Fulbourn would be useful.The busway should not be taken through the city, just alongside the railway. The bus interchange at the station is not an improvement, the shelters are too small and too spread out and too far from the station entrance. There is only one pedestrian crossing. Unloading of lorries should be restricted on bus routes this causes hold ups on Hills Road and Regent Street/St Andrews St it would improve bus times.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.5** |

## 16872 Support

**Summary:**

Yes - support.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.5** |

## 17492 Object

**Summary:**

It is important that the proposed policy approach to promotion of non-car modes represented by Option 184 is reinforced by policies which facilitate the practical delivery of the transport infrastructure necessary to support it. It is considered that greater prominence should be given to rail in this context and specifically to the policy measures to foster implementation of key projects at Cambridge Central Station and at Chesterton, and the importance they play in sustainable transport planning for the A10 corridor to the north of the city.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.5 |
|---|---|

## 17505 Object

**Summary:**

We object to the lack of effective integration of major site and transport planning and object to consultation on whether or not to support major sites without any proper transport assessment of the sites.We are enthusiastic supporters of shifting more journeys to non-car modes, we are concerned at complacent statements that Cambridge does not have increasing transport problems, and we believe the draft transport strategy is inadequate without additional measures including increasing the switch from central car parking to park and rides particularly at peak congestion times, greater intervention in bus service provision including new routes and better interchanges and facilities, particularly for bus passengers, and wider measures to assist pedestrians, cyclists and also motorcycles

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.5 |
|---|---|

## 18162 Object

**Summary:**

Perhaps encouraging electric car clubs for travel around Cambridge (anyone for a C5?)

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.6 |
|---|---|

## 14749 Support

**Summary:**

Infrastructure should be provided as required, not only to facilitate transportation in the immediate vicinity of the development, but throughout an integrated network. In particular paths and cycle routes need to be better planned and coordinated, so that death and serious injury to community and commuting pedestrians is reduced. This policy should not be limited to new developments, but should enforce these requirements on new developments.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.6 |
|---|---|

## 18166 Object

**Summary:**

Avoid simply losing parking spaces to chicanes or other incursions (e.g. along Sidgwick Avenue) where nothing achieved by adding these

## 9589   Object

**Summary:**

This is an unrealistic utopian idea.  Even if people only need to use their car once a month, many people would find such a development deeply unattractive to live in, as it would totally exclude them from being able to use a car, even to go on holiday.  Cambridge does not have good enough public transport links with enough places (eg the coast for those with children) to make this practicable.

## 10462 Object

**Summary:**

Car free development will simply push car parking problems elsewhere. People who cannot park their cars near their dwellings will park as near as possible elsewhere. Car free development is then counter productive.

## 11038 Object

**Summary:**

Bidwells supports Option 190 over Option 189, as such a policy would provide more flexibility to provide car parking or car free development depending on specific site locations and types of development.

## 11532 Support

**Summary:**

support

## 11653 Support

**Summary:**

It is important that such car-free developments have Car-Club cars parked within them and that use of these cars should be affordable.

## 11666 Support

**Summary:**

...but you would have to provide excellent car-free alternative infrastructure before this were sensible.
Would it make sense to link such developments with out-of-town car parks and frequent on-demand public transport?

## 12168 Object

**Summary:**

Head in sand thinking. There are too many reasons for people requiring, even occasional use of a car.

### 12575 Support

**Summary:**

Excellent idea. It was proposed some years ago for Clay Farm. There might be problems getting suitable residents and with the sale of houses subsequently. But well worth exploring the possibility.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 189 - Car free development |
|---|---|

### 12763 Support

**Summary:**

Very bold, and exactly what's needed. Our problems are every bit as bad proportionately as these cities.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 189 - Car free development |
|---|---|

### 13921 Support

**Summary:**

Worth pursuing

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 189 - Car free development |
|---|---|

### 14765 Support

**Summary:**

We support a car free development policy because it maximises environmental sustainability, quality of life, health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Cars remain the greatest contributor to accidental child mortality and serious injury in Britain and world-wide. We do not believe it is appropriate for developers to be able to influence transportation policy.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 189 - Car free development |
|---|---|

### 15708 Support

**Summary:**

We support a car-free development policy because it maximises environmental sustainability, quality of life, health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists.  Cars remain the greatest contributor to accidental child mortality and serious injury in Britain and world-wide.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 189 - Car free development |
|---|---|

### 16412 Support

**Summary:**

We support a car-free development policy because it maximises environmental sustainability, quality of life, health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Cars remain the greatest contributor to accidental child mortality and serious injury in Britain and world-wide.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 189 - Car free development |
|---|---|

### 18176 Object

**Summary:**

With reference to Question 12.11, support in principle but urge the Council to fully investigate the implications for the City Centre in promoting this type of scheme.
In addition to the above, we note that the City Council is exploring ideas for making Cambridge a more pro  actively car free place to help reduce traffic congestion and pollution, improve the quality of the environment and encourage yet more travel on foot, by cycle and by public transport. We are broadly supportive of this approach but urge the Council to fully investigate the implications for the City Centre in promoting this type of scheme.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 189 - Car free development |
|---|---|

## 18261 Object

**Summary:**

Does this policy make provision for other forms of personal transport as listed above. Space to travel, park and manoevre is still required. What about taxis; disabled and elderly?

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 190 - Incorporate car free devlopment into existing policy |
|---|---|

## 11039 Support

**Summary:**

Bidwells supports Option 190 over Option 189, as such a policy would provide more flexibility to provide car parking or car free development depending on specific site locations and types of development.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 190 - Incorporate car free devlopment into existing policy |
|---|---|

## 12722 Support

**Summary:**

I think this is the most realistic option. I love the idea of car-free areas, but agree that the provision of other modes of transport just isn't up to this currently in Cambridge.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 190 - Incorporate car free devlopment into existing policy |
|---|---|

## 13210 Support

**Summary:**

We would support a policy for car free development at locations which are suitable, close to the city centre and well served by public transport. This would need to be subject to negotiations between developers and the local authority. A specific policy on car free development would be required in order to guide development proposals.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 190 - Incorporate car free devlopment into existing policy |
|---|---|

## 14763 Object

**Summary:**

We support a car free development policy because it maximises environmental sustainability, quality of life, health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Cars remain the greatest contributor to accidental child mortality and serious injury in Britain and world-wide. We do not believe it is appropriate for developers to be able to influence transportation policy.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 190 - Incorporate car free devlopment into existing policy |
|---|---|

## 15712 Object

**Summary:**

We support a car-free development policy (option 189) because it maximises environmental sustainability, quality of life, health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Cars remain the greatest contributor to accidental child mortality and serious injury in Britain and world-wide. We do not believe it is appropriate for developers to be able to influence transportation policy.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 190 - Incorporate car free devlopment into existing policy |
|---|---|

## 16418 Object

**Summary:**

We support a car-free development policy (option 189) because it maximises environmental sustainability, quality of life, health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Cars remain the greatest contributor to accidental child mortality and serious injury in Britain and world-wide. We do not believe it is appropriate for developers to be able to influence transportation policy.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.11 |
|---|---|

### 7143   Object

**Summary:**

No. In the ultimate car free developments are a nonsense. To lead a reasonably full life one has to have personal transport and some people, notably self employed tradespeople, need vans/cars for their work.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.11 |
|---|---|

### 7397   Object

**Summary:**

In a very congested city like Cambridge with high levels of cycle use and some public transport, it is important to ask for each central development whether it should be car free.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.11 |
|---|---|

### 8504   Support

**Summary:**

yes

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.11 |
|---|---|

### 8971   Object

**Summary:**

Not practical

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.11 |
|---|---|

### 9525   Object

**Summary:**

A car free development policy is not needed.

The further I read through this document, the more I feel thare are too many policies and that the plan might be better if it were significantly shorter.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.11 |
|---|---|

### 11097 Support

**Summary:**

Car-free areas are in principle a good idea, but probably many people will simply keep their cars in other nearby areas.  Public transport and cycling/walking must be made MUCH more attractive, so that people are not seduced into their cars.  Even at the cost that it currently is, the Grand Arcade car park still has long queues on a Saturday.  Maybe queueing along Trumpington Street should not be permitted? Or perhaps that car park should only be available to disabled people or others who cannot easily use other forms of transport?

