

CAMBRIDGE NORTHERN FRINGE EAST AREA ACTION PLAN – ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT

To: Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group

From: Head of Planning Services, Cambridge City Council
Director for Planning and New Communities, South Cambridgeshire District Council
Head of Growth and Economy, Cambridgeshire County Council

Date: 16 November 2015

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Cambridge Northern Fringe East (CNFE) area is one of the most significant brownfield regeneration opportunities in Greater Cambridge. The emerging Local Plans for both Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire recognise that regeneration and redevelopment of the area is important, both in the short term, aligned with the opportunity presented by the opening of a new rail station, and in the long term to ensure that maximum regeneration benefits are captured for Greater Cambridge.

1.2 The Area Action Plan (AAP) will be a key document for guiding and shaping the development of the CNFE area, and its preparation has been prioritised to be undertaken in parallel with the local plans process. In this context, this report:

- provides an update on progress in preparing the CNFE AAP;
- informs Members of the key issues arising from comments received on the Issues and Options Report, which took place between December 2014 and February 2015;
- seeks a steer from Members on whether two revised redevelopment options should be taken forward for further investigation, including transport and development viability assessments, ahead of the preparation of the draft Plan; and
- sets out the proposed revised timetable for the preparation of the AAP for incorporation into each Councils Local Development Schemes.

1.3 This report is being submitted to the JST&SPG for prior consideration and comment before being considered by Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. The views of this group will be reported to and considered by the relevant decision making bodies of each council as part of their decision making processes. For South Cambridgeshire it will be considered by the Planning Portfolio Holder at his meeting on the afternoon of the 17 November 2015, and later for the City Council, it will be considered by the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport at the Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee on the early evening of the 17 November 2015.

2 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 The Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group recommends;

- To note the summary and conclusions of responses to the AAP Issues and Options consultation (as referred to in Appendices A and B); and
- To agree two revised options for the potential range of development for the purposes of;
 - a) testing the potential environmental and infrastructure impact and the economic viability of the emerging AAP proposals;

- b) informing the preparation of other ancillary assessments required to ensure the deliverability and soundness of the draft AAP; and
- c) guiding further conceptual urban design work that will inform the ultimate preferred development approach.

3 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The CNFE area has been the subject of comprehensive development policy aspirations for more than two decades, but there has been little in the way of any catalyst to provide the incentive to bring forward a co-ordinated development programme for the area.
- 3.2 Currently, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council are both producing new local plans for the period to 2031. Policy 14 in the submitted Cambridge Local Plan 2014 and Policy SS/4 in the submitted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2014 seek the regeneration of CNFE and say that the precise amount of development, site capacity, viability, time-scales and phasing of development will be established through the preparation of a joint AAP for defined area.
- 3.3 The importance of regenerating the northern fringe area has been recognised by both councils with the commitment to undertake the AAP work in parallel with the local plans process. Work commenced on the joint AAP through the publication and consultation on an Issues and Options Report earlier this year which included the identification of four potential options for the provision of future development in the AAP area. The completion of the analysis of comments received during that consultation now enables additional and more detailed work to proceed with a view to preparing a draft AAP for consultation and, ultimately, examination and adoption.
- 3.4 Appendix A of this report:
 - provides an update on the preparation of the AAP;
 - assesses the outcome of the Issues and Options Report consultation and, in particular, the responses to the four options for development;
 - sets out two modified development options to be used for testing their impacts and deliverability as part of developing a preferred development option; and
 - identifies the workstreams and programme for taking the AAP forward to the consultation stage on a draft document.
- 3.5 In May 2015 the Inspectors examining the two local plans wrote to the Councils outlining some preliminary conclusions following the joint hearings and further work required to support the Local Plans. In July, following an exchange of correspondence, the Inspectors recognising the positive approach taken by the Councils in addressing their concerns, formally suspended the examinations until March 2016. However, this does not preclude the principle of further work being undertaken towards the preparation of the draft CNFE AAP, especially given that there has been progress on two major infrastructure projects that will provide significant access improvements to the AAP area.
- 3.6 The extension of the Cambridgeshire Busway to the site of the proposed new Railway Station on the Chesterton Rail Sidings within the CNFE area was completed this summer. Planning permission was granted on 18 December 2013 by the Joint Development Control Committee (JDCC) for the new Railway Station, and a similar scheme was approved by the same Committee on 19 August 2015. The new Railway Station is due to open in December 2016.
- 3.7 The JDCC also granted planning permission on 18 February 2015 for the reconfiguration and consolidation of the existing Lafarge Tarmac minerals processing and DB Schenker transfer operation at Chesterton Rail Sidings which involves the relocation of the tracks within the sidings area closer to the main railway line, freeing up land for redevelopment.

- 3.8 The promoters of the proposed new town north of Waterbeach have indicated that they wish to submit a Development Framework Document and a planning application to South Cambridgeshire District Council in 2016.
- 3.9 To support the preparation of the CNFE AAP, the wider allocations of the Local Plans between Cambridge and Ely, and to assist with the delivery of future development, a major transport study has been commissioned for the A10 corridor. This is led by Cambridgeshire County Council in partnership with the local planning authorities and other agencies, and in collaboration with the landowners of significant employment sites and promoters of major proposed residential and mixed use sites including those of Waterbeach.

4. Next Steps

- 4.1 The next formal stage in preparing the AAP is the production of the “submission draft” plan based upon the councils preferred development approach to the site. In order to do this, it is essential that more detailed background work is undertaken, as outlined in Appendix A, to provide robust evidence that will demonstrate that the ultimate preferred option can be delivered.

5. Background papers

- 5.1 These background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission July 2013
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission 2013
- CNFE AAP Issues and Options Consultation Report
- Supporting Technical Statement
- Interim Sustainability Appraisal Annex: Detailed Assessment Tables – Appraisal of Spatial Redevelopment Options
- Interim Sustainability Appraisal: Appraisal of Policy Options
- Employment Options Study – Final Report
- Employment Options Study – Sector Profile
- Area Flood Risk Assessment
- Consultation and Community Engagement Strategy
- Equalities Impact Assessment

- The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004:
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2004/5/contents>

- The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012:
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/767/contents/made>

- Cambridge City Council Local Development Scheme 2014
<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/about-the-local-development-scheme-latest-information-and-timetables>

- South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Development Scheme 2014
 - <https://www.scams.gov.uk/content/local-development-scheme>

6. Appendices

- Appendix A: Cambridge Northern Fringe East AAP Update
- Appendix B: Key Issues from the CNFE AAP Issues and Options Consultation
- Appendix C: Summary of comments received to Options 1 – 4 of the Issues and Options Report

7. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Author's Name: Julian Sykes
Author's Phone Number: 01223 457384
Author's Email: julian.sykes@cambridge.gov.uk

Author's Name: Jonathan Dixon
Author's Phone Number: 01954 713194
Author's Email: jonathan.dixon@scambbs.gov.uk

Cambridge Northern Fringe East AAP Update

Background

- A1. Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, with support from Cambridgeshire County Council as a key stakeholder, started work on the development of the Cambridge Northern Fringe East Area Action Plan (CNFE AAP) early in 2014, in parallel with the later stages of the respective district wide local plans.
- A2. The initial stage, the Issues & Options Report, was informed by a number of studies and related background work primarily prepared in support of the respective draft local plans, but including locally specific information and constraints concerning matters such as odour.
- A3. The opportunities and constraints identified as a result of the background work informed the preparation of four Redevelopment Options and a further question (Q14) as to whether there are any alternative redevelopment options that should be considered e.g. include more residential development. The four Redevelopment Options suggested broad approaches as to how the area could be regenerated, namely:
- Option 1: Lower Level of Development.
 - *Creates an enhanced 'Boulevard' approach to the proposed new railway station, to provide a gateway to Cambridge.*
 - *Focuses on regeneration of areas of more easily available land, allowing existing businesses and the Water Recycling Centre to stay, whilst creating a major new area for businesses.*
 - *Could be delivered early, but does little to secure the wider regeneration of the area;*
 - Option 2: Medium Level of Development.
 - *Focuses on regeneration of areas of more easily available land, allowing existing businesses and the Water Recycling Centre to stay.*
 - *Includes new homes and a local centre near the proposed new railway station, to create a vibrant mixed use area around the gateway.*
 - *More comprehensive redevelopment improving existing areas south of Cowley Road, to integrate them into the Station area.*
 - *A new road north of Cowley Road to separate out industrial traffic from the main station access.*
 - *Option for Nuffield Road industrial area to change to offices / residential.*
 - *Could be delivered in the short to medium term;*
 - Option 3: Higher Level of Development
 - *Retains Water Recycling Centre but reconfigures onto a smaller site, with more indoor or contracted operations, subject to technical, financial and operational deliverability.*
 - *Opens up options for larger scale employment redevelopment and a mix of other uses.*
 - *Delivery of the full option would be in the longer term.*
 - *The potential to phase redevelopment to achieve the objective of an early gateway to the proposed new railway station would need to be explored, whilst ensuring that the delivery of the full option is not prejudiced by piecemeal redevelopment.*
 - *Nuffield Road industrial area is proposed for entirely residential development, with existing industry relocated north of Cowley Road;*

- Option 4: Maximum Level of Development
 - *Water Recycling Centre relocated off site, subject to identification of a suitable, viable and deliverable alternative site being identified.*
 - *Frees up a large area of land for redevelopment, and the opportunity to comprehensively address the area.*
 - *Delivery of the full option would be in the longer term.*
 - *The potential to phase redevelopment to achieve the objective of an early gateway to the proposed new railway station would need to be explored, whilst ensuring that the delivery of the full option is not prejudiced by piecemeal redevelopment.*

A4. In addition, the consultation document sought comments on the following potential policy areas:

- Land Uses
- Places Making, Gateway and Building Design
- Density and Building Design / Heights
- Employment
- Housing
- Services and Facilities
- Transport
- Climate Change and Environmental Quality
- Development Management Policies
- Infrastructure Requirements
- Development Phasing and Delivery

A5. Consultation on the Issues & Options Report took place between 8 December 2014 and 2 February 2015 in accordance with the adopted City Council's Statement of Community Involvement 2013 and Code for Best Practice on Consultation and Community Engagement July 2011, and the South Cambridgeshire Statement of Community Involvement 2010. As part of the consultation, the Issues and Options Report was made publicly available and could be downloaded from the Councils websites. Public exhibitions were also held, as follows:

- Wednesday 10 December 2014: 1pm - 7pm St John's Innovation Centre, Cowley Road, Cambridge, CB4 0WS
- Thursday 18 December 2014: 4pm - 8pm. North Area Committee – Buchan Street Community Centre, Cambridge, CB4 2XF (Note Committee meeting starts 7pm)
- Wednesday 14 January 2015: 1pm - 5pm. Trinity Centre (Science Park), Milton Road, Cambridge, CB4 0FN
- Saturday 17 January 2015: 1.30pm – 6pm. Brown's Field Youth & Community Centre, Green End Road, Chesterton, CB4 1RU
- Monday 19 January 2015: 2pm - 8pm Milton Community Centre, Cambridge, CB24 6BL

Issues and Options Consultation Response

A6. A total of 71 individuals, organisations, companies and statutory bodies submitted a total of 1,316 responses to the consultation within the consultation period. Every registered comment received during the Issues and Options consultation, as well as a summary of each comment, is available to view on the Planning Policy pages of the Council's website.

In addition, an indication of the main remarks made against each question, with the exception of the redevelopment options (Questions 10 to 13), is attached as Appendix B of this report.

A7. In relation to the four redevelopment options, the number of responses received on each were as follows:

Option	Support	Object	Comment
1 – Lower Level	17	15	8
2 – Medium Level	13	19	9
3 – Higher Level	11	21	11
4 – Maximum Level	11	24	11

A8. A summary of the comments received on each option, as well as generic comments covering all four options is attached as Appendix C of this report. The main concerns for each redevelopment option can be summarised as follows:

Option 1

- Not the best, but deliverable
- Start small and grow (natural impetus)
- Odour zones are somewhat arbitrary
- Inefficient use of land/ not strategic
- Inconsistent with vision and development objectives
- Limits development potential released by infrastructure and connectivity investments
- Omission of residential is a failure
- Opposition to Household Waste Recycling Centre position in all options

Option 2

- Still not a strategic and ambitious vision – fails to delivery wider regeneration
- Good balance between delivery and ambition
- More balanced mix of uses than Option 1
- Support provision of heavy goods vehicle access
- Sacrifices commercial land for housing
- More likely to be deliverable than options 3 and 4
- Replacement locations needed for existing businesses
- Leaves significant area of under-used land

Option 3

- Benefits from reduction of Water Recycling Centre, but concerns over deliverability
- Option too ambitious and will never happen
- Support for mixed use approach
- Maximises employment opportunities
- Imbalance between residential and employment
- Significant viability concerns

Option 4

- Option should maximise housing and densities
- Not clear on new location of WRC which could constrain proper planning of site
- Concerned about viability and deliverability

- Imbalance between homes and jobs provision
- The delivery of this amount of development could achieve development principles
- Provides a more comprehensive view

A9. The responses received to the Issues and Options consultation enable a narrowing down of potential options for the purposes of testing probable environmental and infrastructure impact and the economic viability of the AAP proposals. Two refined options have therefore been formulated which are based upon Options 2 and 4 in the Issues and Options Report. At this stage it is important to emphasise that these refined options do not represent a recommendation of preferred development options, but set out approaches for the potential range of development in order to undertake the testing referred to above together with further conceptual urban design work that will inform the ultimate preferred development approach. These options are summarised below:

- **Option 2A: Medium Level of Redevelopment** – This Option includes modifications to the original layout contained in Option 2 on the Station/Chesterton Sidings area, and incorporates a higher density across the whole of the CNFE area. It continues to focus on the regeneration of areas of more readily available land, allowing the Water Recycling Centre and other existing businesses, where possible, to remain within the area, should they so wish.

The proposals would include:

- New homes and a local centre near the proposed new station, to create a vibrant mixed use area around the gateway;
- More comprehensive redevelopment improving existing areas along Cowley Road, to integrate them into the Station area;
- A new road north of Cowley Road to separate out industrial traffic from the main station access; and
- The option for Nuffield Road industrial area to change to offices / residential.

Subject to the outcomes of testing infrastructure and transport impacts and overall viability, this option could be delivered in the short to medium term and therefore it is appropriate to undertake further assessment and more detailed urban design.

- **Option 4A: Maximum Level of Redevelopment** - This Option modifies the original Option 4 to provide a more balanced employment and residential mixed use vision, primarily through a much higher mix of residential development in the AAP. The other considerations remain the same as Option 4 in the Issues and Options Report, but it relies on the Water Recycling Centre being relocated off site.

The proposals would include:

- Increased employment provision;
- A larger area set aside for residential development;
- A local centre near the proposed new station;
- The option for the Nuffield Road area to change to residential
- a new primary school;
- Segregated heavy good vehicle and station/residential access; and
- Reconfigured aggregates railhead and sidings.

This is a more complex approach and its full delivery would require a long term approach. Importantly, the potential to bring forward early redevelopment on parts of the AAP area on a phased basis will still need to ensure the comprehensive delivery of the full option is not prejudiced by piecemeal redevelopment.

Options Assessment

- A10. In order to progress the AAP, further assessment and testing of the two refined options will be needed to inform the choice of a final development approach for incorporation into the Draft AAP. Ultimately, the final development option is likely to be a modified version of one of the options.
- A11. **Transport:** The transport impacts of development at CNFE could, depending upon the chosen option, have considerable effects on the highway network in the locality, including the A14 and A10. This in turn, depending upon the ability and viability of mitigating impacts, could determine the amount of development that can take place at CNFE.
- A12. The County Council, as highway authority, with the support of the local planning authorities, have commissioned a wider transport modelling study of the A10 corridor between Cambridge and Ely. The transport study will identify the potential impacts of planned development along the route. In the case of CNFE, it is proposed that the two redevelopment options referred to above (2A and 4A) are initially assessed and then further work will follow to refine the options. It is anticipated that the results of the full study will be known in April/May 2016.
- A13. **Infrastructure and Delivery:** The Issues and Options Report also includes consideration of infrastructure and delivery matters. The refinement of the redevelopment options, as set out above, now enables work to proceed on assessing the infrastructure requirements that would result from the scale and nature of development for securing the delivery of such infrastructure. It is therefore proposed to jointly commission a Development Infrastructure and Funding Study to provide a greater understanding of the scale, type and costs of infrastructure and the impact on development viability of paying for the infrastructure. This assessment will be necessary to demonstrate the viability of the proposals, the ability to fund infrastructure and satisfy the Planning Inspector examining the AAP that it is deliverable.
- A14. **Water Recycling Centre:** Anglian Water has commented that they do not object to the relocation of the WRC in principle but state that the funding to relocate the facility would have to come from the proceeds of redevelopment rather than Anglian Water customers. It is recognised that there is;
- considerable uncertainty regarding the viability of the relocation of the WRC;
 - further uncertainty and complexity inherent in finding a suitable alternative location for the WRC; and
 - complex technical measures to relocate an operational WRC.
- A15. Anglian Water further suggest that finding, funding and constructing a new WRC facility could take a minimum of ten years but state, in their response, to the consultation that, if this option is pursued, they would co-operate with the local planning authorities to identify solutions to these issues.
- A16. On the basis of the comments submitted by Anglian Water, a development option that includes the relocation of the WRC to another site away from CNFE needs to demonstrate that it is technically feasible, viable and deliverable and, on this basis, it is suggested that the development of Option 4A will need to involve further liaison with Anglian Water and other relevant agencies.

A17. **Further appraisals:** In addition to the above assessments, further work needs to be undertaken to assess:

- the implications of odour from Water Recycling Centre on nearby uses;
- land contamination;
- ecology impact and mitigation;
- visual impact of the options;
- noise impact and mitigation;
- air quality; and
- where necessary, other aspects which will be determined as the favoured option emerges.

Other ongoing work

A18. The Issues and Options Report asked how to deal with a range of key policy options covering aspects such as:

- densities of development,
- employment uses,
- housing mix,
- provision of services and facilities,
- place making and urban design; and
- transport.

A19. The outcome of the consultation, together with the requirement not to repeat policies that are included in other local plans or the NPPF, will now inform the preparation of any specific policies that will be required for the consideration of development proposals in the AAP area. Work will proceed on drafting such policies, having regard to the ongoing examination of the generic policies in the respective local plans, the outcome of the A10 Transport Study and the Development Infrastructure and Funding Study and any other assessments as referred to above.

Stakeholder Group

A20. A CNFE Stakeholders Group involving the local planning authorities, other agencies, landowners and promoters has been established to support the preparation and delivery of the CNFE AAP.