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.11 |
|---|---|

### 12760 Support

**Summary:**

Yes

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.11 |
|---|---|

## 13275 Support

**Summary:**

Yes,  See Question 12.12

| | |
|---|---|
| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.11** |

## 14296 Object

**Summary:**

Incompatible with an inclusive community. Carers can't all come by bike. Disabled people need access to vehicles.

| | |
|---|---|
| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.11** |

## 14767 Support

**Summary:**

Yes
We support a car free development policy because it maximises environmental sustainability, quality of life, health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Cars remain the greatest contributor to accidental child mortality and serious injury in Britain and world-wide. We do not believe it is appropriate for developers to be able to influence transportation policy.

| | |
|---|---|
| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.11** |

## 15007 Support

**Summary:**

Yes.

- We support car-free developments and whichever policy is adopted should encourage these.

- City living is ideal for this scenario; example of Petersfield vs Arbury shows that people will choose where to live based on car parking availability

- Car-free developments should avoid the wasting of space for car parking so in fact could help lower housing costs.

- Car Club spaces should be incorporated into such developments, however, as these make development more viable.

- Need space for visitors and deliveries, otherwise these block walking/cycling routes and green space / the public realm.

| | |
|---|---|
| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.11** |

## 15290 Object

**Summary:**

No car developments are appropriate only in locations with good local services and reliable public transport throughout the day and late into the night as is the case in inner London. Cambridge is nowhere near this standard and it is not easy to see it being achieved any time soon without a radical change of transport policy and an authority capable of controlling quality, reliability and extent of services. There will be a continuing need for parking for those for whom access by car is the only reasonable option. Otherwise disabled relatives are left firmly off the visitor list.

| | |
|---|---|
| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.11** |

## 15709 Support

**Summary:**

We support a car-free development policy because it maximises environmental sustainability, quality of life, health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Cars remain the greatest contributor to accidental child mortality and serious injury in Britain and world-wide.

| | |
|---|---|
| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.11** |

## 15773 Support

**Summary:**

Yes there is a need for a policy as no developer would consent otherwise.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.11 |
|---|---|

## 16414 Support

**Summary:**

We support a car-free development policy because it maximises environmental sustainability, quality of life, health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Cars remain the greatest contributor to accidental child mortality and serious injury in Britain and world-wide.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.11 |
|---|---|

## 18180 Object

**Summary:**

Nothing currently to prevent car-free developments, and cannot force car-free developments if that would make them non-viable - so no need for a policy that I can see

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.12 |
|---|---|

## 7398   Support

**Summary:**

Option 190 preferred. In a very congested city like Cambridge with high levels of cycle use and some public transport, it is important to ask for each central development whether it should be car free.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.12 |
|---|---|

## 8505   Support

**Summary:**

Option 189

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.12 |
|---|---|

## 8972   Object

**Summary:**

Neither policy is really workable. An interesting idea but probably impossible to implement in a congested city like Cambridge since it is doubtful that the quality of public transport required could be provided for 18 hours a day, 7 days a week, 364 days in the year.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.12 |
|---|---|

## 9553   Support

**Summary:**

Option 190

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.12 |
|---|---|

## 11667 Support

**Summary:**

Option 189.
But is there a chicken-and-egg problem here? People won't want a car-free development unless there's a public transport alternative. Public transport providers won't want to provide unless there's deamnd.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.12 |
|---|---|

## 13277 Support

**Summary:**

We support Option 189 and the principle of car free development.  We believe a specific policy would be a pro-active and positive way to encourage development of this sort.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.12 |
|---|---|

## 13460 Support

**Summary:**

190, if possible.
Important to recognise that occasional car journeys are very
desirable even for those living in the city centre, then car clubs schemes should be encouraged strongly as these will minimise the demand for parking locations and encourage people to consider more carefully when and
why they would wish to make a car journey.  The provision of charging sites does not impact congestion and transfers CO2 production to the energy production site hence is not as important as reducing the number of journeys.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.12 |
|---|---|

## 14323 Support

**Summary:**

Option 189. This really needs to happen.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.12 |
|---|---|

## 14768 Support

**Summary:**

Option 189
We support a car free development policy because it maximises environmental sustainability, quality of life, health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Cars remain the greatest contributor to accidental child mortality and serious injury in Britain and world-wide. We do not believe it is appropriate for developers to be able to influence transportation policy.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.12 |
|---|---|

## 15711 Support

**Summary:**

We support a car-free development policy (option 189) because it maximises environmental sustainability, quality of life, health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Cars remain the greatest contributor to accidental child mortality and serious injury in Britain and world-wide.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.12 |
|---|---|

## 16417 Support

**Summary:**

We support a car-free development policy because it maximises environmental sustainability, quality of life, health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Cars remain the greatest contributor to accidental child mortality and serious injury in Britain and world-wide.

## 7399   Object

**Summary:**

The policy should be beefed up to require the council to pro-actively identify areas of the city in which car free developments would be the norm, unless a strong case is made by developers for a small number of car users.   Criteria should be defined by which developers might argue for a very limited number of car users (a defined low percentage of occupants, say up to 10%) in any development in the area.

## 9555   Support

**Summary:**

Car ownership cannot be controlled by local authorities, even if usage is discouraged. Private cars need to be kept off-street when not in use. Also, residents do have visitors, and businesses have customers. Only student accommodation is really suitable for car-free development, although some affordable housing, and sheltered housing, might allow it.

## 11585 Object

**Summary:**

A conflict between low car use and Cambridge's dynamic labour market: a job change may mean the use of a car (if it's in, say, Ramsey or Mildenhall).  But often moving house is not an option (housing market inertia, losses due to stamp duty, partner's work needs, schools, etc), which leads to previously car-free people having unexpectedly to gain cars.

Perhaps promote centralised secure parking areas which are far from residential accommodation (which only has drop-off/pick-up/disabled bays).  This makes a car unattractive for short journeys but still viable to have one if you need it.

## 11957 Object

**Summary:**

I strongly support the development of car-free areas -- it is shameful that people don't have the opportunity to opt out of the domination of their local environment by cars. However I don't understand the two policies we are offered. The development of a car-free area should be used as a catalyst to stimulate the improvement of sustainable transport modes to suitable standards, a policy that would also bring benefits to surrounding areas. Such a policy would be the best hope of achieving the traffic neutrality that I call for in my answer to Q3.11.

## 14769 Support

**Summary:**

We support a car free development policy because it maximises environmental sustainability, quality of life, health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Cars remain the greatest contributor to accidental child mortality and serious injury in Britain and world-wide. We do not believe it is appropriate for developers to be able to influence transportation policy.

## 17507 Object

**Summary:**

Parking standards review - We request an effective and transparent additional consultation/review on parking standards, including a specific consultation in areas adjacent to recent large development which has under-provided for parking on-site.  We object to intensive development being allowed which results in parking spillover on to adjacent streets - links also to 9.21.  We also oppose proposed parking reductions e.g. Station area, not least as these areas already damage adjacent areas through unnecessary overspill parking and extra traffic.  We support the principle of car free development but not where a route to displace parking on to already overcrowded neighbouring streets

## 18182 Object

**Summary:**

Deliberate restriction towards car-free developments may just exacerbate problems elsewhere, so new offices without sufficient spaces mean that staff just park elsewhere (especially given house prices in Cambridge!)

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.14 |
|---|---|

## 8973  Object

**Summary:**

We agree with the desirability of minimising car use. This could perhaps be achieved partially by siting frequently-used facilities close to housing and by providing cycle ways separated from motor traffic.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.14 |
|---|---|

## 14770 Support

**Summary:**

We support a car free development policy because it maximises environmental sustainability, quality of life, health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Cars remain the greatest contributor to accidental child mortality and serious injury in Britain and world-wide. We do not believe it is appropriate for developers to be able to influence transportation policy.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.14 |
|---|---|

## 15774 Support

**Summary:**

Yes, neither option 189 nor 190 is quite right. Instead the plan should earmark up-front certain zones in which car-free developments are the expected default. In larger new developments at the edge of the city, as a principle, a certain minimum proportion of the housing to be provided could be earmarked as traffic-free.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.23 |
|---|---|

## 12735 Support

**Summary:**

Very strongly agree with this. Just thinking of the new development planned on the Cambridge United site as I write this. This will almost certainly add to the congestion on Newmarket Road. Oh and that's not to mention the new travel lodge and premier inn!

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.24 |
|---|---|

## 11535 Support

**Summary:**

good

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.25 |
|---|---|

## 15469 Support

**Summary:**

Transport statements and assessments must make direct reference to cycling and high-quality cycling provision that provides quick and direct access must be designed in from the start. This includes wide cycle paths, preferably separate from the road network, constructed with good surfaces that will last, junctions that are easy to negotiate on a bicycle, and ample cycle parking.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | 12.26 |
|---|---|

## 8979   Object

**Summary:**

The traffic congestion in Cambridge is already so bad that development should be prevented if there is a CUMULATIVE impact. Grid locks already occur in the city and further traffic would worsen the situation. Further deterioration of Cambridge's unique atmosphere with its architecture, river and open spaces must be avoided.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 193 - development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against |
|---|---|

## 8980   Object

**Summary:**

Minimising the impact on traffic will not be adequate to prevent further congestion. Also, developments should not be considered in isolation; rather the cumulative effect of all developments is the important standard.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 193 - development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against |
|---|---|

## 9592   Support

**Summary:**

The impact on cyclists and pedestrians must also be taken into account, as well as the impact on congestion.  Often new developments lead to an extra junction which needs several presses of pelican crossings, thus significantly slowing pedestrian progress, or making what had been a good cycle route less safe or interrupted.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 193 - development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against |
|---|---|

## 11042 Object

**Summary:**

The Option recognises that all new development is likely to place some impact on the transport network, even with mitigation, as Cambridge suffers from significant congestion.  Therefore, the current wording of the policy would preclude most development in Cambridge.

Paragraph 32 of the NPPF states: "Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe." Therefore, Bidwells considers it would be more practical to change the wording of the policy to only permit development "where the residual cumulative impacts of development is not severe".

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 193 - development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against |
|---|---|

## 11536 Support

**Summary:**

yes, useful objective.

---

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 193 - development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against |

## 12579 Support

**Summary:**

This is another common sense policy.

---

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 193 - development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against |

## 12744 Support

**Summary:**

Strongly agree with this. I refer again to the new Travel lodge and Premier Inn on the junction of Newmarket Road and Coldhams Lane. Apparently 'evidence' was supplied that these will not impact the traffic in this already heavily congested area! This policy needs to be very carefully written to make sure that developers really do have to prove that a development will have no impact in congested areas. This must be improved from the current situation.

---

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 193 - development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against |

## 12775 Support

**Summary:**

This is, of all of the policies set out, one of the most important!  We cannot have a situation where some parts of the city are left relatively non-congested and others are left to become ever-more gridlocked.  Allowing further development because of an already parlous state of play cannot be permitted and the council should seek to actively improve not just maintain these situations.

---

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 193 - development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against |

## 12782 Support

**Summary:**

And not all sites can be mitigated for - council should display courage to say 'no' where there really is no mitigation possible.

---

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 193 - development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against |

## 13297 Support

**Summary:**

Cambridge is already a highly congested city. CCF does not support further new development around Cambridge, partly for this reason. New developments should only go ahead if the transport impact is shown to be acceptable.  We particularly agree with the third bullet point, that in areas of already high congestion, development should only be allowed if it will have no impact on traffic.

The traffic impacts of new developments can be significant, and for an already congested city this could cause severe problems.  All efforts should be taken to mitigate this at the planning stage.

---

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 193 - development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against |

## 14686 Support

**Summary:**

We believe it is insufficient to state that developments should only be required to mitigate impact, and the policy should declare an explicit aim of improving where possible the traffic in all communities that may be impacted by through traffic. Under the Localism Act, Local communities should be consulted and their approcal sought prior to approval. We do not believe that development should only be prevented if the cumulative impact is found to be severe. We consider this totally unacceptable, and believe that any negative impact must be mitigated in a City where congestion and pollution is significant and hampering growth and quality of life.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 193 - development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against |
|---|---|

## 15032 Object

**Summary:**

- Provision of Dutch-quality cycle infrastructure (see our comments on Option 182) would go a very long way in avoiding the creation of congestion - should become a requirement of new developments.

- Congestion definition needs to include cycles: e.g. a toucan crossing supposedly increases congestion under the current definition. Shouldn't allow a developer to avoid cycle provision on the basis that it creates (car) congestion.

- Some existing off-road cycleway provision, such as the cycle paths across commons and cycle/pedestrian bridges across the Cambridge already suffer cycle/pedestrian congestion at certain times of the day; developments should contribute to mitigation.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 193 - development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against |
|---|---|

## 15292 Object

**Summary:**

This is crying for the moon. The Elizabeth Way junction with Chesterton High Street operates at 165% of capacity for most of the day yet this has not prevented massive new developments of housing in Chesterton replacing local employment facilities thus adding to the need for out commuting. I do not think such a policy would work in practice even if it survived the examination in public.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 193 - development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against |
|---|---|

## 15722 Object

**Summary:**

We believe it is insufficient to state that developments should only be required to mitigate impact, and the policy should declare an explicit aim of improving where possible the traffic in all communities that may be impacted by through-traffic. Under the Localism Act, local communities should be consulted and their approval sought prior to approval. We do not believe that development should only be prevented if the cumulative impact is found to be severe. We consider this totally unacceptable, and believe that any negative impact must be mitigated in a City where congestion and pollution is significant, hampering growth and quality of life.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 193 - development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against |
|---|---|

## 15783 Object

**Summary:**

It's important that this does not claim that measures needed to support sustainable modes of transport with an overall net good, e.g. cycle crossings, bus lanes, bus priority, etc. are not rejected because they "increase congestion". Congestion which has a net benefit for sustainable modes of transport should be excluded from such restrictions. Also congestion should not just be considered just on the highway - some cycle routes are narrow, and it should be possible to require developers to contribute towards expansion if the routes are to become better used.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 193 - development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against |
|---|---|

## 16427 Object

**Summary:**

We believe it is insufficient to state that developments should only be required to mitigate impact, and the policy should declare an explicit aim of improving where possible the traffic in all communities that may be impacted by through-traffic. Under the Localism Act, local communities should be consulted and their approval sought prior to approval. We do not believe that development should only be prevented if the cumulative impact is found to be severe. We consider this totally unacceptable, and believe that any negative impact must be mitigated in a City where congestion and pollution is significant, hampering growth and quality of life.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 193 - development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against |
|---|---|

## 16636 Support

**Summary:**

Agree with the first sentence. Bullet point 3: yes, agree strongly with this proposal. The last sentence is self-evident.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Option 193 - development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against** |
|---|---|

## 16923 Support

**Summary:**

We agree a policy to allow new development only where the transport impact can be mitigated or managed. We would urge that the policy be clarified to ensure that the impact include the effects on the local network of residential streets not just on the main network.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Option 193 - development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against** |
|---|---|

## 18263 Object

**Summary:**

My observation locally (Mitchams Corner) is that the cost of highway assessment seems to be prohibitive when the County do not want to do anything and non-existent when they do. Some consistency on policy would be helpful.
How is significant congestion quantified? Certain uses (hospital and private schools) generate huge congestion - what policy? What about no traffic lights?
Or pedestrian favoured traffic lights? Can Cambridge become a leader in this field?

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.18** |
|---|---|

## 7017   Support

**Summary:**

It is clear that transport congestion along the M11 and A14 corridors in Cambridgeshire is already at breaking point, leading to numerous accidents (see the signs posted on the A14 on numbers of casualties). Further increase in Cambridge's population, *however* this is done, can only make this worse.

This is therefore yet another reason why growth in Cambridge's population needs to be resisted. I am therefore in agreement with Option 193.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.18** |
|---|---|

## 7144   Support

**Summary:**

Yes, I support Option 193

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.18** |
|---|---|

## 7190   Support

**Summary:**

For development likely to place demands on the network, ensuring that mitigating measures are identified and, where appropriate, in place prior to the development being undertaken; and

This should have been the watch word in the case of CB1; the impact of 'cycling from the Student Hostel to the ARU' has seen no mitigating measures, nor development of the Southern Access before the commissioning of commercial building. There is little strategic information available on the treatment of the increased volumes within the closed system. The Gateway was even officially recognised as inadequate to cope with the potential traffic volumes.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.18** |
|---|---|

## 7401   Support

**Summary:**

Yes, we support a policy being drawn up.