Timetable

A21. Whilst other preparatory work will continue, the next formal stages of the CNFE AAP timetable will be determined primarily by the timescales of the A10 Corridor Transport Study and other required assessments. The preparatory work is expected to continue through to June/July 2016 and will be finalised alongside the working up and testing (transport, viability and potentially other considerations) of the preferred option for CNFE in order to provide a sound evidence base for demonstrating the deliverability of the AAP. The Draft AAP will then be finalised in September/October 2016 alongside the Sustainability Appraisal before undergoing a self-assessment of soundness and legal compliance. It is anticipated that in November 2016 Members will be asked to consider the Submission Draft AAP for the purposes of publication with the commencement of the Public Consultation in January 2017. This timetable is illustrated below:

Key Milestone	Date	Progress
Commencement of AAP	March 2014	Complete
Issues & Options Consultation	December 2014 to February 2015	Complete
Members consider Submission Draft AAP prior to public consultation	November 2016	
Publication of Submission Draft AAP & Public Consultation	January 2017 to March 2017	
Submission	June 2017	
Examination of AAP	June 2017 to November 2017	
Adoption and Publication of AAP	December 2017	

- A22. This timetable will require amendments to the adopted Local Development Scheme for both Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils which is being considered as separate items by each authority.

APPENDIX B

Summary of main remarks made against each question

See Appendix C for comments relating to Development Options

CHAPTER 2 – QUESTION 1:

VISION

Do you support or object to this vision for CNFE? Do you have any comments?

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
28	13	6	9

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
----------	--

Qu1 Vision (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considerable support for the vision for CNFE • New railway station is supported along with retention of railhead • Support for new and existing waste management facilities • The CB4 site/ Chesterton Partnership able to deliver a comprehensively planned re-development of the largest brownfield site in Cambridge, without the involvement of multiple land owning parties, ensuring the regeneration of CNFE in tandem with the new rail station opening. • Plan will promote / create a network of green spaces and corridors to support local ecology and surface water mitigation.
Qu1 Vision (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to relocation of sewage works • Site redevelopment will require considerable public investment because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is in an inaccessible location ○ Anglian Water sewage works and railway sidings hampers development potential ○ Power line need to be removed. ○ Stagecoach will need to be relocated. ○ New railway station could increase traffic. ○ Brookgate would have to develop site in a way that would work coherently with potential future development in the area. ○ Transport links would need to be improved. • Relocate Sewage Works to enable residential use. • Put commercial units beside A14, to provide a sound/pollution barrier. • Need for housing rather more commercial units. • The aggregates railhead should be accessed by westbound off- and on-slips from and to the A14. Aggregates vehicles should not travel via the Milton Road. • The Household Waste Recycling Centre should stay at Butt Lane. • Masterplan should safeguard a route for a road across into Fen Road Chesterton. Provide a new level crossing or a bridge over the railway or extend planned foot/cycle bridge to Fen Road. • Vision should encourage greater site intensification. • Vision is unrealistic and contains no clear implementation timescales, with specific reference to: transport funding and improvements; mitigation of incompatible land uses; relocation of existing uses; land ownership fragmentation; and market demand. • New development must not have a detrimental effect on established businesses. • Specific mention of biodiversity required. • Include reference to the proposed Waterbeach New Town. • Need for much more housing and employment • Housing need on this site is uncertain • The vision needs to provide high quality urban centre

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site's continued use for aggregates and waste management will detract from the key objective to deliver a high quality business centre; • Given the employment-led focus, 'sustainable urban living' should comprise part of the overall vision
Qu1 Vision (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for masterplan and comprehensive planning of CNFE • The development should provide everything for its residents including doctors, schools, and cemetery. • New Household Waste Recycling Centre unnecessary • Need policies for renewable and low carbon energy generation and sustainable design and construction • Greater emphasis on developing area as an internationally renowned business, research and development centre. • Site must address current access and infrastructure difficulties. • Essential that the whole area is masterplanned. • Station access via new road adjacent to sewage works • Provide covered square at CNFE and pedestrianised boulevard on existing Cowley Road • Relocate Police Station to CNFE • New NIAB-sized site for 4000+ houses adjacent to the station, in addition to the residential towers

CHAPTER 3 – QUESTION 2:

DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

Do you support or object to these objectives and how would you improve them?

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
24	14	4	6

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
Qu2 Development Objectives (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The important issues have been identified • Obj. 2 supported but should support higher densities. • Obj. 2 and wider development objectives should reference residential land use. • Wildlife Trust welcomes inclusion of objective 7 • Plan will promote / create a network of green spaces and corridors to support local ecology and surface water mitigation. • Objective 3 & 6 considered most important
Qu2 Development Objectives (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives are currently too generic and require further clarity. • Objectives need strengthening to reflect scale/ density of development necessary to attract momentum. Specific goals are key to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ achieve relocation/ reconfiguration of water treatment plant ○ provide substantial new employment opportunities ○ provide residential development on a sufficient scale - more vibrant/ highly sustainable ○ consider denser utilisation/ regeneration (eg Science Park) ○ create connectivity between Science Park, city centre, NE/E Cambridge, villages, beyond ○ enable preparation of detailed, phased master plan - a clearer vision underpinning redevelopment of overall area - including integration of denser developments - enhanced viability and associated quality

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives should ensure the importance of integrating new development with existing development. Appropriate land use relationships need to be secured between new and existing development to ensure neighbouring land uses are compatible with each other. • Objectives are ambitious and not based upon fully researched realistic outcomes. • Objectives should focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ what is deliverable in next five years ○ development standards ○ phasing of land use changes with implementation of new transport links ○ relocation of existing industrial uses (including assessment of alternative locations) ○ Objectives should also focus on mixed use scheme while retaining as many existing industrial use; • Proposed objectives should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ emphasis the contribution CNFE will make to the wider regeneration and growth agenda of Cambridge ○ include the need to ensure a well-coordinated and integrated approach between CNFE and Waterbeach New Town ○ emphasis the need to maximise the potential of the railway station • Include a specific reference to residential to provide support for better balance of land uses. • Include a specific reference to mixed use development; zoning approach could work against well designed buildings. • Stronger connections required to wider area for effective integration. • Highly zoned mono use land blocks works against the objective for a well-integrated neighbourhood. • Current imbalance of land uses could increase carbon footprint, encourage unsustainable travel behaviour and add to emissions. • Further objective needed which highlights potential interface of site not only with immediate neighbourhood but also with more distant locations which can access it through sustainable travel modes. • Complex scheme higher ambitious/ coherent manner needed regarding the quality and type of employment uses proposed for the AAP area within these objectives. • When Sewage Works are removed, area needs to incorporate a new residential area with low-energy housing, community facilities, public open spaces, school and shops linked primarily with foot/cycle paths and bus/roads on the periphery.
<p>Qu2 Development Objectives (Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No excuse to move the Sewage Works • Just as important to maximise affordable housing and schools as it is to maximise employment opportunities • Consideration for a new direct route for cyclists from Abbey to the new station needed • Objective 2 - Amend to ensure the land uses are compatible with neighbouring uses. • New objective to encourage low carbon lifestyle, minimisation of waste both during construction and occupational use and address climate change issues. • New / amend objective to include the consideration for health • The CNFE plan will promote the creation of a network of green spaces and corridors, incorporating ecological mitigation and enhancement and measures to manage surface water. • Important to ensure that the current business research and development and technology function is not diluted. • Useful to identify 'character areas' to confirm the established nature of

	<p>different parts of the AAP area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration needs to be given to how to integrate with the wider community given the perceived and physical barriers surrounding the CNFE. • Important to emphasise the quality of the employment opportunities, reflecting the significant training and apprenticeships opportunities that the employment use here could generate, both during construction and afterwards. • Any new local centre needs to capitalise on both local needs and those using the new station to make sure sustainable and vibrant for extended hours. This ideally means co-location of such facilities but if the planned location of the station prevents this, links between the two are considered important. • This should also mean being well-connected with existing users so for example the owners of Cambridge Business Park and St John's Innovation Centre could be encouraged to create better physical connections, particularly for pedestrian and cyclists, with the new station and the remainder of the CNFE AAP area.
--	---

CHAPTER 4 – QUESTION 3:

AAP BOUNDARY

Do you support or object to the current area identified for the AAP?

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
26	17	6	3

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
Qu3 AAP Boundary (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area needs rejuvenation and should improve the North side of the City • Support CNFE area and Option B boundary extension • CNFE boundary is concurrent with the Draft Local Plans • The economic development perspective are supported
Qu3 AAP Boundary (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand eastern boundary to include current Traveller's site for new housing. • Remove sewage works from CNFE • St Johns Innovation Centre and the other business premises including the Cambridge Business Park do not need redevelopment or intensification • The St John's Innovation land should be included within the CNFE provided that there are no more onerous conditions or policies applied to the CNFE plan area • Boundary needs to include the area to the East of the railway (Fen Road) • The eastern boundary should be re-drawn to include land either side of Fen Road and up to the River Cam, with the proviso that development in that area should not compromise Green Belt principles
Qu3 AAP Boundary (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AAP boundary is defined in the respective draft Local Plans for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire and therefore in procedural terms any amendments may be problematic and should only be contemplated if there are clear and convincing merits in so doing. St John's Innovation Park should only be retained within boundary if it can be allowed to be intensified otherwise it should be excluded • Retain screening within plan and be taken into account for potential waste applications on Anglian Water site

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relationship to the Traveller and Gypsy site should be explored in order to protect the site and associated access.
--	---

CHAPTER 4 – QUESTION 4:

AAP BOUNDARY EXTENSION - OPTION A CAMBRIDGE SCIENCE PARK

Do you support or object to the extension of the CNFE AAP to include Option A - The Cambridge Science Park?

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
27	12	9	6

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
----------	--

Qu4 AAP Boundary Extension Option A – Cambridge Science Park (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area should be included in order to retain control over intensification Include Cambridge Science Park in order to fully address site and station Include Cambridge Science Park because this would provide comprehensive redevelopment principles to both sites, which are adjacent, benefit from the same transport hub, and share similar problems of access Support for proposed boundary and Option ‘A’ extension to include Cambridge Science Park to ensure satisfactory transport modelling is completed.
Qu4 AAP Boundary Extension Option A – Cambridge Science Park (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusion of the Science Park would require a dilution of the aims set out in the proposed AAP vision and objectives Little or no direct relevance of the Science Park to the significant development opportunities that exist further to the east Sufficient policy controls already exist for the Cambridge Science Park Cambridge Science Park is an existing facility while CNFE is a regeneration development Cambridge Science Park should be treated as a separate AAP if redevelopment guidance for the park is needed. No explicit need for the Cambridge Science Park to be included in CNFE boundary Unclear why Cambridge Regional College has been included in boundary AAP not needed to drive large scale redevelopment onsite Policy E/1 of the draft South Cambridgeshire Local Plan would facilitate the redevelopment of the Cambridge Science Park Science Park already developed; option to include it is confusing and unwarranted
Qu4 AAP Boundary Extension Option A – Cambridge Science Park (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace buildings 2 to 24b at the Cambridge Science Park with medium density development with carbon-neutral, radical, sustainable development Unclear about the reasons for including the Cambridge Science Park other than for reasons to do with traffic entering/leaving the area. Inclusion of the Cambridge Science Park (Option A) may be beneficial in the long-term in delivering a more sustainable and well connected development and in achieving Draft Policy E/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. However, the inclusion should be further explored regarding Local Plans development’ its inclusion should not delay the proposed investment and development on the remainder of the CNFE area.

CHAPTER 4 – QUESTION 5:**AAP BOUNDARY EXTENSION - OPTION B CHESTERTON SIDINGS TRIANGLE**

Do you support or object to the extension of the CNFE AAP to include Option B - The additional triangular area south of Chesterton Sidings?

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
27	25	0	2
Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation		
Qu5 AAP Boundary Extension Option B – Chesterton Sidings Triangle (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option will support Objective 6 & 8 • Support the lands inclusion if it is needed to for the comprehensive development of the new station and immediate surroundings. • Include if it maintains or improves access to the railway station • Option enhances the green transport options for CNFE • Option enhances important cycle and pedestrian links to the south • Option will support improved cycle and pedestrian links and the Chisholm Trail 		
Qu5 AAP Boundary Extension Option B – Chesterton Sidings Triangle (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the approved station plans, this area is earmarked for species-rich grassland as part of ecological mitigation • Link across the railway and river very important • Keen for the Chisholm Trail to progress • Area should be a designated transport connection between the station, surrounding developments and the Chisholm Trail. • Replacement location needed before existing site can be released 		

CHAPTER 4 – QUESTION 6:**NAMING THE DEVELOPMENT AREA**

This area is planned to change significantly over coming years. What do you think would be a good new name for this part of Cambridge?

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
17	3	0	14
Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation		
Qu6 Naming the Development Area (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area name should not be decided by an individual landowner 		
Qu6 Proposed Railway Station Name (Other suggestions)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science Park - Simple and established • Cambridge North • Chesterton Paradox • Cambridge Science and Industry, Chesterton Northeast • The area name should match the station name 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science Park East • Cambridge Park • Cambridge Fen Innovation Gateway • Cambridge Business Park • Chesterton Junction
--	---

CHAPTER 4 – QUESTION 7:

NAMING THE PROPOSED NEW RAILWAY STATION (OPTIONS a – e)

Do you support or object to naming the proposed new railway station,?

Respondents		Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
Qu7a	24	11	12	1
Qu7b	15	0	14	1
Qu7c	30	24	2	4
Qu7d	13	1	11	1
Qu7e	10	0	1	9

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
Qu7a Naming Option – Cambridge Science Park Station (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is already ‘known’ as that. • It identifies the location of the new station • The Cambridge Science Park is the best known of the groups of offices in this area and is often referred to as representing all of them • World renowned centre of technological and business excellence
Qu7a Naming Option – Cambridge Science Park Station (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge North so when Addenbrookes has a station that can be called Cambridge South • Station not on Science Park; the name is misleading • Station is more than just for the Science Park • Cambridge Science Park is 1/2mile west of the station • Object to name Chesterton Interchange Station • Naming new station after Science Park would be misleading resulting in poor legibility • Station not at the Science Park • Should not be called Cambridge Science Park • Name is misleading and confusing
Qu7a Naming Option – Cambridge Science Park Station (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Station will benefit from name based affiliation • If option (a) emerges as a key descriptor then name should become Cambridge Science Parks in recognition of proximity of several relevant campuses.
Qu7b Naming Option –	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge North so when Addenbrookes has a station that can be called Cambridge South • It is neither in Chesterton nor is it an interchange

Chesterton Interchange Station (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nobody outside Cambridge will know where it is • Gives wrong impression • Searching online, people will not realise this station in Cambridge without Cambridge at the beginning • Station is not an interchange; it is a new destination • Unimaginative • Cambridge North • Name is misleading; Station is not an interchange with other railways
Qu7c Naming Option – Cambridge North Station (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes what it will be • Makes sense • Cambridge North so when Addenbrookes has a station that can be called Cambridge South • Appropriate as tied to the wider geographical area that it serves is more inclusive • Name is suited giving the area a higher profile
Qu7c Naming Option – Cambridge North Station (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unimaginative
Qu7c Naming Option – Cambridge North Station (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already called Cambridge Science Park and clearly identifies the location • Name must start with Cambridge to aid online searching • CNFE station should be called Cambridge Park Station & City station should be called Cambridge station to improve legibility and help tourists who visit the city • If "science park" emerges as part of this consultation as a key descriptor, we contend that it should be used in the plural - "Cambridge Science Parks" - in recognition of proximity of several relevant campuses. • Identifies in Cambridge and geographically to the north
Qu7d Naming Option – Cambridge Fen Station (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beside Fen Road at Chesterton Fen, near Fen Ditton, and at the junction to Fen Drayton
Qu7d Naming Option – Cambridge Fen Station (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misleading - Station not in the Fen • Name not representative of the location • Undermines proposed vision which is for integration into Cambridge • Won't be in Fens once built around
Qu7e Naming Option – Any Other Suggestions (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge North • Cambridge Science Park • CNFE station should be called Cambridge Park Station & City station should be called Cambridge station to improve legibility and help tourists who visit the city • Cambridge Fen Gateway Station • Milton

CHAPTER 6 – QUESTION 8:

SITE CONTEXT AND CONSTRAINTS

Do you have any comments on the Site Context and Constraints, and what other issues and constraints should be taken into account in the preparation of the Area Action Plan?

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
27	1	3	23
Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation		
Qu8 Site Context and Constraints (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting focus on cycle and pedestrian infrastructure and prioritising this. Ensure area is easy and safe to get to by bike – this is crucial, if the council is to limit increased vehicular congestion. 		
Qu8 Site Context and Constraints (Object)	<p><i>Site Constraints</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial viability. Inaccessible location Anglian Water sewage works and railway sidings hampers development potential Power line would need to be removed. Relocation of stagecoach needed. New station could increase traffic. Brookgate would have to develop site in a way that would work coherently with potential future development in the area. Transport links would need to be improved. We object strongly to the siting of such a new recycling centre as shown in the four options. 		
Qu8 Site Context and Constraints (Comment)	<p><i>Facilities/land uses</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reconsider relocation of water recycling centre Sewage works should remain where they are The Sewage Works should be removed to permit a greater proportion of residential development where the ground conditions permit If the site is largely unsuitable for dwellings both in terms of costs to mitigate contamination and odour issues why would it be conceivable that developments such as restaurants and cafés would be viable? There is the potential through the redevelopment of the site to enhance the First Public Drain, with surface water mitigation, ecological or aesthetic values using a number of possible hydrogeological improvements. Lack of information on traffic and junction layout prevents the assessment of relative impact of options. Household Waste Recycling Centre could be relocated; further research will be needed to explore this constraint Need for housing uncertain on this site against competing land uses Relocation of non-conforming uses is desirable Open space needs careful thought Loss or replacement of the golf driving range not adequately addressed Protection of the waste facility is contradictory to the aim of the AAP Unsuitable access for household recycling facility; too close to Jane Coston bridge and crosses protected verge land. 		