Certain parts of the city are already very congested, and to construct a development there without some measures to reduce its adverse impact on traffic and the environment would not be sensible.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering
Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.18**

**8133   Support**

**Summary:**

I support 193

**12 - Promoting and Delivering
Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.18**

**8508   Support**

**Summary:**

yes

**12 - Promoting and Delivering
Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.18**

**8981   Support**

**Summary:**

yes

**12 - Promoting and Delivering
Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.18**

**9557   Support**

**Summary:**

Yes, but should not stifle building new homes.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering
Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.18**

**10299 Support**

**Summary:**

Yes. We should limit development to where the impact on the network can be reasonably mitigated.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering
Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.18**

**10983 Support**

**Summary:**

Vital - traffic is already very congested

**12 - Promoting and Delivering
Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.18**

**11959 Support**

**Summary:**

Yes, and I believe that the third bullet point should be strengthened to avoid the problem of dispersed developments at sites that do not have congestion problems which together generate traffic that has an adverse effect throughout the city.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering
Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.18**

## 13479 Object

**Summary:**

Policy that prevented development taking place in parts of the City would not be supported. There are other means of managing travel demand without preventing development. For example, the local authorities should monitor the implementation of existing travel plans in Cambridge, and use enforcement action where necessary, to ensure that existing commitments to manage the demand for travel are implemented.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.18 |
|---|---|

## 13534 Support

**Summary:**

Yes

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.18 |
|---|---|

## 14337 Object

**Summary:**

Yes. I strongly agree with this option. No development to be permitted unless it can be shown to have a positive impact on infrastructure.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.18 |
|---|---|

## 14724 Support

**Summary:**

We believe it is insufficient to state that developments should only be required to mitigate impact, and the policy should declare an explicit aim of improving where possible the traffic in all communities that may be impacted by through traffic. Under the Localism Act, Local communities should be consulted and their approcal sought prior to approval. We do not believe that development should only be prevented if the cumulative impact is found to be severe. We consider this totally unacceptable, and believe that any negative impact must be mitigated in a City where congestion and pollution is significant and hampering growth and quality of life.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.18 |
|---|---|

## 15036 Support

**Summary:**

Yes, but needs to go further.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.18 |
|---|---|

## 15723 Object

**Summary:**

We believe it is insufficient to state that developments should only be required to mitigate impact, and the policy should declare an explicit aim of improving where possible the traffic in all communities that may be impacted by through-traffic. Under the Localism Act, local communities should be consulted and their approval sought prior to approval. We do not believe that development should only be prevented if the cumulative impact is found to be severe. We consider this totally unacceptable, and believe that any negative impact must be mitigated in a City where congestion and pollution is significant, hampering growth and quality of life.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.18 |
|---|---|

## 15782 Support

**Summary:**

Yes a policy is needed, as developers have shown desire to create developments with unsafe or unsuitable junctions linking to the transport network.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.18**

### 16430 Object

**Summary:**

We believe it is insufficient to state that developments should only be required to mitigate impact, and the policy should declare an explicit aim of improving where possible the traffic in all communities that may be impacted by through-traffic. Under the Localism Act, local communities should be consulted and their approval sought prior to approval. We do not believe that development should only be prevented if the cumulative impact is found to be severe. We consider this totally unacceptable, and believe that any negative impact must be mitigated in a City where congestion and pollution is significant, hampering growth and quality of life.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.18**

### 16637 Support

**Summary:**

Yes.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.18**

### 18186 Support

**Summary:**

Yes - need to coordinate developments with transport - too often developments only have 'impact analysis' on case-by-case basis; need a wider perspective

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.19**

### 8982  Object

**Summary:**

New option required, namely that no development should be allowed that will lead to increased traffic congestion in Cambridge.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.19**

### 12780 Support

**Summary:**

And, going further, the council should demonstrate the courage to say 'no' where appropriate based on its own local plan and also the courage to say 'yes' where it is appropriate (according to congestion), despite potential opposition

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.19**

### 13543 Object

**Summary:**

This policy needs to be considered and discussed during the early planning stage of a development using the criteria in Option 193.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.19**

### 13569 Object

**Summary:**

Policy should recognise different modes of transport have different impacts when considering the need for mitigation.  Currently a vehicle trip is considered in terms of cost to have the same impact as a non-vehicle trip.  The Council seek to encourage non-vehicle trips as a fundamental part of sustainable development policy.  Car free development generating almost all non-car trips should not be considered to have the same impact on the transport network as a development with vehicle parking facilities.  It may generate the same number of trips but the vast majority are by sustainable modes of travel.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.19**

## 13605 Object

**Summary:**

The policy requires that financial contributions needed to provide appropriate mitigation be identified. It should be a requirement that the developers provide all the funds needed for the mitigation to take place in advance of the development's completion.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.19**

## 14726 Support

**Summary:**

We believe it is insufficient to state that developments should only be required to mitigate impact, and the policy should declare an explicit aim of improving where possible the traffic in all communities that may be impacted by through traffic. Under the Localism Act, Local communities should be consulted and their approcal sought prior to approval. We do not believe that development should only be prevented if the cumulative impact is found to be severe. We consider this totally unaceptable, and believe that any negative impact must be mitigated in a City where congestion and pollution is significant and hampering growth and quality of life.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.19**

## 15038 Object

**Summary:**

Yes, see our comments under Option 193.

And additionally we again emphasise that:

- New developments should require Dutch-quality levels of infrastructure as we define in Option 182, to avoid congestion from tens of thousands of new residences. See http://www.cyclestreets.net/galleries/212/

- High-profile target needed of 40% levels of cycling for all trips in Cambridge.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.19**

## 15724 Object

**Summary:**

We believe it is insufficient to state that developments should only be required to mitigate impact, and the policy should declare an explicit aim of improving where possible the traffic in all communities that may be impacted by through-traffic. Under the Localism Act, local communities should be consulted and their approval sought prior to approval. We do not believe that development should only be prevented if the cumulative impact is found to be severe. We consider this totally unacceptable, and believe that any negative impact must be mitigated in a City where congestion and pollution is significant, hampering growth and quality of life.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.19**

## 15784 Support

**Summary:**

Congestion should not just be considered just on the highway - some cycle
routes are narrow, and it should be possible to require developers to
contribute towards expansion if the routes are to become better used.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.19**

## 16432 Object

**Summary:**

We believe it is insufficient to state that developments should only be required to mitigate impact, and the policy should declare an explicit aim of improving where possible the traffic in all communities that may be impacted by through-traffic. Under the Localism Act, local communities should be consulted and their approval sought prior to approval. We do not believe that development should only be prevented if the cumulative impact is found to be severe. We consider this totally unacceptable, and believe that any negative impact must be mitigated in a City where congestion and pollution is significant, hampering growth and quality of life.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.19** |
|---|---|

## 18188 Object

**Summary:**

Need to consider interaction between types of transport, particularly at some key intersections, e.g. end of Mill Lane, where tourists, touts, pedestrians, and traffic vie for space on a difficult corner.
Option 193 includes '... if mitigation can minimise the impact to the network' - mitigation is not the same as eliminating - I may plan to put 1000 cars a day down Mill Lane, I may mitigate this to just 999 cars, but have scarcely reduced the overall impact; ' ... reduce to minimal impact' would be better

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.20** |
|---|---|

## 14727 Support

**Summary:**

We believe it is insufficient to state that developments should only be required to mitigate impact, and the policy should declare an explicit aim of improving where possible the traffic in all communities that may be impacted by through traffic. Under the Localism Act, Local communities should be consulted and their approcal sought prior to approval. We do not believe that development should only be prevented if the cumulative impact is found to be severe. We consider this totally unaceptable, and believe that any negative impact must be mitigated in a City where congestion and pollution is significant and hampering growth and quality of life.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.20** |
|---|---|

## 16638 Support

**Summary:**

No development should be allowed that would increase traffic congestion within the city boundaries.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Option 194 - Modal split targets for new deveolopment** |
|---|---|

## 12749 Support

**Summary:**

This is a very interesting idea. I think it is a potential alternative to a congestion charge. I think this is viable as I think people would find it easier to restrict their travel rather than change 100% to sustainable methods. I think this has a good chance of being successful.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Option 194 - Modal split targets for new deveolopment** |
|---|---|

## 12789 Support

**Summary:**

Superb!

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Option 194 - Modal split targets for new deveolopment** |
|---|---|

## 13302 Support

**Summary:**

CCF believes modal split targets should be as ambitious as possible.  Having a standard target across the city could mean that some developments are set targets that are too low.
We would like to see targets appropriate for each development.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Option 195 - Do not set city wide modal split target for new developme** |
|---|---|

## 13305 Support

**Summary:**

We support flexibility in the modal split target for developments. However, we would like there to be a minimum standard across the city (such as the 40% mentioned in Option 194), so that flexible targets do not result in an increase in car journeys.
Flexible targets will encourage developments to be ambitious in their reductions in car use.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 195 - Do not set city wide modal split target for new developme |
|---|---|

## 18264 Object

**Summary:**

Do not set a city wide modal split target for new development. Doesn't seem to look at what a car is doing - is it a moving office? Does it take more than one person?

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.21 |
|---|---|

## 7018  Object

**Summary:**

I believe that reduction in car usage in Cambridge is best achieved by limiting the population of Cambridge. Beyond that, there is ever increasing discouragement to car use arising from petrol prices, which show no sign of abating their long term above inflation rises.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.21 |
|---|---|

## 7402  Support

**Summary:**

Yes. policy needed.

If rigorously enforced, this is a method of controlling car use and therefore reducing any adverse impact on the transport network and environment.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.21 |
|---|---|

## 8983  Support

**Summary:**

Yes

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.21 |
|---|---|

## 12788 Support

**Summary:**

Great idea!  Just the sort of bold plan we need for our awful problems.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.21 |
|---|---|

## 13506 Object

**Summary:**

A modal target for Cambridge should be identified in the County Council's emerging Transport Strategy, but targets for each development proposal should take account of the particular circumstances of the proposal and location and should not be prescribed in Local Plan policy. Individual targets can be agreed through site travel plans.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.21 |
|---|---|

## 15039 Support

**Summary:**

- We welcome modal target concept. Without it, every developer will argue that their development will not affect travel patterns significantly.

---

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.21** |

## 15293 Object

**Summary:**

No. The special circumstances of North West Cambridge make modal split a reasonable proposition as the development included a large employment element and most of the housing was effectively intended to comprise 'tied cottages'. There should not be a blanket policy but an enabling policy might be appropriate: In major new developments consideration will be given to the desirability and need for a modal split.

---

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.21** |

## 15785 Support

**Summary:**

Yes there needs to be a modal split target.

---

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.21** |

## 16639 Support

**Summary:**

Yes.

---

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.21** |

## 18189 Support

**Summary:**

Would seem to be needed if we are to plan for less car traffic

---

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.21** |

## 18496 Support

**Summary:**

Support in principle

---

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.22** |

## 8984  Object

**Summary:**

Prefer a mixture of the two. It is essential for all areas to have an upper limite of trips that should be made by private car (40% and preferably an even lower percentage). It would also be important to have the flexibility to reduce the percentage even more for particular areas where possible. However, none of these restrictions is practical unless public transport is really good.

---

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.22** |

## 9558 Support

**Summary:**

Option 195. Sites differ too much for one target, though guidelines might be set out.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.22 |
|---|---|

## 11960 Support

**Summary:**

Modal split targets should definitely be set, but they might vary in accordance with the potential for improved sustainable transport facilities to lead to modal shift for existing traffic -- in other words they might be stronger in areas which had little such potential.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.22 |
|---|---|

## 12791 Support

**Summary:**

194 - a great, bold courageous plan for a terrible congestion problem

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.22 |
|---|---|

## 13550 Object

**Summary:**

Unwise to set a city-wide modal split as circumstances will vary. It is better to negotiate with each development as in Option 195.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.22 |
|---|---|

## 13615 Object

**Summary:**

Option 195.  The appropriate Modal split would depend on ease of use of public transport from the development, and adverse implications of car use by occupants on the local transport infrastructure

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.22 |
|---|---|

## 15040 Object

**Summary:**

- City should require conditions that create 40% (continental) levels of cycling around the city, starting with large new developments. The current level of 22% is poor compared to what should be achievable.

- A 40% target means that every new development will need to achieve at least this level, through the active preference of cycle provision over motor traffic flow.

- So we prefer option 194 over 195.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.22 |
|---|---|

## 15787 Support

**Summary:**

Option 194 is clearly better as it leaves less wiggle room for developers to attempt to negotiate and wriggle out of their obligations. I believe it would be hard to enforce site-by-site requirements.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.22 |
|---|---|

## 16640 Support

**Summary:**

Not enough information to go on. Don't really understand what is meant by a 'modal split'.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.22 |

## 18191 Support

**Summary:**

Site-by-site targets are unlikely to be effective if subsequent use is totally different, so targets only effective if monitored and policed effectively, so think
city-wide only option.
It would allow higher car usage where infrastructure has capacity to support it while perhaps requiring higher noncar use on developments in areas with poor car-based infrastructure

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.22 |

## 18497 Support

**Summary:**

Further investigation and discussion of the options would be welcome to consider the results of the consultation and fit with the strategic approach in the draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. This is currently being developed and would be beneficial to review local policy approach with strategy to ensure they are complimentary. The County Council would be pleased to work with City colleagues/ stakeholders to discuss and review details as plans progress.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.23 |

## 8985   Object

**Summary:**

Enforcement is essential; what options are available?

What is the definition of "work-based"? Does it include transport to and from school? Travel for unpaid work?

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.23 |

## 11591 Support

**Summary:**

Consider long-distance cycle commuting in planning.  For example, I think developers assume that cyclists will commute a maximum of 3 miles.
In the Cambridge region many cyclists commute a greater distance, from places such as Great Shelford and Cambourne.  Longer distance commuting should be encouraged, and part of transport planning.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.23 |

## 15041 Object

**Summary:**

Need specific targets for cycling and each mode.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.24 |

## 8986   Object

**Summary:**

Yes, consider in addition conditions in existing areas of the city and in surrounding villages. Consider what can be done to reduce traffic congestion arising from these. Also consider impact of traffic assoicated with tourism.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**12.29**

## 11597 Support

**Summary:**

I'd support the chisholm trail cycle route along the railway as a great way to improve cycling across cambridge

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**12.29**

## 12754 Support

**Summary:**

This sounds like a good idea.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Option 196 - Set a Travel Plan threshold**

## 9593   Support

**Summary:**

I am sure a sensible policy can be put into place to mitigate the exceptions that might end up being awkward.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Option 196 - Set a Travel Plan threshold**

## 10463 Object

**Summary:**

Ths is an Orwellian nightmare. Strongly object to being controlled by political forces.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Option 196 - Set a Travel Plan threshold**

## 12581 Support

**Summary:**

Obviously sensible to insist on this.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Option 196 - Set a Travel Plan threshold**

## 12757 Support

**Summary:**

I think travel plan thresholds should be set for new developments.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Option 196 - Set a Travel Plan threshold**

## 12794 Support

**Summary:**

I would support this, even if developers would try to avoid doing it - that's no reason not to have any plan at all.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Option 196 - Set a Travel Plan threshold**

## 14431 Support

**Summary:**

We support the need for a threshold, which should be set low to ensure all significant developments have to comply. As a guideline, developments in excess of approximately 10 units should be required to provide a plan and expect enforcement

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 196 - Set a Travel Plan threshold |
|---|---|

## 15726 Support

**Summary:**

We support the need for a threshold, which should be set low to ensure all significant developments have to comply. As a guideline, developments in excess of approx 10 units should be required to provide a plan and expect enforcement.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 196 - Set a Travel Plan threshold |
|---|---|

## 16434 Support

**Summary:**

We support the need for a threshold, which should be set low to ensure all significant developments have to comply. As a guideline, developments in excess of approx 10 units should be required to provide a plan and expect enforcement.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 197 - Do not set a Travel Plan threshold |
|---|---|