Transport

- Network Rail's disused private access road from Milton Road to Chesterton railway sidings running along the north side of the Business Park should be made into a public footpath and cycleway travelling to and from the new railway station.
- Crown Estate should install side entrances on the North side of the Cambridge Business Park
- Local parking will have an impact on local residents
- How will local buses be improved
- Milton Road is already at capacity. Direct access to and within the site should be prioritised for pedestrians, cyclists and users of the guided bus (to discourage use of cars).
- Aggregate lorries should be restricted to the northern perimeter.
- Highway capacity remains a significant constraint requiring further investigation with a mitigation strategy developed as part of any future development proposals.
- Need to reflect all transport modes
- Until updated evidence base including sensitivity testing and transport modelling data is available and understood, there is no benefit with developing the AAP until they are available.
- CNFE should not proceed without Network Rail allowing a cycle and foot path along their land south of Cowley Road
- Need to focus on cycle and pedestrian infrastructure
- Good access for pedestrians and cyclists requires careful consideration

Utilities

- Consider safeguarding the old surface water drain under the sidings (and existing railway) straight through to Camside Farm, which could be a cheaper route for a sewage connection under the railway to Fen Road residents.
- Surface water runoff should be controlled to avoid flooding commercial premises and residences in Fen Road.

Design

- Buildings on the site should be no taller than three floors.
- There should be NO ugly/massive/inhuman 'statement' or 'gateway' buildings on the site.

Links with neighbouring developments

- Need to provide contextual strategic developments to ensure well-coordinated and integrated developments i.e. Waterbeach and associated transport links
- Greater focus should be given to how the wider region (e.g. major housing development West of Cambridge) can access CNFE

Other

- Contamination should not be overstated and seen as a barrier to development. The current odour maps do not reflect Anglian Water's proposed WRC upgrades and should be re-visited
- The issue of land ownership and a commitment of land owners to bring forward land remains a critical feature of the Plan. Whilst the presence of Anglian Water is important it is the case that development can still proceed nearby where appropriate mitigation measures are put in place.
- Would the regeneration of the AAP site for residential, office and R&D

	<p>purposes be the most advantageous way to provide employment opportunities on this site for those as described in paragraph 6.4 of the consultation document, adjacent "disadvantage communities"?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to safeguard the old surface water drain under the sidings (and existing railway) straight through to Camside Farm, a potentially cheaper route for a sewage connection under the railway to Fen Road residences. • Odour issues for WRC key • Density strategy is key and locations for this need careful thought as well.
--	---

CHAPTER 7 – QUESTION 9:

DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES

Do you support or object to the Development Principles (A to P)? Please add any comments or suggestions.

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
25	12	6	7

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
----------	--

<p>Qu9 Development Principles (Support)</p>	<p><i>Principles</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for A, B, D, F, G, L, M, N, O & P • Support B, leisure facilities and open space. • Principals E, F and G will maximise the Employment opportunities of the area. • Support development principle M; in particular the recognition of the importance of biodiversity features being part of a well-connected network. • Subject to highways access issues highlighted above, support these principles to maximise employment opportunities, but would like to see further emphasis on the B1(b) uses. <p><i>Objectives</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend Objective B to read "By creating a sustainable, cohesive and inclusive area by ensuring there is appropriate support, improving access to jobs, homes, open space, leisure facilities and other services within the development and to the wider community". • 2 & 3 most important • Support for the principle of locating higher density development in close proximity to the transport hubs.
<p>Qu9 Development Principles (Object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without changing Development Principles, these will be used to justify the relocation of the Sewage Works to a greenfield site. The existing Sewage Works and underground piping represents a vast investment. <p><i>Objective 1</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A -Current planning mustn't be overturned by commercial interests. • A - Is a piecemeal approach lacking the coherence and critical mass needed to maximise the potential the area has to contribute to the future of the City and South Cambs. • B - No to commercial/industrial as this would attract more attract traffic <p><i>Objective 2</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need explicit references to: high densities given the highly sustainable

	<p>location of CNFE the provision of residential use to meet the need identified in para 1.13</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C - Object to the development of R&D, industrial or commercial purposes unless these are on the perimeter of the site. • D - The guided busway route should retain wide pedestrian and cycle paths beside it, with trees and hedges to protect each from the other and to provide wind protection. Footpaths and cycle paths should be permitted the direct routes; cars should be directed via longer routes to preserve open green space. <p><i>Objective 3</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E - Should be a greater proportion of residential development than industrial. • G - Sewage works should be moved. • G – relocate <p><i>Objective 4</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H - A sustainable new community should be developed with community buildings, local shops houses and a school. <p><i>Objective 5</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I - object to 'development forms' which are large, tall, ugly, conceived as a 'gateway' and poorly designed. I would require human-scale, attractive buildings which are fit for purpose with green space attractive for public use between them. • J - cyclists/pedestrians should have priority. Cars should use the periphery. <p><i>Objective 6</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K - Object to the 'creation of a gateway' which implies a combination of tall, overbearing buildings and draughty, overshadowed streets between them. <p><i>Other</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development, by trying to satisfy development for everyone lacks focus. • There is significant economic potential to promote the wider Cambridge North area including Cambridge Northern Fringe and A10 corridor such as the Research Park and Waterbeach New Town.
<p>Qu9 Development Principles (Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access and traffic must be fully addressed • Refer to the Water Recycling Centre as the Sewage Works • Opportunities identified for the CNFE reflect need to maximise employment opportunities & the St. John's Innovation Park must play a role in this approach <p><i>Objective 4 (Principles C & D)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C - Is too commercially focussed and could work against the need for balanced mix of uses to deliver the most sustainable place that is well integrated with adjoining communities and provides real benefit to those communities. A principle relating to the new residential community envisaged within the AAP area would provide better balance. • C - Should be strengthened to make it abundantly clear that the Council is seeking for CNFE to be delivered as a high quality, exemplar commercial-led scheme. As written the objective does not provide for this important aspiration.

- C - Inadequate emphasis to the employment-led priority for the area and appears to give too much encouragement to residential uses;
- D - Do not agree that this should be focused "around the transport hub" which implies the new railway station. May be appropriate for CB1 but not for CNFE
- C & D - do not make any reference to residential under Objective 2.

Objective 3 (Principles E, F & G)

- Objective 3 shouldn't get highest priority.
- Maximising employment opportunities should include existing developments and brownfield regeneration sites.
- F - "Where possible" too loosely worded; Principle dependent on cost. Developers should provide the same facilities at a limited % extra cost to where they are currently, or for a limited time. Current light industrial users may not be able to afford to stay with no obvious location for them to move to.
- F - Should have a higher ambition of relocating existing businesses, particularly where they are non-conforming, as being "appropriate" and not merely as "possible".
- G - Should not be automatically assumed that the strategic aggregates railhead will be required to be retained on the CNFE site in perpetuity. There may be opportunities to consider other locations whereby its presence will not detract from the quality of development that the Council should be properly seeking at CNFE.
- G - Gives unqualified support for difficult uses (aggregates and waste) without recognising their potential to compromise the quality of the development achievable.

Objective 5 (Principles I & J)

- Reference to mixed use development should be included; zoning approach could work against well designed buildings.

Objective 6 (Principles K & L)

- Stronger connections required to wider area for effective integration. Highly zoned mono use land blocks works against the objective for a well-integrated neighbourhood.
- K - Needs to be broadened to reflect and recognise the other transport modes and routes by which people will access the CNFE area. As written it largely assumes that the railway station and the busway alone are what makes the area a transport hub. That is short-sighted as there is other transport infrastructure such as cycle routes, roads and conventional buses that can equally provide ready access to and from CNFE.
- Care needed with delivery of Principle L alongside existing and planned mineral and waste activity to avoid conflict.

Objective 7 (Principles M, N & O)

- Dev Principle M. Allow the strip of land beside the ditch along Cowley Road to remain a green space with a footpath along it.
- As watercourses are included, we suggest a change to "...a network of green and blue spaces..."
- We also suggest removing the word "attractive" as this is a very subjective idea and not relevant to benefitting biodiversity.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N - Every opportunity should be taken to make the site greener. • O – Caveat this objective by the addition of the words "where necessary". <p><i>Objective 8 (Principle P)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires a mixed community - current imbalance of land uses will increase carbon footprint, encourage unsustainable travel behaviour and add to emissions. • Larger scale and denser development should be centrally located within the AAP area and should not be reflected by the erection of large scale buildings at the eastern edge of the wider site - i.e. where the railway station is to be situated. • The scale, massing and density of development should step down where the CNFE area adjoins and interacts with open countryside and could impact adversely on the setting of the City unless carefully managed and integrated. • There is an obvious interface for an aggregation of larger scale buildings where the designated CNFE area meets with the existing parks in the area, such as St John's Innovation Park, the Cambridge Business Park and the Cambridge Science Park. <p><i>Other</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the addition of a new local centre within the AAP area which will meet the needs of existing and future workers and residents. • Additional development principle needed to ensure essential services /infrastructure retained or provided such as Household Recycling Centre. • Include "health" to address deprivation in/around Chesterton.
--	--

See Appendix C for summary of responses to Questions 10, 11, 12 and 13 – Development Options 1 to 4

CHAPTER 8 – QUESTION 14:			
ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS			
Are there alternative redevelopment options you think we should have considered? For example, do you think the redevelopment options should include more residential development, and if so to what extent?			
Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
34	3	1	30
Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation		
Qu14 Alternative Proposals (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Cycling Campaign questions the apparent mutual exclusivity between residential and employment uses within the redevelopment options. Advisable to plan for a balance between these two uses as this balance will reduce the need for travel at the development. Reducing the trips needed reduces private car use and provides increased opportunities for walking and cycling. A balance in the development's uses will also 		

	<p>reduce the tidal nature of the trips that are generated, lessening the impact on the transport network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The car park development should not be 600 capacity (as it is proposed), but 6,000 car park. Otherwise residents of the surrounding area will be affected.
<p>Qu14 Alternative Proposals (Object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slightly concerned about “intensive” use of land (options 3 and 4)
<p>Qu14 Alternative Proposals (Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much more residential required; over supply of offices once CB1 is finished • New orbital bus route for Cambridge • All reliant on link roads to Fen Ditton and Wadloes Road. • The mix looks optimal • Any development of residential accommodation on this site beyond that in options 1 to 3 would be inappropriate in view of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the odour problems; and ○ the undesirability of making the population of Cambridge even bigger than it already is. • Option 3 - the area will benefit more from strategic long term transformation. • Option 4 - unlikely to occur, so focus effort on achievable solution. Most important thing is sufficient parking and traffic measures to access train station by car. • Options 2, 3 and 4 show heavy goods vehicle access through Stagecoach site. No details on how, where and financing of a relocated bus depot. • Undertaking low and medium development can be done immediately without the need to wait for AW to relocate (something which is not viable). There is an immediate demand for B1(c), B2, B8 space within the city and without this site being developed immediately these occupiers will be forced to leave the city. Moving occupiers from Clifton Road, The Paddocks etc will also free up Brownfields sites for residential within the city. Cowley Road is the only site for them within Cambridge. • Support for Options 1 and 2 because they leave open the option of a sensible future development of the water recycling site that could (and should) include a major new green area (at least 75% of the site). • None of the current proposals add any significant green open spaces. The only green areas shown are no more than token buffer spaces. • This is a great opportunity for providing the City or Cambridge with a new green lung, which could include appropriate leisure opportunities and help re-balance the current trend to over-development. • Whichever option 1-4 is chosen, priority should be given to improving the smelliest parts of the Wastewater Treatment Plant's operation, which now seems to be the open storm tanks that smelly water goes into when it rains hard after a long dry spell. This type of weather will become more common, and there seems to be no justification for having the waste tanks open to the air. They should be covered and the air extracted should be scrubbed so that the smell is removed. • More affordable residential housing with green spaces, shops, banks, post office etc • More car parking space on the site if this project is going to reduce traffic on the M11 going south, the A14 going east and west and the A10 going north. The whole idea is to get people on to the main railway for the long journey. • Option 2a, an enhanced medium level of redevelopment would facilitate a significantly greater number of dwellings near the station, increased

	<p>Offices/RD provision with associated increase in job creation and an increased amount of new informal open space. It would facilitate more efficient use of the land, with a balanced mix of land uses at densities which make the best use of the highly sustainable location. A hotel is proposed adjacent to the station and overall early delivery remains achievable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more car parking space on the site to reduce traffic on the M11 and A14, with people using the main railway for the long journey. • Residential development needs careful consideration given the Water Recycling Centre (Options 1-3), strategic aggregates railheads (Options 1-4) and waste uses (Options 1-4). These facilities and proposed waste management uses, have consultation / safeguarding areas designated by adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan. These Areas seek to prevent essential existing / planned facilities being prejudiced. If residential development is proposed it should be located away from these uses, and demonstrate that existing and allocated waste management / aggregate facilities will not be prejudiced.
--	---

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 15:			
PLACE AND BUILDING DESIGN			
Do you support or object to the proposed approach for place and building design, and why?			
Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
12	8	2	2
Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation		
Qu15 Place and building design (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad support for proposed place and building design approach in principle • Support for a high density approach, in particular around transport interchanges 		
Qu15 Place and building design (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not appropriate to set design standards before setting quantum and types of development. • No clear explanation of what the proposed approach means. 		
Qu15 Place and building design (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design objectives should be similar to those at North West Cambridge site • Bespoke design approach is needed to respond to site significance and context • Consideration needed for the use and site context when setting out the requirements for place and building design especially for waste uses, e.g. adjacent to the A14 with existing screening and surrounding uses. • Concerned that agreeing a detailed design strategy is not deliverable due to the number of different landowners. Set a detailed design strategy for CB4 site which can then inform future CNFE area phases. • High density development requires accompanying sufficient open space, with careful design to break-up massing of tall buildings close to the road 		

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 16:**DENSITIES****Do you support or object to the proposed approach on densities, and why?**

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
19	10	5	4
Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation		
Qu16 Densities (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support from most respondents for the proposed approach • Exploit footprint capabilities through height • Support higher density approach, providing more housing and employment. • Support a design-led approach reflecting the different land uses and viabilities within the CNFE, matching recent approach at Cambridge Science Park. • Support for a bespoke approach reflecting site context. 		
Qu16 Densities (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed approach is too vague. • Not appropriate to set design standards before setting quantum and types of development. • Object to assertion that greatest density should be focused on new railway station interchange, as it is peripheral to the site and is on the edge of Cambridge, unlike the CB1 area developments around Cambridge rail station. • Highest density should be at centre of CNFE area where buildings would be juxtaposed with pre-existing large-scale commercial buildings. 		
Qu16 Densities (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developments around Cambridge Station are too high to be used at CNFE. • Density should reflect general low density across Cambridge • Object to tall buildings, including proposal for a multi-storey car park • Alternative proposals including specific densities were provided. • Support from an economic development perspective • Considerations to be weighed against benefits of higher densities: • Access and impact on existing uses and the existing townscape • Effect on traffic. • Reflect edge of city location • Allow for open space, cycle and pedestrian routes 		

CHAPTER 10 – QUESTION 17:**TALL BUILDINGS AND SKYLINE****Do you support or object to the proposed approach on tall buildings and skyline, and why?**

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
19	6	3	10
Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation		
Qu17 Tall buildings and skyline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the proposed approach to tall buildings and protection of the skyline. • Support for further tall buildings policies specific to the AAP, including 		

(support)	<p>wording to require that existing form is taken into consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the principles described in Cambridge Local Plan 2014 Proposed Submission which recognise that outside the centre, buildings in Cambridge are mainly 2-3 residential storeys high.
Qu17 Tall buildings and skyline (object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for using the Local Plan policy as a baseline for the development of more specific AAP specific policies. • Not appropriate to set design standards before understanding the types and quantum of development. • Consideration of tall building heights should be part of a site specific master-planning exercise, taking into account relevant considerations. • Objection to any buildings over 4 storeys (16m) high. • Be innovative; don't be constrained by policy
Qu17 Tall buildings and skyline (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for taller buildings which make more efficient use of land, and add a dramatic aspect to development. • Agree in principle for skyline to be dealt with in line with eventual Local Plan policy, but currently seeking amendments to policy in submission Local Plan so premature to agree at this stage with this question. • The context provided by neighbouring buildings should be the key criteria for assessing the acceptability of building heights in the area. • Any proposals will need to take into account the requirements placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport (referral for 15m and above in this area). In addition to this consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional / unnecessary screening and landscaping. • Support from an economic development perspective. • The acceptability of building heights in the St John's Innovation Park area, were the principle of plot densification to be accepted, should be assessed within the context of surrounding uses and buildings. • Support for higher density in this area. • Support for the addition of buildings over six storeys. • Objection to any buildings higher than six storeys. • Propose buildings of up to 25 storeys if the maximum level of redevelopment were to be selected. • No clear explanation of what the proposed approach means.

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 18 (a-d)

BUILDINGS HEIGHTS

Do you support or object to the proposed Options on building heights, and why?