## 10465 Support

**Summary:**

This is the only sane option. One cajoles and encourages the right moves but does not impose limits that may be impossible for some to keep.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 197 - Do not set a Travel Plan threshold |
|---|---|

## 10494 Support

**Summary:**

There should be a presumption that all developments have a travel plan in place. A case would then have to be made for not having one.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 197 - Do not set a Travel Plan threshold |
|---|---|

## 14426 Object

**Summary:**

Object:
We support the need for a threshold, which should be set low to ensure all significant developments have to comply. As a guideline, developments in excess of approximately 10 units should be required to provide a plan and expect enforcement

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 197 - Do not set a Travel Plan threshold |
|---|---|

## 15732 Object

**Summary:**

We support the need for a threshold, which should be set low to ensure all significant developments have to comply. As a guideline, developments in excess of approx 10 units should be required to provide a plan and expect enforcement.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 197 - Do not set a Travel Plan threshold |
|---|---|

## 16438 Object

**Summary:**

We support the need for a threshold, which should be set low to ensure all significant developments have to comply. As a guideline, developments in excess of approx 10 units should be required to provide a plan and expect enforcement.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.25 |
|---|---|

## 8134  Support

**Summary:**

I think there should be a policy. However, it is diffficult to see how the ideas in Travel plans can be re-inforced and monitored and what sanctions can be applied if they don't produce the desired effect.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.25 |
|---|---|

## 8509  Support

**Summary:**

yes

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.25 |
|---|---|

## 8987  Support

**Summary:**

Yes

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.25 |
|---|---|

## 10302 Object

**Summary:**

No special policy for travel plans is required - travel plans should be an option to help with mitigating impact of development as in option 193. This covers all sizes of development.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.25 |
|---|---|

## 12796 Support

**Summary:**

More good ideas, though to what extent these 'encouragement' schemes have I don't know.  I'd argue for more 'stick' to this 'carrot' through enforced other schemes such as those outlined elsewhere.  People will not climb out of their cars voluntarily, no matter how good the public transport network (which is sadly, stigmatised)

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.25 |
|---|---|

## 13619 Support

**Summary:**

yes, policy needed.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.25 |
|---|---|

## 14433 Support

**Summary:**

We support the need for a threshold, which should be set low to ensure all significant developments have to comply. As a guideline, developments in excess of approximately 10 units should be required to provide a plan and expect enforcement

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.25 |
|---|---|

## 15294 Support

**Summary:**

An enabling policy for use in 'appropriate developments' to be identified at the outline planning stage seems to be the best way forward if there is any evidence that such Travel Plans actually make a ha'p'orth of difference to the outcome.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.25 |
|---|---|

## 15728 Support

**Summary:**

We support the need for a threshold, which should be set low to ensure all significant developments have to comply. As a guideline, developments in excess of approx 10 units should be required to provide a plan and expect enforcement.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.25 |
|---|---|

## 15789 Support

**Summary:**

Yes travel plans should be needed beyond a threshold.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.25 |
|---|---|

## 16435 Support

**Summary:**

We support the need for a threshold, which should be set low to ensure all significant developments have to comply. As a guideline, developments in excess of approx 10 units should be required to provide a plan and expect enforcement.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.25 |
|---|---|

## 18193 Support

**Summary:**

Yes

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.26 |
|---|---|

## 7403   Object

**Summary:**

Prefer option 196.
It might be appropriate to define criteria for determining whether a particular planned development is above the threshold for a travel plan, which might take into account local traffic congestion, the sensitivity of the site, the nature of the development.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.26 |
|---|---|

## 8135  Support

**Summary:**

Support 196 because of greater clarity

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.26**

## 8988  Support

**Summary:**

Prefer option 196.
It is essential to have a requirement for all developments over a certain threshold to produce a travel plan, otherwise this aspect is liable to be forgotten or not considered with sufficient rigour. By setting the threshold sufficiently low the issue of developers aiming to be just below the threshold should not be a problem.
How would this policy be enforced?

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.26**

## 9560  Support

**Summary:**

Option 196 - on grounds of reducing uncertainty.

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.26**

## 12797 Support

**Summary:**

196

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.26**

## 13552 Object

**Summary:**

there is no need for this so Option 197 is better.

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.26**

## 14342 Support

**Summary:**

Option 196

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.26**

## 14434 Support

**Summary:**

Option 196: We support the need for a threshold, which should be set low to ensure all significant developments have to comply. As a guideline, developments in excess of approximately 10 units should be required to provide a plan and expect enforcement

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.26**

## 15042 Object

**Summary:**

- Option 196 not 197 is needed.

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.26**

---

## 15729 Support

**Summary:**

We support the need for a threshold, which should be set low to ensure all significant developments have to comply. As a guideline, developments in excess of approx 10 units should be required to provide a plan and expect enforcement.

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.26**

---

## 15790 Support

**Summary:**

Option 196 is clearly better. Even its drawbacks are better than no Travel Plan at all, and developers would no doubt fight vociferously against any requirement to provide one, if the criteria for doing so were not crystal clear. So I cannot support option 197.

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.26**

---

## 16436 Support

**Summary:**

We support the need for a threshold, which should be set low to ensure all significant developments have to comply. As a guideline, developments in excess of approx 10 units should be required to provide a plan and expect enforcement.

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.26**

---

## 18196 Support

**Summary:**

Option 196 - traffic impact should be considered for all developments; simple domestic extensions may increase household size so that second car is likely (this could be a problem in some Cambridge terraces); extent of traffic plan should be proportionate, so for small developments simple text assessment - for major developments then full traffic modelling

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.27**

---

## 8510   Support

**Summary:**

Is there any way of cutting down school runs e.g demanding that the independent and Roman Catholic schools - because they are not neighbourhood schools -  run buses to the park and ride car parks with, say, one or two spots en route from which parents could collect their children? Could there be buses for secondary schools that do a circuit of the school's catchment area?

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.27**

---

## 8989   Support

**Summary:**

Yes. Important to specify what is required in a travel plan. Otherwise a shoddy, misleading "plan" is liable to be passed.

---

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.27**

## 11961 Object

**Summary:**

I strongly support the principle of travel plans, and, again, a key consideration should be the potential for any sustainable transport facilities provided as a consequence to attract existing traffic including people not using the site in question.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.27 |
| --- | --- |

## 14435 Support

**Summary:**

We support the need for a threshold, which should be set low to ensure all significant developments have to comply. As a guideline, developments in excess of approximately 10 units should be required to provide a plan and expect enforcement

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.27 |
| --- | --- |

## 15044 Object

**Summary:**

- A Travel Plan must not be seen as a replacement for actual infrastructure to create the conditions for high levels of sustainable travel. For instance, the Lion Yard extension saw the cycle parking requirement waived on the basis of creation of a Travel Plan; if there is poor cycle parking then in practice people won't cycle.

- We are highly sceptical about the current Travel Plan situation. We would like to see more evidence that developers are treating these seriously, despite this being a very useful tool if properly and actively enforced.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.27 |
| --- | --- |

## 15730 Support

**Summary:**

We support the need for a threshold, which should be set low to ensure all significant developments have to comply. As a guideline, developments in excess of approx 10 units should be required to provide a plan and expect enforcement.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.27 |
| --- | --- |

## 15744 Support

**Summary:**

Yes, it is essential firstly that every development and its surroundings should be required to be designed so as to make travel by the sustainable modes the natural and obvious choices. (We have made proposals to this effect elsewhere in this consultation.) This has often not been the case in applications approved hitherto, especially in employment developments.

The travel plan will then be established on a sound base, be realistic and be taken seriously.

It should be mandatory for developments larger than a low-set threshold, and be enforced.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.27 |
| --- | --- |

## 16437 Support

**Summary:**

We support the need for a threshold, which should be set low to ensure all significant developments have to comply. As a guideline, developments in excess of approx 10 units should be required to provide a plan and expect enforcement.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.27 |
| --- | --- |

## 18199 Object

**Summary:**

Need to link travel plans to overall city traffic plan

**12 - Promoting and Delivering
Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.28**

## 14439 Support

**Summary:**

We support the need for a threshold, which should be set low to ensure all significant developments have to comply. As a guideline, developments in excess of approximately 10 units should be required to provide a plan and expect enforcement

**12 - Promoting and Delivering
Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.28**

## 15792 Support

**Summary:**

An alternative way to look at it is to set a lower threshold for a travel plan, and then you can reserve the right to waive the requirement in exceptional circumstances. This would fix the problem of option 196 causing developments to be just under the threshold (the solution being to have the threshold a bit lower than it would otherwise be, and be more prepared to waive the requirement in borderline cases).