Respondents		Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
18a	17	6	10	1
18b	18	5	11	2
18c	18	8	9	1
18d	12	0	1	11

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
Qu18a Building Heights (support)	<p>Support for this approach for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order not to damage the general feel of the area, and prevent a “large city” feel. • New buildings of a similar height to those on the existing Cambridge Business Park would not be likely to adversely impact on the setting of nearby heritage assets. • Tall developments like those at CB1 dwarf existing development, and would not be appropriate at the edge of the city. Smaller, “human-sized” buildings would be more appropriate. • Support for this approach, provided that tall building policy wording states that existing building form should be taken into consideration.
Qu18a Building Heights (object)	<p>Limitation of development to four floors is not desirable because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 storeys is a waste of land. • It would prevent a density of development in keeping with the sustainable location. • It would prevent the creation of landmark buildings on this site. • This option does not maximise the redevelopment opportunity. • Taller buildings would make more efficient use of the land, and would add a dramatic feature to the landscape. • With fens to the north, taller buildings would not affect the view of Cambridge. • This level of development will not maximise the use of the land, or allow for the creation of a sustainable and successful urban community. • There are no views to protect, therefore building heights should be unrestricted, with developers allowed to build as tall as possible, subject to design considerations. • Support for the principles described in Cambridge Local Plan 2014 Proposed Submission which recognise that outside the centre, buildings in Cambridge are mainly 2-3 residential storeys high.
Qu18a Building Heights (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building heights up to 16m may be acceptable and compatible with the safe operation of the airport. • Matching the site with its surroundings is key to protecting the landscape and the feel of the area. • Buildings of 4 storeys may not be economic for developers. • Any proposals will need to take into account the requirements placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport (referral for 15m and above in this area). In addition to this consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional / unnecessary screening and landscaping. • Support an approach which continues the scale and form of development of the Cambridge Business Park perhaps allowing the opportunity to create a single taller landmark building around the new station.
Qu18b Building Heights (support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limiting building heights to 4 storeys is a waste of land. • There are no views to protect, therefore building heights should be allowed to be unrestricted, with developers allowed to build as tall as possible, subject to design considerations. • This option would be less intrusive than option c. • This option provides a balance between impacts on community and traffic, and developer profit. • Support for this approach, which permits higher densities of development

	<p>appropriate for this sustainable location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option permits the articulation of nodal points, vistas and landmark buildings to aid legibility and orientation. • Development of up to six storeys would enable employment objectives of maximising opportunities. • This option would create more flexibility in the delivery of the site. • Building heights should respond to site context - there is a need to exploit the limited resources of remaining land available in Cambridge to meet the needs of an expanding population. • Option B or C would be acceptable, and would optimise density across the site.
Qu18b Building Heights (object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing six storey buildings would damage the feel of the area. • Since the new station is in the south east corner of the site, tall buildings in this area would adversely impact on the character and appearance of the Cambridge central conservation area and Fen Ditton conservation area, and the settings of listed buildings in both conservation areas. • Option B (heights up to 24m) has potential to cause conflicts with safe airport and aircraft operations. • This option does not maximise the redevelopment opportunity. • One or two well designed tall buildings may be acceptable. A large number of poorly designed tall buildings would adversely affect the character of the city. • Taller buildings would make more efficient use of the land, and would add a dramatic feature to the landscape. • With fens to the north, taller buildings would not affect the view of Cambridge. • This level of development will not maximise the use of the land, or allow for the creation of a sustainable and successful urban community. • This option would destroy the feeling in this part of the city.
Qu18b Building Heights (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would have been helpful to have seen an evidence base showing the effect that various heights of buildings would have on heritage assets near to the site. • Request that the Councils engage early with Cambridge Airport to ensure that any building heights are compatible with airport operations. • It is not appropriate to try and set design standards, including building heights and densities, before understanding the types and quantum of development that would be required to make the site deliverable / viable. • Consideration of tall building heights should be part of a site specific master-planning exercise, taking into account relevant considerations. • Any proposals will need to take into account the restrictions placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport, which includes height of buildings. In addition to this consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional / unnecessary screening and landscaping.
Qu18c Building Heights (support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for this approach- build as high as possible in this well connected area. • Support for innovative approaches. • Support for this option, given the sustainable location, relative distance from the historic core of the city, and proximity to the A14. • This option provides the potential to maximise the opportunities making best use of the site's location. • Support – it's important to maximise the commercial value of this development; there is no immediate historic skyline which needs protecting. • Taller buildings would make more efficient use of the land, and would add a

	<p>dramatic feature to the landscape.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With fens to the north, taller buildings would not affect the view of Cambridge. • Allowing taller high quality development here will enable the creation of a modern vibrant city quarter, and will contribute to the financial viability of development options 3 and 4. Higher viability is essential to achieving high quality master-planning and community benefits gained through development levies. • Taller development here will enhance the environmental quality of the area, including existing surrounding neighbourhoods. • Option B or C would be acceptable, and would optimise density across the site.
Qu18c Building Heights (object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing restrictions on building heights could potentially result in a loss of the character of the area. • Without a robust evidence base demonstrating the impact of buildings of varying heights, we cannot support option c. • This would presumably result in very tall buildings being built, which is not supported. • Removing restrictions on building heights could potentially result in a loss of the character of the area. • Taller buildings round the station will reduce sunlight for buildings to the south and west. • Option B (heights up to 24m) has potential to cause conflicts with safe airport and aircraft operations. • Not appropriate to set design standards before setting quantum and types of development. • Draft LP 2014 policies should form the baseline for development of AAP specific policies. • Consideration of tall building heights should be part of a site specific master-planning exercise, taking into account relevant considerations. • Object – Cambridgeshire is not an industrial area, and Cambridge itself is not urbanised enough to justify tall buildings. Allowing tall buildings here would adversely impact on the local character and landscape.
Qu18c Building Heights (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request that the Councils engage early with Cambridge Airport to ensure that any building heights are compatible with airport operations. • Any proposals will need to take into account the requirements placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport (referral for 15m and above in this area). In addition to this consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional / unnecessary screening and landscaping
Qu18d Building Heights (object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These comments are provided on behalf of Marshall Group, which includes Cambridge International Airport. Expect building heights in Option A (heights up to 16m) may be acceptable, but Options B (heights up to 24m) and C (including “significantly taller forms of development”) in particular have potential to cause conflicts with safe airport and aircraft operations.
Qu18d Building Heights (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for this approach- build as high as possible in this well connected area. • Any building proposals above 15m high require consultation with Cambridge Airport. • Building heights up to 16m may be acceptable and compatible with the safe operation of the airport. • Request that the Councils engage early with Cambridge Airport to ensure that any building heights are compatible with airport operations. • The physical context of the site provides opportunities to explore heights and

	<p>densities inappropriate in other parts of Cambridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AAP requires a masterplan that should inform building heights. • Any proposals will need to take into account the requirements placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport (referral for 15m and above in this area). In addition to this consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional / unnecessary screening and landscaping. • Consideration of tall building heights should be part of a site specific master-planning exercise, taking into account relevant considerations. • Support for a flexible approach, aligning with the AAP's promotion of quality design and placemaking. • There is scope for different heights and densities on different parts of the CNFE site. • Object to assertion that density should be focused on new railway station interchange, as it is peripheral to the site, and is on the edge of Cambridge, unlike the CB1 area. • Allowing taller high quality development here will enable the creation of a modern vibrant city quarter, and will contribute to the financial viability of development options 3 and 4. Higher viability is essential to achieving high quality master-planning and community benefits gained through development levies. • Taller development here will enhance the environmental quality of the area, including existing surrounding neighbourhoods. • It would have been helpful to have seen an evidence base showing the effect that various heights of buildings would have on heritage assets near to the site. • It is not appropriate to try and set design standards, including building heights and densities, before understanding the types and quantum of development that would be required to make the site deliverable / viable.
--	---

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 19:

BALANCED AND INTEGRATED COMMUNITIES – EFFECTIVE INTEGRATION WITH THE WIDER AREA

Do you support or object to the proposed approach and measures to integrate the area with the surrounding communities, and why?

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
22	19	1	2

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
<p>Qu19 Balanced and integrated communities – Effective Integration with the Wider Area (support)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for the proposals. • Include as many entrances as possible, including two new entrances to the Business Park, a pedestrianized boulevard on Cowley Road and links to a new area south of the railway line. Fen Road should have improved access as part of Fen Meadows scheme. • Let's not create an island. • This is especially important with regard to transport links; surrounding areas should not be negatively affected by increases in vehicular traffic. • Linking between new and existing infrastructure must be well thought out, with a focus on encouraging sustainable modes of transport, and should be

	<p>in place by the time work begins on site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has the potential to become a distinct quarter in its own right, but needs integrating with the wider urban fabric. • Benefits from the development of this site, such as access to public transport, new amenity space, retail and local services/facilities should be available for the wider community. • When looking to integrate the area with surrounding communities, the integration of existing uses should also be considered, which includes minerals and waste uses. • Add/amend text to bullets as below <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Access to appropriate support to ensure the development of cohesive community ○ Informal and formal social spaces that support the needs of workers and residents. • The proposals on integration with the wider community are supported in order to build a successful, healthy and vibrant community. • Proposals must take account of existing development and not dominate it, including being appropriate in scale. • This policy needs enhancing to more effectively integrate the area with surrounding communities, and to respond to existing needs, aiding integration. • Active and public travel must be prioritised to avoid increasing motor traffic on the road network. • Walking/cycling connections into the area must be of highest quality; shared use facilities are not supported. Protected, direct and efficient crossings for bike and foot must be provided at off-site junctions. • Integration with the surrounding area is important to delivering a successful new city quarter here.
<p>Qu19 Balanced and integrated communities – Effective Integration with the Wider Area (object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The surrounding community, identified as one of the most disadvantaged in the city, would best be integrated into the site by an increase in lower-skilled employment and apprenticeship opportunities.
<p>Qu19 Balanced and integrated communities – Effective Integration with the Wider Area (comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need to balance the desire to integrate new development with the wider city, with the need to minimise negative impacts on existing residents/occupiers. • A number of sites within the AAP area contain commercial premises which cannot be accessible to the public. • One of the key objectives of the proposals should be to break down the bounded nature of the site. It would have been useful to illustrate in detail, and give more importance to, any options that have been explored for the following, in terms of vehicular, pedestrian and cycle routes: improvements to the section of Milton Road adjacent to the site; improvements to, or new, connections into Milton from the site; potential connections over the river, railway, and/or guided busway and cycle path to the south. If including these has been explored and dismissed, knowing the reasons would be useful. • It should be made clear that the “wider communities” are not limited to those adjacent to the site. It should be an objective to make the site accessible to those arriving from some distance, whether by road, rail or public transport. • References should be included regarding connecting CNFE with planned new communities, most significantly Waterbeach new town.

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 20:

NEW EMPLOYMENT USES

Do you support or object to the proposed approach for employment uses, and why?

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
20	12	2	6

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
----------	--

Qu20 New employment uses (support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for this approach. • Support employment development building on Cambridge’s existing strengths. • This approach fulfils the need to integrate with the wider area. • There should not be heavy industry in this area. • Provides a range of options supporting the Cambridge economy. • Support for specific policies relating to employment uses. • The area is suitable for supporting the identified sectors, especially technology and R&D, given the juxtaposition with the Science Park and evidence of existing demand. • Support the intention to provide a range of unit types and sizes, hybrid buildings and laboratory space • The potential of the CNFE to support the cluster of high technology and R&D development is noted. However, it is also one of the very few locations in the Cambridge area which accommodates B2, B8 and sui generis uses which support and provide essential infrastructure for the Cambridge area. This role is reflected in the Options and should not be diminished.
Qu20 New employment uses (object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In opposition to paragraph 9.15, which states that some of the office development could take place after 2031, we contend that at current take up rates, Cambridge will run out of R&D land in the next five years. The plan needs to demonstrate that it can bring forward land rapidly to meet requirements for a full range of R&D uses in the short and longer term. • The R&D sector is diverse and location sensitive. Is it clearly understood if the identified high value employment uses will want to locate to a mixed use site close to waste and industrial uses, close to some other uses in the sector but geographically divorced from others? • The employment uses listed include office and R&D but it is unclear whether market research has been completed to support the sectors listed. • Support for a mixed development with employment and substantial residential provision. • Too much emphasis on employment uses, and in particular B2 and B8 uses in development options 3 and 4.
Qu20 New employment uses (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the sewage works remain in place then employment should be office led. If the sewage works move there may be opportunity to include manufacturing employment. • CNFE is in an accessible location for employment uses, which should be encouraged, although not at the expense of residential development. • A combination of commercial (offices and R&D uses) and residential should be provided in the CNFE area, with the mix being informed by market conditions and successful place-making. • Encouraging a variety of employment space, together with the need for new office and commercial laboratory floorspace are component parts of delivering new employment on new areas of land, as well as consolidating existing employment areas at Cambridge Business Park and St John’s

	<p>Innovation Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment uses should also include pure offices as well as hybrid buildings and buildings aimed at particular sectors or technologies. • Flexibility in responding to the market and economy will be a key consideration. • There needs to be greater reference to middle level jobs not just a focus on high skill jobs as it currently reads. This proposed policy seems to focus on high skills jobs, which as of 2013, made up 70% of the jobs in Cambridge - more focus should be made to the middle level jobs which are desperately needed in Cambridge so people can get out of low skill low paid employment. As it stands this policy does not support the development principle as detailed in chapter 7: <i>'Deliver additional flexible employment space to cater for a range of business types and sizes, and supporting a wide range of jobs for local income, skills and age groups'</i>
--	---

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 21:

SHARED SOCIAL SPACE

Do you support or object to the proposed approach on shared social space, and why?

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
16	13	2	1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
----------	--

<p>Qu21 Shared Social Space (support)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for the proposed approach. • Appropriate for the area, anything more would impact significantly on the neighbourhood. • Particular support for green spaces. • Support for a local centre to serve CNFE businesses and residents, which should be of a size to provide a range of services and facilities. This would increase the sustainability of CNFE, reducing the need to travel out of the area for such facilities, while fostering a new mixed-use neighbourhood. • Support but the viability of such leisure/social facilities may depend on which option/mix of options is selected and the pace of re-development. • The concept of shared space is to be encouraged. The new community including businesses should be consulted on what type of shared space they would like. • Will provide valuable on-site facilities. • Support to enable collaboration between tenants, and providing a complementary eating/drinking hub for workers, which is not currently available. • Given the potential extent of the AAP area, the focus should be on a well located local centre, but more localised provision may be needed too.
<p>Qu21 Shared Social Space (object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This should be a destination for the city and wider region, rather than just for workers on site. The area could include facilities such as an ice rink, concert venue and cinema. • Shared social spaces contribute to open innovation, which has been a key attraction of Cambridge to R&D intensive businesses over the past 10 years. It is highly questionable if an atmosphere of social interaction and open innovation could be fostered at a site which is heavily constrained through

	noise, odour, insects, vibration and HGV traffic.
Qu21 Shared Social Space (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater potential could be created by increasing residential provision here. The proposed approach focuses on 'the needs of workers in the area', and does not recognise that shops and facilities could play an important role in serving a new residential community.

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 22 (a-c):

CHANGE OF USE FROM OFFICE TO RESIDENTIAL OR OTHER USES

Do you support or object to the proposed Options on change of use from office to residential or other purposes, and why?

Respondents		Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
22a	13	6	3	4
22b	17	8	6	3
22c	5	0	0	5

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
Qu22a Change of use from office to residential or other uses (support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for the proposed option A. It would be counter-productive to introduce restraints which would result in a loss of flexibility at this stage. Commercial buildings will be constructed for commercial use with an inherently long lifespan for such a use. Alternative uses will not therefore be forthcoming and additional policy restraint is not necessary. The market will determine what is appropriate over time. It seems unlikely that there will be any great pressure to achieve non-commercial uses at CNFE. There is currently a great deal of demand for employment uses and related business uses and further control is not necessary at this stage.
Qu22a Change of use from office to residential or other uses (object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When an area has been planned at AAP level with facilities to support certain planned uses, increasing residential uses at a later stage when there is no space for required facilities, such as extra green space or school places, results in substandard development. The AAP is intended to become an employment hub. This option would allow piecemeal housing, leading to isolated areas of housing not compatible with employment uses. The presence of significant constraints to residential development (primarily existing odour levels) and the objective of maximising employment development, means that it would be highly desirable for increased protective measures to prevent permitted change of use from office to residential or other uses.
Qu22a Change of use from office to residential or other uses (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change of use from employment to residential use in a mixed use area could potentially give rise to issues if the property to be changed is in an area where amenity issues may subsequently arise. Removal of prior notification rights is therefore supported. The employment land should be protected as employment uses. There can be conflicts with some business uses and residential and therefore the master plan will have considered this, allowing change of use may have the effect of pepper potting residential dwellings within established employment

	areas potentially leading to social isolation.
Qu22b Change of use from office to residential or other uses (support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment must be coordinated with residential development. • We need a mix of residential and employment opportunities. • When an area has been planned at AAP level with facilities to support certain planned uses, increasing residential uses at a later stage when there is no space for required facilities, such as extra green space or school places, results in substandard development. • Change of use from employment to residential use in a mixed use area could potentially give rise to issues if the property to be changed is in an area where amenity issues may subsequently arise. Removal of prior notification rights is therefore supported. • Support in order to protect new employment development from conversion to residential. • It is appropriate to prevent piecemeal housing in inappropriate locations. • The site should be business/commercial/hi-tech. • Flexibility to allow change of use to residential without planning permission was introduced to bring redundant commercial property back into beneficial use. Given the demand in Cambridge and that demand will be met by property designed to meet current tenant expectations, this will not apply on CNFE and so there should be a policy to protect new employment development (at least for a reasonable time period). • The presence of significant constraints to residential development (primarily existing odour levels) and the objective of maximising employment development, means that it would be highly desirable for increased protective measures to prevent permitted change of use from office to residential or other uses.
Qu22b Change of use from office to residential or other uses (object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections to option B. • If there is greater need for residential space than for office/laboratory space, that is what should happen, particularly because more employment space will only create the need for more residential space. • It would be counter-productive to introduce restraints which would result in a loss of flexibility at this stage. Commercial buildings will be constructed for commercial use with an inherently long lifespan for such a use. Alternative uses will not therefore be forthcoming and additional policy restraint is not necessary. • It is not strictly necessary to serve an Article 4 direction.
Qu22c Change of use from office to residential or other uses (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New employment floor-space is unlikely to be affected by Permitted Development rights in any case.

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 23 (a-c):

CAMBRIDGE SCIENCE PARK

Do you support or object to the proposed Options for Cambridge Science Park, and why?

Respondents		Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
23a	12	6	4	2
23b	14	9	5	0
23c	8	0	0	8
Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation			
Qu23a Cambridge Science Park (support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support option A. Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy E/1 provides sufficient support for employment development in key sectors. Further policy guidance risks complicating proceedings for developers, potentially hindering the continued successful development of the Science Park. • Cambridge Science Park has adequate policy direction and protection through the Draft Local Plans. Including the Science Park within the AAP would risk delaying decision making over development there. • To include the Cambridge Science Park within the boundary of the AAP risks that the AAP area will be seen as a success delivering increased employment floor-space by virtue of the Science Park's altering state; development which would happen regardless of the AAP being in place or not. • There is no reason to add an unnecessary layer of policy for further development at the CSP; this would not be in conformity to the NPPF. • The plan should not interfere with something that is already very successful. • Demand and commercial opportunity will drive intensification proposals, and additional policy guidance for the Science Park is not necessary in the AAP. 			
Qu23a Cambridge Science Park (object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AAP and Science Park areas should be considered together. • Applying policy guidance ensures a cohesive approach over both sites, which are linked in employment use. One site may provide expansion opportunity for businesses on other, and should not have added restrictions/leniency. 			
Qu23a Cambridge Science Park (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The issues related to the Science Park are not unique and there is no requirement for additional policy guidance for Cambridge Science Park. • Site specific policies may be required to control the type and quality of development on opportunity sites within the AAP area. 			
Qu23b Cambridge Science Park (support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate Cambridge Science Park with the wider economic area. • The Science Park is to be redeveloped and the whole area should be considered together. • Cambridge Science Park is part of CNFE and should be considered as part of a combined area. • The Science Park has significant potential for future enhancement and connections with the rest of the area and the wider surroundings. To exclude it risks stagnation and uncoordinated future development in the Science Park that could conflict with the CNFE area. • Support in order to protect the Cambridge Science Park from possible conversions and retain its essential character and attractiveness. 			

<p>Qu23b Cambridge Science Park (object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy E/1 provides sufficient support for employment development in key sectors. Further policy guidance would risk complicating proceedings for developers, potentially hindering the continued successful development of the Science Park. The intensification of uses within the science park is a current and ongoing dynamic; the need to provide guidance is now. To delay providing guidance by placing it within this AAP would be too late. The Council should seek to address these issues through the Draft Local Plan which could be complemented by Supplementary Planning Guidance, if it is considered necessary at all. Cambridge Science Park (CSP) as an existing entity is very different to a regeneration development. It is not appropriate to apply bespoke CNFE policies as blanket policies to a wider area. The plan should not interfere with something that is already very successful. It is not necessary to include the Cambridge Science Park in the AAP. In light of this, there is no reason why there should be a policy approach for the Science Park. Cambridge Science Park does not have the same regeneration needs as the CNFE area and is an employment area only, rather than a mixed use neighbourhood as identified in the proposed CNFE vision. It is not appropriate to share policies between the CNFE area and the Science Park; South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Policy E/1 already provides clear guidance for the development of the Science Park.
<p>Qu23c Cambridge Science Park (comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The environment of the Science Park's early phases with its now-mature trees should be treated carefully, so as not to lose the 'Park' concept. The inclusion of the Science Park could facilitate a more coordinated approach to the use of Section 106 and CIL funding across the area. If the Science Park is included within the AAP then Option B would be preferred to allow for the intensification of technology and R&D uses. Inclusion within the AAP area could also help facilitate improvements to the pedestrian environment and connections from existing employment sites to the new railway station. However, the AAP should be responsive to evidence on market demand and viability to provide flexibility to cope with future economic changes. The Science Park should be independent.

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 24 (a-d):

CHANGE OF USE FROM INDUSTRIAL TO OTHER PURPOSES AT NUFFIELD ROAD

Do you support or object to the proposed Options on change of use from industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road, and why?

Respondents		Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
24a	12	4	6	2
24b	10	2	6	2
24c	12	7	4	1
24d	9	0	0	9

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
Qu24a Change of Use from Industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road (support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for this option. • Support for this option if there was access from Milton Road. • Industrial land uses are important to the City functionality, and there are no clear agreements to demonstrate that their relocation to within a short distance can be achieved. • The access issues are clearly of concern to local residents and any improvement in this would be welcomed. It is challenging however, given the varied ownership and legal interests on these industrial estates. It seems that either a wholesale change to residential is required or the status quo.
Qu24a Change of Use from Industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road (object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given a choice between residential accommodation and more employment, the preference should be for residential accommodation, as more employment just boosts the need for more housing even further. • This site is suitable for residential, accessed from Green End Road.
Qu24a Change of Use from Industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As explained in response to Q.11, Anglian Water would not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. The introduction of residential uses within the 1.5 odour contour line has a high risk of loss of amenity which may also impact on Anglian Water's ability to operate. Other potentially sensitive development such as the local centre and office uses should also be considered against this risk.
Qu24b Change of Use from Industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road (support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would make for better zoning.
Qu24b Change of Use from Industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road (object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is suitable for residential, accessed from Green End Road. • Industrial land uses are important to the City functionality, and there are no clear agreements to demonstrate that their relocation to within a short distance can be achieved.
Qu24b Change of Use from Industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As explained in response to Q.11, Anglian Water would not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. The introduction of residential uses within the 1.5 odour contour line has a high risk of loss of amenity which may also impact on Anglian Water's ability to operate. Other potentially sensitive development such as the local centre and office uses should also be considered against this risk.

Qu24c Change of Use from Industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road (support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cambridge needs accommodation, especially for key workers, but with access to the accommodation directly from Milton Road. This will reduce traffic in Green End Road and Nuffield Road. This is a good location for residential accommodation. This site is suitable for residential, accessed from Green End Road. Residential development here would be good environmentally. Support this option in order to provide a better environment for residents in the Nuffield road area.
Qu24c Change of Use from Industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road (object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial land uses are important to the City functionality, and there are no clear agreements to demonstrate that their relocation to within a short distance can be achieved. Option B would result in better zoning.
Qu24c Change of Use from Industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As explained in response to Q.11, Anglian Water would not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. The introduction of residential uses within the 1.5 odour contour line has a high risk of loss of amenity which may also impact on Anglian Water's ability to operate. Other potentially sensitive development such as the local centre and office uses should also be considered against this risk.
Qu24d Change of Use from Industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to consider the impact of additional traffic as part of this development. Additional housing should be well back from the road and provided with adequate parking facilities and green spaces. Potential for relocation of uses beyond the AAP boundary should also be considered as this creates a greater opportunity for the area. A flexible mix may be most appropriate to allow the market to respond but avoid the redevelopment of the site for 100% residential given the opportunity of this site to attract employment generating uses in this location. The site adjoins the proposed guided busway route and has good accessibility on foot to the new station, therefore it would be logical to locate more intensive employment uses on the site.

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 25:

BALANCED AND INTEGRATED COMMUNITIES - WIDER EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Do you support or object to the proposed approach on wider employment benefits, and why? Please add any other suggestions you have for policies and proposals that could be promoted through the AAP to support local jobs for local people and reduce barriers to employment in the wider area.

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
12	9	2	1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
Qu25 Balanced and Integrated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is common sense. Could help be given to employers to aid the setting up of apprenticeships? Support – and offer apprenticeships.

<p>Communities - Wider Employment Benefits (support)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy aims are not consistent with the overall vision of the use classes which will dominate the AAP area, however, if the AAP area refocused its attention to creating a more intense and purposeful industrial hub then the outlined approach is agreeable. • Would expect this to potentially go beyond current provisions. • The proposed approach is supported. This should also reflect the significant training and apprenticeship opportunities that the employment use here could generate, both during construction and afterwards. Cambridge Regional College will be very accessible from this site by Guided Bus or cycling along the Busway. • Support proposed approach, however, should include reference to apprenticeships to ensure opportunities for all avenues into work and skills development. • Support the aspiration to provide training and employment opportunities for local people if it can realistically be delivered. • The policies regarding local employment are supported, access to employment is a key wider determinant of health and local employment should be encouraged to cater for local residential development.
<p>Qu25 Balanced and Integrated Communities - Wider Employment Benefits (object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AAP cannot be a panacea to resolve Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire employment problems. Whilst local training opportunities, especially apprenticeships, should be encouraged, it is not a role of the planning system to impose such obligations upon developers. • Local Plans should not interfere at this level. It is for the market supported by central Government policy to worry about these issues.
<p>Qu25 Balanced and Integrated Communities - Wider Employment Benefits (comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ability to provide training and employment opportunities for local people and local procurement may not always be possible or appropriate for all businesses, particularly those within the R&D sector operating within an international market context and reliant on attracting the best international talent. It is considered that bespoke solutions to maximise economic and employment benefits should be secured as part of individual applications rather than through a generic and inflexible policy approach. This will ensure better outcomes tailored to individual circumstances without stifling innovation.

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 26 (a-d):

HOTEL & CONFERENCING FACILITIES

Do you support or object to the proposed Options on hotel and conference facilities, and why?

Respondents		Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
26a	10	0	9	1
26b	12	7	3	2
26c	12	9	2	1
26d	9	1	0	8

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
----------	--

<p>Qu26a Hotel & Conferencing Facilities (object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for Option C. • Support for 1 or 2 hotels; consider a mixed-used area essential. • Let existing accommodation plans take account of the project. • The development of the new railway station and regeneration of the wider CNFE area will create a demand for a hotel in this location and this should be recognised in the CNFE AAP. The land adjacent to the new station provides a sustainable and easily accessible location for a hotel to serve business users associated with the large number of existing and proposed businesses in the CNFE area. The proposed vision for the CNFE states that the area will embrace modern commercial business needs and ensure that the new area is supported with the right social and community infrastructure. See attached Brookgate's submission document, Appendix 2: CNFE Redevelopment Option 2a, including a proposed hotel. • An area of land close to the railway station should be provided with dual use allocation of either residential or hotel. If the market demands are great enough the hotel will be developed. The provision of a conference centre could be integrated into the hotel as an ancillary use. • As covered in response to Q.11 above, Anglian Water would not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. Potentially sensitive development such as a hotel and conference centre and student accommodation within this contour line would be unacceptable due to the risk of odour adversely affecting the occupants of these buildings. Anglian Water would advise caution in considering any such proposal.
<p>Qu26b Hotel & Conferencing Facilities (support)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for 1 or 2 hotels; consider a mixed-used area essential. Support for conference accommodation, as people would more than likely use this hotel instead of central ones, meaning less traffic and easier access for residents of East Anglia. • Important to provide hotel facilities in this development. • Support, however subject to viability conference facilities could also be provided. The development of the new railway station and regeneration of the wider CNFE area will create a demand for a hotel in this location. The land adjacent to the new station provides a sustainable and accessible location for a hotel to serve business users associated with the large number of existing and proposed businesses in the CNFE area. The proposed vision for the CNFE states that the area will embrace modern commercial business needs and ensure that the new area is supported with the right social and community infrastructure. See Brookgate's submission document, Appendix 2: CNFE Redevelopment Option 2a, including a proposed hotel. • An area of land close to the railway station should be provided with dual use allocation of either residential or hotel. If the market demands are great enough the hotel will be developed. The provision of a conference centre could be integrated into the hotel as an ancillary use. • A hotel here would support business uses on CNFE and Science Park.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for the provision of a hotel and/or conference facilities within the mixed-use development of land around the proposed new railway station, on the basis that this would be a supporting use with the focus remaining on employment and office floor space.
Qu26b Hotel & Conferencing Facilities (object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for Option C. As covered in response to Q.11 above, Anglian Water would not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. Potentially sensitive development such as a hotel and conference centre and student accommodation within this contour line would be unacceptable due to the risk of odour adversely affecting the occupants of these buildings. Anglian Water would advise caution in considering any such proposal.
Qu26b Hotel & Conferencing Facilities (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If a hotel is provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated. Support either option B or C but may depend on whether development of a hotel at the entrance to the Science Park goes ahead. Any provision allocation in the AAP needs to be kept flexible if no demand materialises.
Qu26c Hotel & Conferencing Facilities (support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Essential to have at least one hotel with conference facilities, as it can be hard to get a central location for a conference, plus it would reduce traffic movements in the city centre. Support, however the provision of conference facilities should be subject to viability. The new railway station and regeneration of the wider CNFE area will create a demand for a hotel and conference facility. The land adjacent to the new station provides a sustainable and accessible location for a hotel and conference centre to serve business users associated with existing and proposed businesses in the CNFE area. This accords with the proposed CNFE vision which states that the area will embrace modern commercial business needs and ensure that the new area is supported with the right social and community infrastructure. An area of land close to the railway station should be provided with dual use allocation of either residential or hotel. If the market demands are great enough the hotel will be developed. The provision of a conference centre could be integrated into the hotel as an ancillary use. A hotel here would support business uses on CNFE and Science Park. Provision of a hotel and conference centre close to the station, is supported as part of the mix. Having both available will be a natural addition to the rail station serving businesses located both here and at the Science Park, allowing their visitors to stay away from the city centre during the business hours, and especially to avoid contributing to traffic in the rush hour. This would be logical and would enhance the area.
Qu26c Hotel & Conferencing Facilities (object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As covered in response to Q.11 above, Anglian Water would not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. Potentially sensitive development such as a hotel and conference centre and student accommodation within this contour line would be unacceptable due to the risk of odour adversely affecting the occupants of these buildings. Anglian Water would advise caution in considering any such proposal.
Qu26c Hotel & Conferencing Facilities (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If a hotel is provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.
Qu26d Hotel & Conferencing Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not so sure about a hotel being too near the station. A hotel use within any part of the CNFE subject to its siting and relationship to other land uses would be appropriate, and there should be no

(comment)	<p>geographical limitation as to where such facilities could be provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowance could be made within the AAP for this use but flexibility should be maintained. The location of the hotel/conference facilities do not need to be specified at this stage. • There could well be scope and demand for a hotel within the CNFE area. It is not clear however why this would need to be situated "around the new railway station" and there could be perfectly sound reasons why it should be located more centrally within the CNFE area and not to one side by the station. • There is a currently proposed hotel and conference facility on the Science Park in addition to several other hotels within close proximity at Orchard Park, Impington and Quy. If there is sufficient market demand, such proposals should be considered. • If a hotel is provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.
-----------	---

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 27:

BALANCED AND INTEGRATED COMMUNITIES - HOUSING MIX

Do you support or object to the proposed approach on housing mix, and why? Please add any other suggestions you have for the types and sizes of houses that should be included within the CNFE area.

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
13	11	1	1

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
<p>Qu27 Balanced and Integrated Communities - Housing Mix (support)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad support for the proposed approach. • A highly mixed development would be most suitable. • A mix of high-rise and a new area of low-rise on the south side of the railway tracks would be the ideal situation. • There should be mainly affordable housing, or inexpensive let properties. • Could a small percentage be cooperative housing with a mixture of personal and shared living space? • Would like to see 40% affordable housing. • A sustainable mix of dwelling types will result in a range of family units. • The type and size of affordable housing should be informed by the City Council's Housing Policy. • If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated. • The need to ensure a balanced housing mix is supported. A mix of house types and tenures can help community cohesion and help maintain a healthy development.
<p>Qu27 Balanced and Integrated Communities - Housing Mix</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be an explicit reference to the Private Rented Sector (PRS). The significant increase in demand for PRS needs to be accounted for and its provision actively encouraged within the AAP. • Constraints on the CNFE site must be recognised and a realistic housing mix provided. PRS will play an important role in achieving this outcome.

(object)	
Qu27 Balanced and Integrated Communities - Housing Mix (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Somewhat indifferent as to whether there is a need for housing at CNFE, and whether it should be pursued. • Housing should not be pursued at a level exceeding that indicated in the current version of the AAP. • If there is to be housing flexibility of tenure should be accepted including affordable housing.

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 28:

AFFORDABLE HOUSING REQUIREMENT

Do you support or object to the proposed use of Cambridge City Council’s affordable housing requirements for the whole of the CNFE area, and why?

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
14	8	2	4

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
----------	--

Qu28 Affordable Housing Requirement (support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad support for proposed approach. • Or even increase the amount to 50% affordable or more. • Support subject to detailed viability testing to ensure delivery across a significant timeframe, and to meet the vision and objectives. • CNFE should be treated the same as any other development. • This approach supports a more balanced community as well as housing located by employment use.
Qu28 Affordable Housing Requirement (object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preference for a mixture of high quality council housing and student housing rather than affordable housing. To make developments attractive to developers it is important to allow them to make profits on high quality buildings. • Let the market function policy free.
Qu28 Affordable Housing Requirement (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for proposed approach, subject to viability testing. • The heavy infrastructure costs and brownfield nature of the land with associated remediation costs must be recognised; viability is of key importance. • Support for the City Council's flexible affordable housing requirements, which differentiate between different scales of development; South Cambridgeshire policy is less flexible. • Consideration should be given to PRS developments where a different approach may be required, such as discounted market rents or off-site contributions toward affordable housing provision. • If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated. • Affordable housing requirements should be subject to viability and development will need to mitigate a range of services such as education and transport.

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 29 (a-c)**PRIVATE RENTED ACCOMMODATION****Do you support or object to the proposed Options on private rented accommodation, and why?**

Respondents		Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
29a	7	7	0	0
29b	7	1	3	3
29c	7	0	0	7
Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation			
Qu29a Private Rented Accommodation (support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support, as long as housing is reasonably priced. • Detailed guidance is not necessary as existing policies aim to deliver quality places to live. In addition, there is significant guidance already published that could be beneficially referenced by the authorities. • If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated. • Support, allow the market to deliver private rented accommodation rather than encourage it given the uncertain implications. • There is no evidence to justify selecting Option B. 			
Qu29b Private Rented Accommodation (support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing, and affordable housing are at a premium here and houses must not be bought as an investment and kept empty. 			
Qu29b Private Rented Accommodation (object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed guidance is not necessary as existing policies aim to deliver quality places to live. In addition, there is significant guidance already published that could be beneficially referenced by the authorities. 			
Qu29b Private Rented Accommodation (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will be important to ensure that properties in this area are not bought as investments and either left empty or rented out to commuters. • If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated. 			
Qu29c Private Rented Accommodation (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inexpensive accommodation needs to be provided. Does this option mean there could be council houses? If so, option B could be a very good option. • It is essential there is affordable housing only - ideally with council housing included. • PRS schemes can create quality places to live if they have a clear brief, good design, delivery and collaborative working to. Many authorities are developing PRS design guides to assist developers. The authorities may wish to produce PRS design guidance in association with the developer as part of the AAP. • If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads, and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily 			

	<p>mitigated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow a flexible approach. • Private market housing could play a greater role in delivering future housing needs in the Cambridge area, but it is important to allow the market to deliver this form of housing in response to demand. The range of planning policies allow for both the mix and the environmental conditions to be managed through the planning application process without additional polices in the AAP.
--	--

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 30 (a-e)

STUDENT HOUSING

Do you support or object to the proposed Options on student housing, and why?

Respondents		Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
30a	11	3	8	0
30b	8	4	3	1
30c	5	3	1	1
30d	5	0	4	1
30e	8	0	0	8

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
Qu30a Student Housing (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support especially as the need for student accommodation in the area has yet to be made. • Limited obvious demand for this use because there are no educational institutions nearby, however the option is supported with evidence of need
Qu30a Student Housing (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location too far from Universities and associated facilities • Market demand for student accommodation and therefore should be permitted/accommodated. Failure to do so would be contrary to the NPPF • Object; Use should be integrated
Qu30a Student Housing (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated. • No more than 20% (Option b) • Anglian Water does not support sensitive development within the 1.5 odour contour line. • This location could also leave students isolated as there are limited facilities available unless there is significant provision on site within the AAP area.
Qu30b Student Housing (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensible option but it is difficult to justify a limit and enforce • Student accommodation supported as a complimentary use to employment, research and development; any large proposals for should be complimentary with large proposals refused
Qu30b Student Housing (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit is an inflexible approach which might fail to meet market need and hinder redevelopment • Support Option A

Qu30b Student Housing (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.
Qu30c Student Housing (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Let the market decide Would maintain a flexible approach Policy requirement for student accommodation proposals to explain how benefits will outweigh possible negative impacts. Mitigation is a sensible safeguard which will not result in unnecessary restrictions and ensure this type of use forms part of a balanced community.
Qu30c Student Housing (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object (1)
Qu30c Student Housing (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.
Qu30d Student Housing (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unnecessary restrictions resulting in lost flexibility towards the evolution of CNFE Support for Option A
Qu30d Student Housing (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated.
Qu30e Student Housing (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated. Flexibility is required at this stage Rationale for student accommodation is not clear when it is typically provided in more central locations in Cambridge; CNFE should be employment focussed allowing other complimentary uses to improve the area's sustainability Student accommodation should be integrated to avoid concentration in one area.