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **12.33** |
|---|---|

## 13693 Support

**Summary:**

"Broadband" is not specific enough. The council should adopt a policy of requiring fibre optic to the premises to be installed in new developments; and should encourage its installation across the city to upgrade the existing infrastructure. The council needs to encourage a competitive market in provision of services over the infrastructure so that residents and businesses can obtain reasonably priced services under reasonable contract terms. The council's plans and strategy in this area need to be developed in much greaterr detail.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **12.35** |
|---|---|

## 16647 Support

**Summary:**

Yes

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Option 199 - Telecommunications policy criteria based** |
|---|---|

## 8991   Support

**Summary:**

Yes

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Option 199 - Telecommunications policy criteria based** |
|---|---|

## 12584 Support

**Summary:**

Common sense.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Option 199 - Telecommunications policy criteria based** |
|---|---|

## 14397 Object

**Summary:**

support: We believe it is insufficient to state the "significant interference" should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference and real-word measures need to be included in the policy to remoce uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Option 199 - Telecommunications policy criteria based** |
|---|---|

## 15296 Support

**Summary:**

I support this approach as reasonable and proportionate.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Option 199 - Telecommunications policy criteria based** |
|---|---|

## 15734 Object

**Summary:**

We believe it is insufficient to state that 'significant interference' should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference, and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Option 199 - Telecommunications policy criteria based**

### 16440 Object

**Summary:**

We believe it is insufficient to state that 'significant interference' should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference, and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Option 199 - Telecommunications policy criteria based**

### 16646 Support

**Summary:**

Bullet point 4: agree that consultation should take place before installation near a school or college.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.32**

### 8992  Support

**Summary:**

Yes

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.32**

### 13560 Support

**Summary:**

Yes

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.32**

### 13642 Support

**Summary:**

we support the need for a policy and the criteria set out seem adequate.

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.32**

### 14346 Support

**Summary:**

yes

**12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and**

**Question 12.32**

### 14399 Support

**Summary:**

We believe it is insufficient to state the "significant interference" should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference and real-word measures need to be included in the policy to remoce uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.32** |
| --- | --- |

## 16643 Support

**Summary:**

Yes, emphatically.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.32** |
| --- | --- |

## 18204 Support

**Summary:**

Yes - as suggested

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.32** |
| --- | --- |

## 18498 Support

**Summary:**

Support

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.33** |
| --- | --- |

## 9526   Object

**Summary:**

Yes all the hygiene factors are important, but the text misses the point that good provision of telecommunications infrastructure can have a major impact on transport network requirements

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.33** |
| --- | --- |

## 9563   Support

**Summary:**

There should also be a bullet point forbidding masts/sites within an agreed distance (say 50 metres) from any residential property.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.33** |
| --- | --- |

## 10468 Object

**Summary:**

Again neither an objection or support but a question.

Should there not be somewhere a policy that limits the electromagnetic field intensities? I expect that we are no where near the health limit but  a policy should exist to ensure that we do not get near health limits with electromagnetic hotspots are prohibited.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.33** |
| --- | --- |

## 13562 Support

**Summary:**

Favour a policy as outlined in Option 199.

| **12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and** | **Question 12.33** |
| --- | --- |

## 13689 Object

**Summary:**

The council should adopt a policy of requiring fibre optic to the premises to be installed in new developments; and should encourage its installation across the city.

The council needs to encourage a competitive market in provision of services over the infrastructure so that residents and businesses can obtain reasonably priced services under reasonable contract terms.

This would make the city attractive to those working in technology, boost the city's economy, and potentially reduce the amount of travel people need to undertake.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.33 |
|---|---|

## 14401 Object

**Summary:**

We believe it is insufficient to state the "significant interference" should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference and real-word measures need to be included in the policy to remoce uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.33 |
|---|---|

## 15736 Object

**Summary:**

We believe it is insufficient to state that 'significant interference' should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference, and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainity. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.33 |
|---|---|

## 16442 Object

**Summary:**

We believe it is insufficient to state that 'significant interference' should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference, and real-world measures need to be included in the policy to remove uncertainity. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.33 |
|---|---|

## 16645 Support

**Summary:**

Has the impact of existing masts been assessed locally?

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.33 |
|---|---|

## 18499 Object

**Summary:**

Consultation should also include the Highway Authority where appropriate if works may be in the highway or near the guided busway, or a safeguarded line of a highway, and also the SuDs Approval Body in due course.

We would recommend the inclusion of a policy that requires new developments to make provision for communications / broadband infrastructure.   New employment and residential development should be served by a high-quality digital infrastructure and .a specific reference to the provision of ducting to industry standards should aid transparency and promote  delivery . There are economic and social gains for doing so.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.34 |
| --- | --- |

## 14416 Support

**Summary:**

We believe it is insufficient to state the "significant interference" should be used as a test, and a tighter definition should be used. There is already anticipated interference and real-word measures need to be included in the policy to remoce uncertainty. The requirement to consult should apply equally to all spaces where people live, work or spend considerable periods of time. It should also be clarified that the consultation should not be limited to immediate neighbours to the site, but those nearby within a radius to be defined.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 200 - Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lord's Bridge - Consultation areas |
| --- | --- |

## 8993   Support

**Summary:**

Yes

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 200 - Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lord's Bridge - Consultation areas |
| --- | --- |

## 9595   Support

**Summary:**

The Mullard is a world class institution.  It would be madness, especially in the light of many other chapters in this document regarding jobs, growth etc, not to ensure that the Mullard is not safeguarded, since otherwise policy would be at variance with everything else I have read.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 200 - Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lord's Bridge - Consultation areas |
| --- | --- |

## 9672   Support

**Summary:**

an important site of international importance.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 200 - Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lord's Bridge - Consultation areas |
| --- | --- |

## 12208 Support

**Summary:**

Options 66 (p. 147), 70 (p. 158), 164 (p. 263), 178 (p. 277) and 200 (p. 301) are essential.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 200 - Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lord's Bridge - Consultation areas |
| --- | --- |

## 12587 Support

**Summary:**

Obviously needs protection.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 200 - Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lord's Bridge - Consultation areas |
| --- | --- |

## 12805 Object

**Summary:**

I'm not sure that I agree to the observatory holding such a powerful sway over development in this area, which could rule out important sites potentially?  Can it not move in some way in the longer term?  Presumably it was built when Cambridge was much smaller city?

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 200 - Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lord's Bridge - Consultation areas |
| --- | --- |

## 15297 Support

**Summary:**

This seems to have been a successful policy and should be retained

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 200 - Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory, Lord's Bridge - Consultation areas |
| --- | --- |

## 18265 Object

**Summary:**

Is light pollution considered in mitigation of traffic lighting?