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 31:

PROVISION OF SERVICES AND FACILITIES

Do you support or object to the proposed approach on provision of services and facilities, and why? Please also add any other suggestions for provision of services and facilities.

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
-------------	---------------------------	--------	---------

12	9	0	3
Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation		
Qu31 Provision of Services and Facilities (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulation needed to ensure SME provide a wide range of services • Early provision of schools and health centres where the accommodation is provided • Supportive of this policy, especially regarding co-location of services for community, retail and leisure uses. • The proposal on services and facilities are supported. • Education and health services must be provided as there is already one school on Nuffield Road and a doctor's surgery. • Brookgate support the proposed approach. In order for the regeneration of the CNFE area to be successful the required services and facilities must be provided. This will require collaborative strategies between key stakeholders and will be easier to achieve on sites such as CB4, where large areas can be brought forward by relatively few stakeholders, simplifying the planning and engagement process. The delivery of such services and facilities is essential to ensure the creation of a vibrant, mixed use neighbourhood, as set out in the proposed vision. • The Science Park is a good example of this approach working. • Support. Balanced, sustainable community requires such services and facilities as do the employees working locally. It is considered important that these are not too fragmented across the CNFE as that could reduce their viability or contribution to extended opening hours and thus service provision. 		
Qu31 Provision of Services and Facilities (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of community facilities need to be allowed for in the original design and built as the development becomes occupied. • Leisure/sporting facilities could be built at the northern and eastern edges of the site (as an acoustic barrier to the A14 and railway) • The proposed approach to the delivery of supporting services is supported in principle. However, the location of facilities must have regard to other development existing or proposed in the locality, so that potential amenity issues arising for example from proximity to the Water Recycling Centre, waste management uses, and the railheads are avoided and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated. • Community facilities should be provided early in the development of the residential component of the development. 		

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 32:

NEW LOCAL CENTRE

Do you support or object to the proposed approach for the new local centre, and why?

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
15	10	1	4
Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation		
Qu32 New Local Centre (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensible but should not forget SMEs • Residential flats will ensure the area is not dead in the evenings. • Provided it is tastefully done • Where there is residential development there must also be local shops and 		

	<p>community facilities, including a doctor's surgery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brookgate agree that a new local centre is essential to the creation of a vibrant, mixed use neighbourhood as set out in the proposed CNFE vision. It will act as both a focal point and a social hub for the CNFE area. There should be flexibility regarding its location along the Boulevard, positioning it around the station would ensure a highly accessible and sustainable location. It should include new retail provision to meet local needs and complement nearby centres as set out in objective 4 of the proposed development objectives. Employment and residential uses could be provided on upper floors. • Providing sufficient services for immediate needs of community near station most suitable location to ensure maximum use. • Residential flats will ensure the area is not dead in the evenings. • The Crown Estate support the approach set out for the new local centre and welcome the proposals to include retail and other uses within this location. These new uses should be located in one area (as part of the local centre) so as not to dilute the existing office and employment functions of the CNFE area. • The provision of such facilities together is likely to be more sustainable and viable.
Qu32 New Local Centre (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new local centre should be created to support the needs of a local community, however, it is not possible to make any informed decision on quantum, uses or location until the deliverability of the AAP area is further advanced.
Qu32 New Local Centre (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed new local centre in Options 2-4 is supported in principle. However, it is noted that it is proposed that this include a residential element and other elements which will be used by people, and in Option 2 the local centre appears to lie partially within the odour zone which is not suitable for such a use. The location of the local centre must have regard to other development existing or proposed in the locality, so that potential amenity issues arising for example from proximity to the Water Recycling Centre, waste management uses, and the railheads are avoided and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated. • At this stage the approach is too rigid and could need adaptation if more residential is included. Thus location and form needs to be less specific. • Turnstone consider that any uses proposed on the CNFE site should be totally complementary to employment uses. Retail facilities of an appropriate scale would be an acceptable use, subject to commercial viability.

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 33:

OPEN SPACE STANDARDS

Do you support or object to the proposed approach on open space standards, and why?

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
19	12	1	6
Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation		
Qu33 Open Space (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open spaces will make the area more pleasant to work and live in. • Encouragement of wildlife should be a default requirement, with a particular focus on providing habitat for birds, hedgehogs and bees. • Appropriate in the wider context. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open space should be maximised. • Open space vital for health, relaxation and environmental enhancement - reflects existing standards elsewhere there parity providing sufficient space. • We support the application of the relevant open space standards, but wish also to emphasise that the development must be integrated into the wider landscape through the improvement and development of green infrastructure beyond the currently identified site boundary. This should include the creation of a strategic accessible landscape/green space area along the River Cam Corridor and linking Milton Country Park (akin to developments to the south and west of Cambridge). • Support. Open space is very important in high density schemes and can also help to reduce the impact of tall buildings.
Qu33 Open Space (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support provision of open space in particular, which is not addressed in Option 1. Support a higher level than shown in any of the Options, given the huge benefits that open space provides to well-being and how crowded Cambridge is.
Qu33 Open Space (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brookgate agree that the re-development of the CNFE area presents a range of opportunities to enhance the existing green infrastructure. There should however remain flexibility to allow the off site provision of certain open space typologies such as playing fields. • The standards need to be defined in the context of the proposals and the wider context beyond the AAP area as promoted through enhanced connections to a variety of amenity spaces in the wider area. • On the proviso that the emerging Open Space Standards, as set out in Policy 68 and Appendix I of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 (proposed submission) only apply to residential development, Turnstone does not object to the approach that has been suggested. It must be clear, however, that the Open Space Standards should only apply to residential developments, and that questions of the appropriate quantum of open space related to commercial developments should be negotiated on a case by case basis. • The approach to the provision of open space is supported in principle. However, regard needs to be paid to amenity issues which may arise from other uses in the CNFE area, such as the Water Recycling Centre, waste management uses and railheads which could give rise to dust, noise and odour. Open space needs to be located in a position where such matters will not arise and/or can be satisfactorily mitigated; otherwise the areas will not be capable of being used and enjoyed for the purpose designed. • The policy to require open space is supported, as the action plan area is located in both Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire the local plan with the greater requirement for open space should be followed to ensure enough provision is made. • Access to open space is a key wider determinant of health.

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 34:

KEY TRANSPORT AND MOVEMENT PRINCIPLES

Do you support or object to the proposed key transport and movement principles, and why? Please add any other suggestions you have for key transport and movement principles to improve and promote sustainable travel in the area.

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
-------------	---------------------------	--------	---------

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
Qu34 Key Transport and Movement Principles (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New bus routes running through the area • New bus stops half way down the new Cowley Road • Old Cowley Road pedestrianized • River taxi, car parking the guided bus, cycling and taxis. • More crossings of the railway and river to assist in traffic flow. • focus on walking, public and cycles - car parking creates too much dead space • A pedestrian/cycle path should be provided, linking the Jane Coston Bridge with the Station. • Good bus links must be provided for those who are unable to walk or cycle to work. • Promotion of non-car and active modes of travel, delivering a highly accessible development. • Need to recognise that CNFE will generate additional vehicle trips. • A key principle needs to include 'enhance the Milton Road corridor to ensure that traffic can move efficiently in appropriate locations'. • Cambridgeshire CC Transport Strategy (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire) and associated strategic transport modelling significantly underestimates development opportunities. • The TSCSC recommendations (and proposed City Deal schemes) don't adequately address existing highway network constraints or consider measures required to unlock the full potential of CNFE. • Radical solutions are likely to be required to enable appropriate road based access to the sites. • Strongly support the focus on making transport safer and more sustainable. • Opportunity to create safe and attractive routes for pedestrians and cyclists. • Permeability (for these users) is very important to making the area attractive. • All criteria necessary to ensure sustainability. • Need recognition that some staff and visitors to current and future uses will make journeys by car. • The absence of any information about traffic and junction layout is a considerable omission as it is impossible to assess the relative impacts of the options on existing developments within the AAP area. • Support the proposed key transport and movement principles and welcome the focus on sustainable transport. • Focus on public and active transport. • Filtered permeability (full access for sustainable modes, no through routes for motor vehicles) needed throughout to create an attractive environment for cycling and walking. • Bus gates to provide efficient bus routes. • Off-site junctions must consider cyclists and walkers avoiding indirect, multi-stage crossings for these users. • Avoid current Cowley Road design that disadvantage active modes in preference to private motor traffic. • Open up parallel Network Rail route as a high quality cycle and walking provision to resolve this issue • Transport and improvements to infrastructure need to consider the whole CNFE AAP area so that any improvements needed reflect the future needs of the whole area and not individual land ownerships. • Incremental improvements by various land owners based on demand and phasing related only to that land ownership should be resisted as that may

	<p>lead to greater disruption over the period in which the CNFE is developed, both to those with the CNFE area and outside as offsite improvements are likely to be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RLW Estates generally support the transport and movement principles. • Specific reference should be made to the new station and other gateways to the site (such as Milton Road and the Jane Costen Bridge - both as a key element of the sustainable transport infrastructure serving the area, and in terms of its contribution to the role which CNFE should play in fulfilling the wider growth strategy for the Cambridge area. • The approach on transport is broadly supported particularly the approach on walking and cycling.
<p>Qu34 Key Transport and Movement Principles (Object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to maximise the potential for sustainable links between CNFE and existing and planned communities. • Suggested wording is as follows: "To ensure sustainable transport links are made with existing and new communities, including Waterbeach New Town" • Doubtful that the site can fulfil its development potential without the provision of direct access from the A14. • Need to investigate this option. • The transport modelling of the wider development area and mitigation strategies/new road infrastructure will be crucial in the development of the AAP. Until this modelling data is available and understood, there is no benefit in developing the AAP. • The Crown Estates do not support the proposals to allow public access through CBP.
<p>Qu34 Key Transport and Movement Principles (Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to the new railway station would be significantly improved. • Turn Network Rail's disused private access road from Milton Road to Chesterton sidings along the north side of Cambridge Business Park into a public footpath and cycleway - more pleasant than the foot/cycle path planned for Cowley Road. Would enable the Crown Estate to install side entrances on the North side of the Cambridge Business Park to shorten the walk between offices on the Cambridge Business Park and the new railway station and encourage travel to the Cambridge Business Park by train. • Turning the current railway sidings along the north side of the Business Park in to a cycle / pedestrian route would be more pleasant and convenient than the proposed route for Cowley Road up to the boundary of the current sidings. This would also allow for entrances to be installed on the north side of Cambridge Business Park, allowing easier access for commuters. • Policy must also consider the needs of those who are unable to cycle or walk to work. • Cycling is not a solution for everyone, especially older members of the community and the needs of all must be considered. • Where cars are not an option good regular all day and evening public transport must be provided. • Need to provide bus transport to the station for local residents • Cyclists should be considered too and allowed a traffic free approach where the interaction with LGVs/buses is eliminated to improve safety. • Need to emphasise the significant role that could be played by the new railway station and the Guided Bus, both of which clearly have scope to help meet the objective to minimise journeys to the site by private car • All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their interrelationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly the case for those that propose higher levels of development which might require significant transport intervention to ensure that transport impacts are not severe. This applies to both the

	<p>local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway) and also the strategic road (i.e.: Highways Agency) and rail (i.e.: Network Rail) networks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CNFE is a mixed use area with a variety of uses existing and proposed through the AAP. There will be a wide variety of modes of transport ranging from pedestrian and cyclist to heavy commercial vehicles (HCVs) accessing the B2, B8 and Sui Generis areas. It is important to have some degree of separation between HCVs and other users. This is in part encompassed by the objective relating to safety, but the need to separate and avoid conflict between the less compatible transport modes such as HCVs and pedestrian / cyclists could be made more explicit in the transport and movement principles.
--	---

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 35 (a-d)

MODAL SHARE TARGET

Do you support or object to the proposed Options on modal share target, and why?

Respondents		Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
35a	11	2	5	4
35b	13	8	4	1
35c	6	3	2	1
35d	8	0	0	8

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
Qu35a Modal Share Target (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Orbital bus routes also for local residents Support the setting of a modal share target for the CNFE. The 24% car trip target should be applied to trips that have an origin and destination within Cambridge City only, recognising that short urban trips have the highest propensity to be undertaken on foot, by bicycle or public transport. This may be challenging to deliver given the potential employment levels created here and the regional draw to such employment. It is considered that a target is required but this needs to be realistic and challenging.
Qu35a Modal Share Target (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The modal share target set for of 24% car trips by 2031 is an aspirational target, it is not clear how this will be obtained or monitored, it should also be noted that there is an obvious funding gap in the Councils transport infrastructure plans. Paragraph 154 of the NPPF advises that Councils should be aspirational but realistic. Due to transportation infrastructure funding gaps it is doubtful if this target is realistic. Matching the modal share target is not ambitious enough. It should be possible to do much better than in other areas of Cambridge. When working within the constraints of an existing road network, improvements for pedestrians and cyclists in particular are difficult to achieve. In developing a new area there is no reason to repeat those mistakes, and a much better modal share should be achieved. The absence of any information about traffic generation means it is impossible to assess if this target is achievable. Support option C

<p>Qu35a Modal Share Target (Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orbital bus, with new rail/river crossing to Wadloes Road • Pedestrianised existing Cowley Road, with traffic rerouted on a new road adjacent to the sewage works • Pedestrianised area around the new square (as featured on map) • Buses running until midnight with stops on the new Cowley Road (B on map) • Bus routes from the north (A10/Waterbeach/Milton) should be routed via the new station to improve connectivity via public transport and buses should run every day and up to midnight, to encourage people to use the bus. • All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their interrelationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme, in particular proposals requiring significant transport intervention for both local, strategic and rail networks.
<p>Qu35b Modal Share Target (Support)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orbital bus, with new rail/river crossing to Wadloes Road • Pedestrianise existing Cowley Road, with traffic rerouted on a new road adjacent to the sewage works • Pedestrianised area around the new square (as featured on map) • Buses running until midnight with stops on the new Cowley Road (B on map) • Show we can be innovative and leading for new infrastructure. • Make the area an example of what can be achieved. Cambridge is already a tech and academic hub; and in the next few years will, hopefully, become a model cycling city. Let's merge those three together and show the country what is possible. Silicon Valley-meets-Copenhagen, if you will. • The rail, bus and cycle links make this an ideal opportunity to maximise travel by train, bus and cycling instead of by car. • Modal share targets need to be ambitious but realistic and achievable. The Cambridgeshire County Council Cambridge Sub Regional Model (CSRM) should be utilised to undertake further transport modelling work for the CNFE to develop appropriate modal share targets for the CNFE. Once further modelling work has been undertaken it will be possible to identify whether tougher modal share targets can be achieved at the CNFE. • It should be possible to do much better than in other areas of Cambridge. When working within the constraints of an existing road network, improvements for pedestrians and cyclists in particular are difficult to achieve. In developing a new area there is no reason to repeat those mistakes, and a much better modal share should be achieved. • The absence of any information about traffic generation means it is impossible to assess if this target is achievable. • Subject to viability; recognise the need to minimise car journeys and exploit the enhanced transport infrastructure. • Strongly support Option B • Go beyond the target set for the city and make the area an exemplar scheme. • This development is an ideal opportunity to have aspirational transport goals. • The Guided Busway, a new rail link and the local cycle network provide excellent connections by public and active transport. • Every effort should be made to minimise private motor vehicle use at this location.
<p>Qu35b Modal Share Target (Object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies that attempt to force people into doing things they don't want to will both be unpopular and cause trouble - see, for example, the parking problems in Orchard Park resulting from insufficient provision of parking spaces. • To set an unrealistic target for modal shift at a time when there is an obvious

	<p>funding gap in the Councils transport infrastructure plans would not be compliant with paragraph 154 of the NPPF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support option C
Qu35b Modal Share Target (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their interrelationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme, in particular proposals requiring significant transport intervention for both local, strategic and rail networks.
Qu35c Modal Share Target (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is inappropriate to set such targets in policy before the precise mix of uses is known and understood. • The absence of any information about traffic generation means it is impossible to assess if this target is achievable. • I don't think a local plan such as this should get itself involved in such matters and not constrain any particular form of transport.
Qu35c Modal Share Target (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support using this opportunity to minimise car usage. • Realistic and achievable targets should be set in order to determine the likely transport impact of the CNFE and to what extent travel planning and transport improvements are able to mitigate the impact. Modal share targets should be produced to inform the development of a package of phased transport measures required to achieve the targets.
Qu35c Modal Share Target (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their interrelationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme, in particular proposals requiring significant transport intervention for both local, strategic and rail networks.
Qu35d Modal Share Target (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a footpath (and possibly cycle path as well) from the new station to Green End Road, to encourage local people to leave cars at home. • Buses should stop along Milton Road to collect local people who want to use the station etc. At present many buses travel along Milton Road, but few stop. • Perhaps buses travelling along Milton Road could also serve the station via Cowley Road. • I would like to be able, for example, to get on a bus at Union Lane to take me to the new station. • The 24% car trip target by 2031 only focuses on car trips within Cambridge. Therefore further assessment work is required to identify realistic CNFE site wide car modal share targets and targets for individual land uses. The CNFE modal share targets need to be linked to a package of phased transport measures that are required to achieve the modal share targets. • Whilst the benefits of an overly prescriptive approach to mode share within the area are questionable it is clear there is strong potential for the CNFE Area to become an exemplar sustainable community and destination. To ensure this goal is fulfilled, sustainable transport links to existing and new communities, including Waterbeach New Town, need to be emphasized. • Good pedestrian/cycle links are required for all the surrounding areas such as Milton via Jane Coston Bridge, Chesterton via the sidings triangle, and Abbey and Fen Ditton via the planned Chisholm Trail river bridge. Bus shuttles should be considered for all the surrounding areas with departure/arrival times properly matched with rail services. Through bus services such as the green P&R service or number 9 should call at the station with Citi 2 terminus. • It is very difficult, at this early stage in the evolution of CNFE, to say with certainty that modal shift percentages can and will be achieved. It is certainly

	<p>a worthwhile objective to ensure that modal share targets that are set for the whole of Cambridge are met on the site, and there is room for optimism that this can be achieved at CNFE. This will however be an exacting target, and Turnstone do not consider that it would yet be appropriate to seek to go beyond the target of 24% set for the City as a whole.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not possible to set a precise target at present given the uncertainty at this stages in the process as regards the mix of land uses in the scheme. However RLW Estates object to no mode share target being set as this would almost certainly undermine the transport and movement principles. • All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their interrelationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme, in particular proposals requiring significant transport intervention for both local, strategic and rail networks.
--	--

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 36 (a-d):				
VEHICULAR ACCESS AND ROAD LAYOUT				
Do you support or object to the proposed Options for Cowley Road, and why?				
Respondents		Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
36a	10	2	6	2
36b	14	5	4	5
36c	14	8	1	5
36d	19	2	1	16
Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation			
Qu36a Vehicular Access and Road Layout (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimise car usage and maximise use of rail, bus and cycling. • Do not build any additional roads. • Retain existing Cowley Road as the main access road for all modes of transport. • Need to re-route HGV movements on a dedicated route to the north of Cowley Road and provide a more pedestrian and cycle friendly main access through the AAP area along Cowley Road. • The whole of the 'corridor' between the disused NR access road, the First Public Drain and the existing Cowley Road should be used to create a wide tree-lined boulevard delivering a high quality walking and cycling route as well as appropriate vehicle access to CNFE. 			
Qu36a Vehicular Access and Road Layout (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrianise existing Cowley Road • New boulevard to the north, adjacent to the sewage works • HGV banned from turning right towards the station • By retain Cowley Road as the only entrance / exit into the AAP site, future development opportunities would be restricted especially those associated with industrial / waste / minerals uses which is what this AAP should focus its attention on developing • Option A would be a disaster. Need to improve pedestrian and cycling access to the new station. The road is too narrow and totally unsuitable for these users to share it with general traffic. 			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The absence of any information about traffic generation means it is impossible to assess the impacts of this option. Increased traffic, including heavy goods traffic will impact upon existing businesses and may prejudice safety of pedestrians and cyclists. • There will be an increasing number of users and a wide variety of modes of transport using this area, ranging from pedestrian and cyclists going to the offices and the station, to HCVs. The redevelopment of the area provides an opportunity to improve conditions. This includes improved separation between HCVs and other users, given the significant levels of demand likely to be generated by the AAP proposals, but also to minimise the impact of such traffic on other land uses through minimisation of noise and vibration of vehicles.
Qu36a Vehicular Access and Road Layout (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain Cowley Road as the main site access but Milton Road corridor must cater for sustainable modes of travel to allow reliable journey times from new and existing communities. • No objection to separating the heavy industrial traffic from pedestrians and cyclists. • No objection in principle to the creation of a new access road along the southern boundary of the WRC. However, land ownership details will need to be clarified.
Qu36b Vehicular Access and Road Layout (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the area from increased congestion, there must be a focus on encouraging people to use sustainable modes of transport. • Need to make the routes safe and easy to use for cyclists and pedestrians, improving the journey times and experience for everyone. • A second vehicular access is a reasonable compromise. However, it must consider active modes at a design stage; efficient access, priority over side roads, dedicated space. Also there should be no through routes between the two vehicular accesses, to prevent rat running and create a safe attractive space for active modes. Filtered permeability and bus gates should be used to enable active and public modes have full access to the site. • Option B is supported above Option A, but less than Option C. • Cowley Road access would also be greatly improved by opening up the old Network Rail access track as a high quality off road cycle and walking connection. • Priority for cyclists and pedestrians will become increasingly important • Would segregate station and cycling/walking traffic from main employment route. However, the absence of any information about traffic generation means it is impossible to assess the impacts of this option. Increased traffic, including heavy goods traffic will impact upon existing businesses and may prejudice safety of pedestrians and cyclists.
Qu36b Vehicular Access and Road Layout (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimise car usage and maximise use of rail, bus and cycling. • Do not build any additional roads. • Object to proposal to restrict private car movements on Cowley Road. A Quality Bus corridor is being constructed south of Cowley Road as an extension of the existing CGB. This route should be open to all public transport vehicles both guided and un-guided. The CGB route is sufficient to provide reliable and fast public transport services to the new railway station and the AAP area. High quality cycle facilities can be provided parallel to the existing Cowley Road by utilising the disused Network Rail site access road, without needing to restrict vehicle movements on Cowley Road. • No details about funding necessary before a large quantum of development can take place. This would prioritise sustainable modes of transport suitable for the AAP site if this included a large amount of residential and office uses. Doubtful that those uses can be delivered.
Qu36b Vehicular	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the focus on walking, cycling and public transport. But to make a route truly attractive for these users, pedestrians should not be forced to

<p>Access and Road Layout (Comment)</p>	<p>share pavement with cyclists and cyclists should have a route separate from the road. There is no reason why this cannot be achieved and it is unclear whether even option B would do this, as Cowley Road will still be narrow even if most of its traffic is removed. What is really needed is a new route away from the road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The improvements to Cowley Road are supported but sustainable modes of travel along the Milton Road corridor must be catered for to allow reliable journey times from new and existing communities. Any new junction arrangements with Milton Road must be shown to deliver benefits to all but with reference to the hierarchy of users. • There will be an increasing number of users and a wide variety of modes of transport using this area, ranging from pedestrian and cyclists going to the offices and the station, to HCVs accessing the B2, B8 and Sui Generis areas. It is important to have separation between HCVs and other users, not least to ensure the safety of those moving in and through the area. • Priority for cyclists and pedestrians will become increasingly important. • We understand the importance of seeking to separate the heavy industrial traffic from pedestrians and cyclists and have no objection in principle to the creation of a new access road along the southern boundary of the WRC. However, the detail of land ownership will need to be explored as some of this appears to be on land in the ownership of Anglian Water.
<p>Qu36c Vehicular Access and Road Layout (Support)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping heavy traffic away from any residential development is highly desirable. • HGV route will be needed • Option C is supported above Option A and Option B • Support the provision of a new Heavy Goods Vehicle access parallel and to the north of Cowley Road for industrial, minerals and waste activities only. This vehicle access strategy will significantly reduce heavy good vehicle movements from Cowley Road, allowing the flexibility to create a safer walking and cycling environment for CNFE residents and employees along the Cowley Road corridor. • Support in principle. The creation of a dedicated HGV access to support the existing industries on site is considered to be a positive step in developing the AAP site for an industrial hub. However, there remains substantial concern about the funding and deliverability of such a solution. • The absence of any information about traffic generation means it is impossible to assess the impacts of this option. • Cowley Road should be prioritised for the station, office and any residential traffic. Turnstone agrees that it would be sensible for any heavy goods vehicle (HGV) access to be provided parallel and to the north of Cowley Road, for industrial, minerals and waste activities only. This should not pre-determine that heavy industrial or - for instance - minerals/aggregates uses will be a permanent feature at CNFE, but it would make considerable sense to have appropriate contingencies in terms of access in place right from the very outset. • The provision of a new HGV access to the area would be a major benefit for all industrial, minerals and waste activities taking place in the area. A route separating HGV traffic from traffic accessing the station, office and residential areas would be a major improvement in terms of Health and Safety. It would also reduce congestion and improve the ease and efficiency of access for all concerned. • We understand the importance of seeking to separate the heavy industrial traffic from pedestrians and cyclists and have no objection in principle to the creation of a new access road along the southern boundary of the WRC. However, the detail of land ownership will need to be explored as some of this appears to be on land in the ownership of Anglian Water.

<p>Qu36c Vehicular Access and Road Layout (Object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would encourage developments which lead to more lorries going to the site.
<p>Qu36c Vehicular Access and Road Layout (Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All aggregate lorries should access the site via westbound on-off slips from the A14 and not go onto Milton Road at all. • Access solutions that look to segregate heavy vehicle traffic from more vulnerable users are supported but designs and movement strategies must ensure that the future wholesale redevelopment of the area is acknowledged. • HGV route will be needed. • There will be an increasing number of users and a wide variety of modes of transport using this area, ranging from pedestrian and cyclists going to the offices and the station, to HCVs accessing the B2, B8 and Sui Generis areas. It is important to have separation between HCVs and other users, not least to ensure the safety of those moving in and through the area.
<p>Qu36d Vehicular Access and Road Layout (Support)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nearside lane of Milton Road southbound from the interchange should be a Cowley Road only filter lane. • A route for aggregate lorries serving the A14 improvements to come off the A14 westbound directly (left-off, left-on) to fill up at ground level from the aggregate depot, would be a great improvement, so that this activity did not affect the development of the area or traffic on Milton Road. If a left-turn-off left-turn-on route is made west of the railway then it should continue beside the A14 to join with Cowley Road as a dedicated access for heavy lorries headed towards Cambridge. • Cyclists and pedestrians need to be catered for on each and every access road. Should the plan opt for a second access road the Campaign recommends that no through routes for motor vehicles are created between them, preventing the temptation for drivers to rat-run though the development to beat traffic on Milton Road. Flexibility and convenience of routes for active modes must be as good, indeed better, than that available for motorised vehicles. Providing this filtered permeability is crucial for central areas to be attractive for cycling and walking.
<p>Qu36d Vehicular Access and Road Layout (Object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan does not seem terribly joined up about road access. The whole question of linkages to the A14 from Fen Road could be readily added into this mix, unsnarling major traffic issues.
<p>Qu36d Vehicular Access and Road Layout (Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A route for aggregate lorries serving the A14 improvements to come off the A14 westbound directly (left-off, left-on) to fill up at ground level from the aggregate depot, would be a great improvement, so that this activity did not affect the development of the area or traffic on Milton Road. • Strategic traffic modelling work is required to identify the highway capacity improvements required on the Milton Road corridor and access to the site. Priority needs to be given in the City Deal to funding transport schemes that improve the accessibility of the CNFE site. • Area-wide travel planning should be given greater importance in reducing existing vehicular travel demand by extending the existing Travel Plan Plus scheme. The County Council also needs to undertake further assessment work to understand the impact of the new railway station on the potential for modal shift from car to rail trips in the local area. • Concentrate major highway improvements in the interface where Cowley

Road meets Milton Road - to perpetuate a situation of the whole CNFE area being accessed through a single stretch of road wedged between the Innovation Park and the TV building is simply going to exacerbate existing problems.

- The quantum of development envisaged through the AAP should be reduced to reflect that which is sustainable in the next five years. This needs to take account of the delivery times for the railway station, Guided busway interchange and the Milton Road A10 / A14 access upgrades.
- Need to widen Milton Road to two lanes southbound, between the Science Park junction and the busway. Congestion approaching the Science Park is already a serious problem, particularly as it often stretches back to the A14. This problem can only become worse if the area is developed, even if the focus is on sustainable transport.
- Vehicle access into and out of the CNFE Plan area remains a significant problem. A major new interchange is required for vehicle traffic, with the existing network of footpath and cycleways creating links to the surrounding area. If provision is not materially increased, existing problems will be exacerbated, dissuading landowners from looking at alternative uses and discouraging investors from bringing forward development proposals.
- Insufficient detail to comment at this stage.
- Cyclists should be considered too and allowed a traffic free approach where the interaction with LGVs/buses is eliminated. This is the chance to prevent the distressing and needless deaths one sees so often in London and the cities.
- Bus priority measures are being explored along Milton Road and this is supported in principle. The potential to intelligently use carriageway space in the vicinity of the Science Park should also be explored to respond to changes in tidal demand.
- We understand the importance of seeking to separate the heavy industrial traffic from pedestrians and cyclists and have no objection in principle to the creation of a new access road along the southern boundary of the WRC. However, the detail of land ownership will need to be explored as some of this appears to be on land in the ownership of Anglian Water.
- In addition to the vehicular options proposed through the CNFE AAP, in order to relieve traffic congestion around the existing A14/Milton Road junction, TTP Consulting have considered whether an additional access from the A14 to the station could be included within the AAP and delivered as part of the redevelopment. Request consideration of this option to address existing and future transport, highways and access issues.
- Option depends upon the final option chosen for CNFE, its context of the whole site and not individual land ownerships or phasing. Separation of cyclists and pedestrians from vehicles should be an aim.
- All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their interrelationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme, in particular proposals requiring significant transport intervention for both local, strategic and rail networks.

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 37 (a-c):

PARKING AT TRANSPORT INTERCHANGE

Do you support or object to the proposed Options for parking at the proposed new rail/bus transport interchange, and why?

Respondents		Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
37a	7	1	5	1
37b	14	12	0	2
37c	5	0	0	5

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
Qu37a Parking at Transport Interchange (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low-level car parking facilities
Qu37a Parking at Transport Interchange (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the current proposed surface car parking layout. The consented layout fails to make best use of the site. It would be difficult to extend or to construct a multi-storey structure on the footprint given the site's shape and proximity to the Bramblefields reserve. • Better location for a surface car park is adjacent to the existing main railway line, north of new station building. A conventional rectangular footprint could be used, being more efficient in terms of the number of spaces and providing flexibility to convert to a multi-storey car park if sufficient future demand arises. • Short-sighted option; Justification for capacity not provided • CNFE Area should maximise developable land in and around the comprehensive transport networks that exist. • Support option B
Qu37a Parking at Transport Interchange (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final proposal should inform car parking provision which has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network.
Qu37b Parking at Transport Interchange (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Makes better use of the land and not everyone can walk or cycle to the station. Would there be appropriate public transport when the late trains arrive from London? • Support a multi-storey car park. Witness the pressure on parking at the main station. Not everyone can walk or cycle. • Support the location of a surface car park that makes best use of the overall site. It is recommended that the surface car park is constructed adjacent to the existing main railway line to the north of the new station building. The surface car park could be laid out in a conventional rectangular footprint which is more efficient in terms of the number of spaces and provides flexibility to convert to a multi-storey car park if there is sufficient future demand. • Final proposal should inform car parking provision which has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting

	<p>sustainable transport access to the site, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to make best use of the available space • Flexible option with more realistic longer term solution although no details of capacity given • The efficient use of land is supported in this key Cambridge North location where strong sustainable transport links are already in place and will be enhanced between existing and new communities, including Waterbeach New Town. • Will ensure more people have the ability to use the station • Maximises land use, potentially enables a wider range of land uses and should enable more residential development away from the odour footprint.
Qu37b Parking at Transport Interchange (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final proposal should inform car parking provision which has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network. • Should consider a multi-storey car park. Cambridge North could, and possibly should be, a new city centre, so we will need considerably more parking than is currently proposed in the future.
Qu37c Parking at Transport Interchange (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The car parking at the Station should be for station users only. The car park should not be operated as a 'park and ride' site for the CGB. • Final proposal should inform car parking provision which has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network. • Adequate provision should be made to preclude overspill parking elsewhere in the area. • The key priority as regards car parking is to ensure that it is provided to a standard and in a way which supports the overall strategy for CNFE. Therefore proper provision needs to be made both for appropriate car parking, but also for public realm befitting of one of the main entrances to CNFE.

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 38 (a-d):

CAR PARKING STANDARDS

Do you support or object to the proposed Options for car parking standards, and why?

Respondents		Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
38a	7	4	1	2
38b	10	6	3	1
38c	6	1	3	2

38d	9	1	0	8
Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation			
Qu38a Car Parking Standards (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking standards should not be more onerous than in the rest of the city especially given the location on the edge of the settlement. • This is the least worst Option • Should include CCC adopted car parking standards and cycle parking standards. • The Crown Estates are planning to improve the amount of cycle parking provision and quality at CBP, and hope to deliver on this initiative within 2015, again this is part of their Sustainability Action Plan. 			
Qu38a Car Parking Standards (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The car parking restrictions in appendix L8 of the referenced documents are far too tight - see what has happened about car parking in Orchard Park 			
Qu38a Car Parking Standards (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brookgate support the use of car parking standards across the whole area that are more restrictive than the car parking standards policy set by the Cambridge City Council car parking standards, to reflect the highly sustainable location. The current policy however forms a useful starting point in discussions over car parking levels. • Car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network. • More detailed consideration of parking numbers and approach to parking provision, will be required including detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, potential for shared use of parking across different land uses and impacts of traffic on networks 			
Qu38b Car Parking Standards (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the future cars should not be the primary mode of transport. • Support more restrictive car parking standards across the whole area to reflect the highly sustainable location. Transport modelling work will assist in determining the appropriate levels of car parking taking into account the site accessibility and proposed land-uses. It should be recognised that car parking levels particularly for commercial development should not be set too low as it may make development unattractive to potential tenants, particularly given the high car parking levels consented on adjacent established commercial development sites. The under-provision of car parking could also lead to off-site overspill parking. • Consideration to be given to this to reflect sustainability of location • Restricting car parking standards across the whole area will reflect the area's highly sustainable location. • Enabling active and public transport must be the focus for this development. Restrictions on private motor use are part of achieving this mode shift. • Sensible approach to maximise more sustainable forms of transport as well as encouraging employers to support more sustainable forms of transport for travel to work. 			
Qu38b Car Parking Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even tighter restriction for residential accommodation would be ridiculous (see answer to 38a). However, there is a need to ensure that parking intended for residents and their visitors isn't usurped by station and business users. Therefore such parking should not be "on-street" but within the confines of each property, in order to avoid having to pay for a "residents' 			

(Object)	<p>parking scheme".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourages on-street parking, competition for spaces and does not reduce car usage, just displaces it. • This is the worst option
Qu38b Car Parking Standards (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network. • More detailed consideration of parking numbers and approach to parking provision, will be required including detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, potential for shared use of parking across different land uses and impacts of traffic on networks
Qu38c Car Parking Standards (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support only providing displacement of station area parking is carefully controlled to prevent problems elsewhere.
Qu38c Car Parking Standards (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As experience in the rest of Cambridge has shown, if you stop people parking in one place or charge for it they will just move to parking somewhere nearby (even, it seems, on double yellow lines). Therefore you have no option but to either provide entirely adequate car parking facilities for those who want to park, or to provide car parking facilities on individual properties that are owned by the residents. • Brookgate object to a 'tiered' approach to car parking standards based on the proximity to the station. The success of the whole AAP will in part be based on linking the benefits of the new station and the extension of the CGB with the whole AAP site through a variety of sustainable transport measures including encouraging walking, train/cycle, shuttle buses and other innovative solutions which will allow the whole allocation (and the wider area) to shift from car dominated transport to other modes. • This is the second worst Option
Qu38c Car Parking Standards (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More focus on public transport • Car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network. • More detailed consideration of parking numbers and approach to parking provision, will be required including detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, potential for shared use of parking across different land uses and impacts of traffic on networks
Qu38d Car Parking Standards (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is entirely appropriate for the Plan to acknowledge that car parking in and around a new CNFE area will be an important part of any new development. This is particularly the case where existing employment areas have established patterns of movement and car parking which seek to meet the needs of users. We acknowledge that owners and tenants of existing buildings will perhaps need a more stringent car parking management system in place to ensure that there is no abuse of the spaces within their control.
Qu38d Car Parking Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network. • More detailed consideration of parking numbers and approach to parking

(Comment)	<p>provision, will be required including detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, potential for shared use of parking across different land uses and impacts of traffic on networks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A balanced approach is required recognising the accessibility of the site by non-car modes but also the need to provide appropriate levels of operational car parking. Further modelling work should be undertaken to inform the car parking standards for each of the land uses proposed on the CNFE site. • It is important that any new developments which do come forward do not compound existing parking problems. Land owners such as St John's College along with their tenants may well need a more stringent car parking management system to ensure proper controlled parking in the instance where new significant development is coming forward. • All the options fail to consider pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users, including disabled on buses, by placing a Multi-storey carpark right next to the station. This replicates the horrendous conditions at Cambridge railway station where vehicles pick up and deposit people just a couple of metres from the front door, creating a fume-filled and dangerous approach, frequently gridlocked and preventing buses from completing a turning round a small roundabout. This delays the buses from arriving at their stops, delays the public travelling on them and makes it the poor relation. • Consideration to be given to reflect sustainability of location • No preference on the three options but it is relevant that car use can be further discouraged by ensuring sustainable links are secured to existing and planned communities, including Waterbeach New Town. A relationship between accessibility and parking provision is a sensible and pragmatic approach. Any adopted parking standards need to consider the volume of vehicles that this could in turn generate and the implications for traffic and transport along the important Milton Road corridor. • Turnstone agrees that appropriate levels of car parking must be planned for as part of the CNFE development. However, parking associated with the railway station must not, under any circumstances, interfere with the need to create a proper entrance/arrival point to CNFE, and therefore parking should not be delivered for cars at the expense of high quality provision for bicycles, bus interchange and public realm. • Crown Estate do not support a restriction in car parking standards or further cycle parking spaces.
-----------	---

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTIONS 39 (a-d):

CYCLE PARKING PROVISION

Do you support or object to the proposed Options for cycle parking standards, and why?