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.35 |
| --- | --- |

## 8513   Support

**Summary:**

yes

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.35 |
| --- | --- |

## 8994   Support

**Summary:**

Yes

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.35 |
| --- | --- |

## 9527   Support

**Summary:**

I support Option 200

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.35 |
| --- | --- |

## 11592 Support

**Summary:**

Support

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.35 |
| --- | --- |

## 13515 Support

**Summary:**

The University welcomes the retention of this policy which serves to protect the operations at the Observatory.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.35 |
| --- | --- |

## 14347 Support

**Summary:**

Yes

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.35**

### 18206 Support

**Summary:**

Yes - as suggested

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.35**

### 18383 Support

**Summary:**

A policy similar to that in the current Local Plan is necessary to protect the operation of the observatory, which lies in South Cambridgeshire.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.36**

### 13564 Support

**Summary:**

best to continue with the current safeguards as outlined in Option 200.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.36**

### 16648 Support

**Summary:**

Add the proposal (if it still exists) to reopen the Oxford-Cambridge rail link. It used to run right through the site.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**12.43**

### 7191   Support

**Summary:**

There is clear evidence the Authorities are behind the curve in infrastructure provision, especially water, given it is designated as a semi arid zone, the importance of national self sufficiency in agriculture and the impact of the Growth Equation, which sought to increase the population by half as much agaiin, with its consequent effect on water consumption, the use of white goods, etc.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**12.51**

### 8995   Support

**Summary:**

Essential to have robust for funding infrastructure.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Option 201 - Provision of infrastructure and services**

### 8996   Support

**Summary:**

These are essential requirements

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Option 201 - Provision of infrastructure and services**

## 9785   Object

**Summary:**

The policy should also ensure Developer contributions to non-vehicular infrastructure should be encouraged, with links to the existing networks

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 201 - Provision of infrastructure and services |
|---|---|

## 12589 Support

**Summary:**

Again perfectly reasonable to insist on this.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 201 - Provision of infrastructure and services |
|---|---|

## 12761 Support

**Summary:**

agree

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 201 - Provision of infrastructure and services |
|---|---|

## 13216 Support

**Summary:**

We would support appropriate and relevant provision of infrastructure and services which is derived from demand created by new development. Improvements and provision for infrastructure would need to be proportionate and related to the scale of development proposed taking account of the developments own impact on local infrastructure whilst not providing infrastructure to make up for infrastructure not provided by existing development which generates demand but has not contributed financially to infrastructure provision.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 201 - Provision of infrastructure and services |
|---|---|

## 14772 Support

**Summary:**

We support the need for a policy in this respect and that developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 201 - Provision of infrastructure and services |
|---|---|

## 15298 Object

**Summary:**

It is easy to add to the cost of development by levying charges through infrastructure payments. In general major developments should meet their own infrastructure needs and this provision should be completed before the overall scheme is complete, perhaps withholding consent for 20% of the development might encourage early delivery.
I would stress that these costs add directly to the costs of housing inc Cambridge and need to be fully justified and kept within limits.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 201 - Provision of infrastructure and services |
|---|---|

## 15737 Support

**Summary:**

We support the need for a policy in this respect and that developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 201 - Provision of infrastructure and services |
|---|---|

### 16065 Support

**Summary:**

This appears to be the basis for a necessary policy offering clear conditions relating to development.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 201 - Provision of infrastructure and services |
|---|---|

### 16443 Support

**Summary:**

We support the need for a policy in this respect and that developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 201 - Provision of infrastructure and services |
|---|---|

### 16649 Support

**Summary:**

Support strongly.  All these points are essential.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Option 201 - Provision of infrastructure and services |
|---|---|

### 17799 Support

**Summary:**

Option 201 Provision of infrastructure and services - green infrastructure and open spaces provision could enhance biodiversity and is therefore welcomed.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.38 |
|---|---|

### 7145   Support

**Summary:**

Yes, I fully support Option 201

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.38 |
|---|---|

### 8514   Support

**Summary:**

yes

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.38 |
|---|---|

### 8626   Support

**Summary:**

Based on the experience with the agreed developments in the Southern Fringe, the Trumpington Residents' Association supports Option 201 and the need for a policy to require developers to support the provision of infrastructure.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.38 |
|---|---|

### 8997   Support

**Summary:**

yes

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.38 |
|---|---|

## 10315 Support

**Summary:**

All new developments need infrastructure and services.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.38 |
|---|---|

## 10634 Support

**Summary:**

The Wildlife Trust supports such a policy as planning obligations / CIL are one of a number of essential sources of funding to help deliver the 2011 Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy, the 2006 Cambridge Nature Conservation Strategy and the policies within the Local Plan aimed at increasing quality of life for new and existing residents of the city.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.38 |
|---|---|

## 13523 Object

**Summary:**

Any policy should ensure that contributions from developers should only be sought where necessary to make a scheme acceptable in planning terms and should be fair and reasonable in both scale and kind.

The level of contributions sought should strike a balance between the need for funding and the impact on the viability of development.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.38 |
|---|---|

## 13572 Support

**Summary:**

Option 201 to provide adequate cover.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.38 |
|---|---|

## 13646 Support

**Summary:**

we support the need for a policy along the lines proposed

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.38 |
|---|---|

## 14774 Support

**Summary:**

Yes. We support the need for a policy in this respect and that developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.38 |
|---|---|

## 15045 Support

**Summary:**

- Yes. We support the concept of CIL/S106, and it is important to ensure that policies are robust so that they cannot be challenged by developers.

- We do not accept the view of some that such funds constitute a 'bribe'. New developments usually generate traffic and other problems, which create costs to existing users; it is not acceptable for a developer to offload these externalities onto the taxpayer, and so the CIL/S106 payments ensure that these costs are properly accounted for.

- There is a real need to keep Area Corridor Plans updated.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.38 |
|---|---|

## 15133 Support

**Summary:**

Yes, support.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.38 |
|---|---|

## 15738 Support

**Summary:**

We support the need for a policy in this respect and that developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.38 |
|---|---|

## 16444 Support

**Summary:**

We support the need for a policy in this respect and that developers should be required to support the provision of infrastructure.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.38 |
|---|---|

## 16650 Support

**Summary:**

Yes.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.38 |
|---|---|

## 17038 Object

**Summary:**

The Plan should provide a realistic and deliverable strategy which identifies the key infrastructure constraints and highlights how any constraints will be overcome.  This should be set out in a delivery and broader implementation plan.
Although planning for a 20 year period, it is essential that the development strategy can be delivered and implemented with reasonable confidence.  In assessing development sites we would ask that the Council considers the changing circumstances of sites within the plan area and clearly understands any delivery constraints at both a site and the wider area.

| 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and | Question 12.38 |
|---|---|

## 18209 Support

**Summary:**

Yes - as suggested

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.38**

### 18500 Support

**Summary:**

The County Council supports in principle a policy for the provision of infrastructure and services. The County Council notes that the list given in Option 201 "is not exhaustive and there may be scope for requiring contributions towards a wider range of infrastructure measures".

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.38**

### 18539 Support

**Summary:**

Based on the experience with the agreed developments in the Southern Fringe, we support Option 201 and the need for a policy to require developers to support the provision of infrastructure.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.39**

### 8998 Object

**Summary:**

There is no statement about how this policy will be monitored and enforced

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.39**

### 9564 Support

**Summary:**

Infrastructure must be in place before any of the development is occupied, although phasing may be appropriate for larger developments.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.39**

### 12888 Object

**Summary:**

Yes we should ask for developer contributions towards various costs, however I think that exceptions should be made for housing co-operatives and community land trusts. This is because housing co-operatives usually have little money and in any case are not-for-profit. Also, the benefits they provide are usually greater than any perceived initial impact e.g. a housing co-operative would usually seek to develop in a way that is environmentally friendly, innovative, uses renewable and sustainable energy (e.g. solar panels, carbon neutrality) and favours green transport over car-travel.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.39**

### 13652 Object

**Summary:**

a continuing complaint from resident associations is the lack of information and transparency of the amount and use of S106 moneys from developments. The City Council should, in our view, develop a policy on how such information should best be available and communicated

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.39**

### 15047 Object

**Summary:**

There is currently a massive democratic deficit with regards to how S106 moneys are spent. For instance, the Arbury Park development resulted in very regressive changes to King's Hedges Road that had no democratic input. By contrast, the Traffic Management Area Joint Committee can easily spend half an hour on discussing a relatively small matter such as single parking space, and it only reaches that committee because the funding is from public funds. There is a high-priority need to ensure both publicly- and privately- funded changes which affect the public highway are subject to the same levels of democratic scrutiny.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.39**

## 15797 Object

**Summary:**

The democratically elected parts of the council must have more control over how such monies from developers are spent. At present, there is insufficient democratic oversight of the spending of private money from developers.

## 12 - Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and

**Question 12.39**

## 18501 Object

**Summary:**

The services included in Option 201 is not exhaustive, library services should be included because of funding and their use as hubs.
The need for the new HRCs is generally through allocations made in the adopted Minerals and Waste SSP Plan 2012. The Inspector advised that the 3 planning authorities concerned should work together to identify a suitable site for a new HRC to serve Cambridge South.

The County Council considers that 1.30 should still acknowledge the role waste will play in emerging developments, recognizing the district role as collection authority and the County's role as disposal authority.