Respondents		Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
39a	4	2	1	1
39b	12	10	1	1
39c	8	5	2	1
39d	5	0	0	5

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
Qu39a Cycle Parking Provision (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The standards have been successfully used on the CB1 development, a similar highly sustainable transport hub. • The Crown Estate support Option A for the CNFE AAP to include CCC adopted car parking standards and cycle parking standards. The Crown Estate are planning to improve the amount of cycle parking provision and quality at CBP, and hope to deliver on this initiative within 2015, again this is part of their Sustainability Action Plan.
Qu39a Cycle Parking Provision (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable location given existing and new cycleway links, therefore adequate provision needed which is likely to exceed local plan standards.
Qu39a Cycle Parking Provision (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network. • More detailed consideration of parking numbers and approach to parking provision, will be required including detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, potential for shared use of parking across different land uses and impacts of traffic on networks
Qu39b Cycle Parking Provision (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The more available cycle parking there is the more attractive and convenient this area will be for cycling to & from CNFE. • Providing even greater amounts of cycle parking that are expected to be used seems an appropriate way to encourage people to use cycles. If you are hoping that some workers will arrive by train and then cycle to locations on the Science Park, then you need to provide sufficient secure cycle storage to enable people to leave their cycles at the station overnight and at weekends. • A higher standard of cycle parking will be needed and it would be absurd to create a pleasant cycling environment but not require there to be enough spaces for all potential users. • New cycleways will encourage more cycling and therefore higher level of provision likely. • Consideration to be given to higher standard to reflect sustainability of location. • This would be more likely to maximise the potential for employees and visitors to travel by bike, for example between Waterbeach New Town and the CNFE Area. • The Campaign supports Option B: higher cycle parking standard across the whole area to reflect the highly sustainable location. High-quality, easily accessible and available cycle parking throughout the site is entirely appropriate for enabling high cycling use at all destinations - employment, residential and the station. The Campaign also recommends secure, covered cycle parking in residential areas as these reduce theft and deterioration of residents' bikes.
Qu39b Cycle Parking Provision (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brookgate object to higher cycle parking standards as the current standards are sufficient to deal with the likely demand for cycle parking in areas with good cycle infrastructure and connectivity.

<p>Qu39b Cycle Parking Provision</p> <p>(Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network. • More detailed consideration of parking numbers and approach to parking provision, will be required including detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, potential for shared use of parking across different land uses and impacts of traffic on networks
<p>Qu39c Cycle Parking Provision</p> <p>(Support)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would also like to see cycle lockers as an option in the station cycle parking areas. • To encourage cycling, it will be essential to have sufficient, safe, well-lit, adequately roofed cycle parking • We would also like to see cycle lockers as an option in the station cycle parking areas. • The station will inevitably be used for commuting and encouraging travel to the station by cycle should be supported and provided for. The Guided Busway links will also encourage the use of cycling from possibly further than may otherwise be the case.
<p>Qu39c Cycle Parking Provision</p> <p>(Object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brookgate object to a 'tiered' approach to cycle parking standards based on the proximity to the station. The success of the whole AAP will in part be based on linking the benefits of the new station and extension of the CGB with the whole AAP site through a variety of sustainable transport measures including encouraging walking, train/cycle, shuttle buses and other innovative solutions which will allow the whole allocation (and the wider area) shift from car dominated transport to other modes. • New cycleways will encourage more cycling and therefore higher level of provision likely.
<p>Qu39c Cycle Parking Provision</p> <p>(Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ability to park a cycle in a safe, secure, and convenient location is a key aspect of encouraging and supporting travel by bike. Cycle parking provision at least in line with standards will be required. However, further more detailed analysis will be needed on cycle mode share and targets to determine an appropriate level that maximises cycle access to the area. This is likely to confirm a level of provision in excess of standards given the high levels of non-car mode split likely to be required.
<p>Qu39d Cycle Parking Provision</p> <p>(Comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City Council have a preference for cycle parking to be provided using Sheffield Stands. Increasingly double stacking racks are being installed and used at rail stations and are widely used new residential and non-residential developments. Double stackers provide added benefits, maximising cycle parking provision and making the most efficient use of limited space. It is suggested that the Cambridge City cycle parking standards are updated to reflect the increased use and popularity of double stackers. The provision of a high proportion of cycle parking using double-stackers would maximise the efficient use of the CNFE site. • Consideration to be given to higher standard to reflect sustainability of location • In order to achieve the modal share targets envisaged, high levels of cycle parking provision will be required. As a starting point the standards in the emerging Local Plan (Policy 82 and Appendix L) should be adopted, but Turnstone agrees that there may be scope for higher levels of provision in close proximity to the railway station interchange. • Car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation. Need to balance operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport, ensuring minimal residual impact on the highway network. • More detailed consideration of parking numbers and approach to parking

	<p>provision, will be required including detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, potential for shared use of parking across different land uses and impacts of traffic on networks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to further cycle parking spaces.
--	---

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 40:

MOVEMENT, SEVERANCE AND PERMEABILITY

What further provision should be made to improve the cycle and pedestrian environment in the Cambridge Northern Fringe East area, and are there any other pedestrian and cycleway linkages that are important and you wish to be included in the plan?

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
25	2	1	22

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
-----------------	---

<p>Qu40 Movement, Severance & Permeability (support)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Off-site connections are crucial for enabling a high cycling and walking mode share. These should have separate provision for each mode - no shared use. Priority over side accesses. Separated from motor traffic. Direct (not multi-stage) protected crossings at off side junctions. • Major connections to consider: Jane Coston bridge; Northern Guideway; Fen Road (through Chesterton Sidings Triangle); Cowley Road (need to ensure Network Rail track is protected from development to use as cycle and pedestrian access to station); Chisholm trail (including bridge). • Suggest that filtered permeability (full access for sustainable modes, no through routes for motor vehicles) is used throughout the development, to create an attractive environment for cycling and walking free from the noise and pollution of through traffic.
<p>Qu40 Movement, Severance & Permeability (object)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The North Area (including Science Park) is dis-joined in cycling planning. Cycle routes should also be better joined up to create more safe, segregated cycling. The question of bridges and river crossings in Chesterton should be addressed as part of this plan - people still face a nightmare-ish commute north of the river to these re-generated areas.
<p>Qu40 Movement, Severance & Permeability (comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider pedestrian and cycling infrastructure as two separate priorities, and keep pedestrian/cycle routes separate. In all cycling infrastructure cyclists should be given the same right-of-way as vehicular traffic - new cycle routes should not be broken up by side roads. • Look at the following routes into the area: Milton Road; Green End Road; Fen Road. • Improvement to cycling infrastructure here should be considered as part of the plan, encouraging more people to travel by bike. • Make Network Rail's disused private access road from Milton Road to Chesterton sidings a public footpath and cycleway for travelling to and from the new railway station. This would be more pleasant and convenient than the pedestrian and cycle route currently proposed for Cowley Road. • The Crown Estate could install side entrances on the North side of the Cambridge Business Park to shorten the walk between offices on the Cambridge Business Park and the new railway station and encourage travel to the Cambridge Business Park by train.

- There should be a new bridge over the river for cyclists to reach the station directly from the Abbey area. I believe this has already been discussed and I hope approved.
- Cycling along Fen Road should be made safer; I think there are already proposals for this.
- Access should be available between the newly pedestrianised Cowley Road and the Business Park to avoid the need to walk all the way up to Cowley Road if pedestrians are coming from the south. Initially this could be at the very end of the Business Park, with additional access to the side once the area there gets developed.
- Provide more connections to the North and East of the area: a cycle tunnel under the A14 near the railway into Milton Country Park, and a level crossing link to Fen Road and onwards to the River Cam via Grassy Corner.
- Safeguard the old Network Rail (Lafarge) track on the south side of the First Public Drain as a dedicated cycle path to the station.
- These ideas need careful thought to provide suitable access for everyone. Local consultation would be desirable.
- Provide a direct route (avoiding all the junctions off Milton Road) from the Jane Coston Bridge to the railway station.
- CNFE should deliver improvements to the Milton Road corridor and the Jane Coston Bridge corridor, improving cycle access to the CNFE site and improving connections northwards to Milton village.
- The City Deal should deliver the Chisholm Trail to improve cycle connectivity to the south along with good quality local links into Chesterton.
- High quality cycle facilities could be provided parallel to the existing Cowley Road by utilising the disused Network Rail site access road to help improve links to Milton Road and the existing Science Park.
- Links from the Jane Coston bridge are very important, both to the new station and to Milton Road (where the existing path has much scope for improvement).
- Any considerations for further provision of cycle and pedestrian access in CNFE should take account of both the existing and planned mineral and waste activities in the area and the importance of separation between HCVs and other users.
- The carpark should be sited a minimum of 100 metres away from the new station in order to improve safety and air quality for pedestrians and cyclists. A covered walkway could be provided, if one is also provided from public transport users - but priority must be given to pedestrians and users of public transport (excludes taxis). Similarly, a taxi rank should not be any closer than 100 metres to allow space for ordinary and guided buses.
- Support the need to maximise linkages, but there are insufficient details to assess proposals fully at this stage.
- There are economic and environmental benefits in ensuring CNFE has sustainable links not only to existing residential neighbourhoods but also planned new communities. The AAP should set out how CNFE will contribute to securing and/or enhancing cycle links to the proposed Waterbeach New Town. Specifically cycle links along the River Cam, through Milton, between the Jane Coston Cycle Bridge and the CNFE and also along any future bus priority routes - especially along the Chisholm Trail to connect to the future busway links under the A14.
- Support for proposed attention to cycle improvements linked to Chisholm Trail and Milton Road.
- Consideration needs to be given to how cycling and walking linkages could be improved to the north of the area, specifically linking to Milton Country Park and the River Cam/Hailing Way.
- A further pedestrian / cycle tunnel under or bridge over the A14 to the West

of the River Cam and East of the existing Coston Cycle Bridge would bring significant benefits.

- Good pedestrian/cycle links are required for all the surrounding areas such as Milton via Jane Coston Bridge, Chesterton via the sidings triangle, and Abbey/Fen Ditton via the planned Chisholm Trail river bridge.
- The AAP must recognise existing cycle infrastructure which exists in the area, and must consider the scope that may exist for enhancing this.
- There are important links to the CNFE area from the north, via the Jane Coston Bridge, and possibly up from the River Cam corridor. Adequate provision must be provided in terms of wide cycle paths, etc, but also these gateways are made as attractive as they possibly can be.
- Good linkages for pedestrians and cyclists and, potentially, horse riders should be achieved to the eastern boundary of the site linking with the River Cam Corridor (and its special neighbourhood) and Milton Country Park (including proper wide tunnel etc under or bridge over the A14 adjacent to the River Cam).
- Effective and sympathetic solutions need to be found to link with existing neighbourhood to south of the new Guided Bus Route and the River Cam / Chisholm Cycle Trail.
- Support for access between the new railway station and existing offices in the AAP, specifically Cambridge Business Park. Potential pedestrian/cycle access options, supported by Business Park occupiers have previously been worked up by Scott Brownrigg and HED and are enclosed for information. We would therefore like to see these options included within the next stage of the AAP.
- The proposals should not go ahead unless as part of the scheme a cycle footway is provided on Network Rail land alongside Cowley Road. The scheme needs a safe route for cyclists and pedestrians; the Cowley Road footpath as proposed would have the entrances across it.
- The strategy must focus on connectivity with key destinations lying to the south and north, including accessibility to CNFE itself and as part of the wider corridor, including the link between Waterbeach new town (via Jane Coston Bridge) and the city centre. In addition, the opportunity for linking the Chisholm Trail northwards through CNFE to the Milton Country Park via the rail corridor should also be taken.

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 41 (a-c):

SUSTAINABLE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION & FLOOD RISK

Do you support or object to the proposed Options on sustainable design and construction, and flood risk?

Respondents		Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
41a	8	3	2	3
41b	14	7	2	5
41c	5	0	0	5

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
Qu41a Sustainable Design & Construction & Flood Risk (support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should not be more expensive than elsewhere in the City. Should comply with policy which complies with NPPF or other national standards. • Anglian Water support option (a) which proposes that the CNFE area relies upon Local Plan polices related to climate change and sustainable design and construction.
Qu41a Sustainable Design & Construction & Flood Risk (object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Option B.
Qu41a Sustainable Design & Construction & Flood Risk (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the constant changes in Building Regulations requirements and with regards to sustainability, standards targets are unrealistic at such an early stage of policy formation. The relevant Building Regulations standards will be imposed at the point of delivery on the ground. • Support for Option A. Creating a specific and potentially more onerous policy framework for the CNFE would be strongly objected to by St John's College, assuming that their landholdings would fall within the Plan area. • Rely on Local Plan policies related to climate change and sustainable design and construction.
Qu41b Sustainable Design & Construction & Flood Risk (support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the future so let's do it now. • In view of the low-lying nature of this area and the flood map which shows very flood-prone areas just between here and the river, it is essential that SuDS do not discharge water into the ground. There are gravels under the wider area which have been extracted in places, and water runs under the railway and out at ground level on Chesterton Fen in places. As much rainwater as possible to be used on-site. • The AAP does not mention stormwater retention, balancing ponds to achieve greenfield runoff (or sewage farm runoff) rates etc. This must be addressed. • Support the proposal for redevelopment in the vicinity to be above the existing standards identified within the Local Plan policies. SuDS should also consider the improvement of water quality as a key feature. • BREEAM is the standard CNFE should be working to. • Support for proposals to develop policies for renewable and low carbon energy generation and sustainable design and construction. Recommendation that these should be worded to ensure benefits for the natural environment are maximised. • Support. Given the reputation of the adjoining Science Park and the likely employment uses within CNFE, it is considered that aspiring to high levels of sustainable design should be expected, although this may in itself be driven as much by occupier demand as policy.
Qu41b Sustainable Design & Construction & Flood Risk (object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adds further onerous requirements to costs. Should comply with policy which complies with NPPF or other national standards. • Anglian Water support option (a) which proposes that the CNFE area relies upon Local Plan polices related to climate change and sustainable design and construction.

<p>Qu41b Sustainable Design & Construction & Flood Risk (comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that this is a Flood Zone 1 area. • It is vital that rainwater run-off is controlled and contained such that it does not seep through the underlying gravels to flood the residential and industrial properties on Fen Road to the east, which lie at a lower level. The groundwater is already very close to the surface on Fen Road and frequently floods. • Due to the constant changes in Building Regulations requirements and with regards to sustainability, standards targets are unrealistic at such an early stage of policy formation. The relevant Building Regulations standards will be imposed at the point of delivery on the ground. • At present the proposal to develop a bespoke sustainable design and construction policy for CNFE through Option B seeks a minimum BREEAM standard of 'excellent' for all 'new non-residential development' under point (a). As 'new non-residential development' would include future mineral and waste applications, where operations can be designed without the need for a building, question whether a minimum standard of BREEAM excellent is relevant in these circumstances? As such we would recommend that point (a) is reworded to make reference to non-residential built development in the form of offices and industrial units etc. which excludes mineral and waste uses • Support exploration of bespoke policies for CNFE subject to viability.
<p>Qu41c Sustainable Design & Construction & Flood Risk (comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AAP does not mention stormwater retention, balancing ponds to achieve greenfield runoff (or sewage farm runoff) rates etc. This must be addressed. • Due to the constant changes in Building Regulations requirements and with regards to sustainability, standards targets are unrealistic at such an early stage of policy formation. The relevant Building Regulations standards will be imposed at the point of delivery on the ground. • The AAP should rely on policies in the emerging Cambridge Local Plan 2014 (proposed submission), as these will have been subjected to independent scrutiny by the Local Plan Inspector. There is no basis for more exacting standards being applied in the case of development within the CNFE area. • In view of the low-lying nature of this area and the flood map which shows very flood-prone areas just between here and the river, it is essential that SuDS do not discharge water into the ground. There are gravels under the wider area which have been extracted in places, and water runs under the railway and out at ground level on Chesterton Fen in places. As much rainwater as possible to be used on-site. • The AAP does not mention stormwater retention, balancing ponds to achieve greenfield runoff (or sewage farm runoff) rates etc. This must be addressed. • Anglian Water support option (a) which proposes that the CNFE area relies upon Local Plan polices related to climate change and sustainable design and construction.

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 42:

RENEWABLE & LOW CARBON ENERGY GENERATION

Do you support or object to the proposed approach on renewable and low carbon energy generation, and why? If you have other policy option suggestions for renewable and low carbon energy generation please add your suggestions.

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
15	8	0	7
Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation		
Qu42 Renewable & Low Carbon Energy Generation (support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has to be done to protect the future. • It would be irresponsible to ignore energy efficiency and generation with new buildings. • Site wide provision of energy generation gives economies of scale, but needs careful consideration re technologies promoted to ensure no adverse impacts. Anaerobic digester proposals must fit with surrounding uses. • These types of schemes need encouragement. • Support for proposals to develop policies for renewable and low carbon energy generation and sustainable design and construction. Recommendation that these should be worded to ensure benefits for the natural environment are maximised. • CNFE may present opportunities for a site wide approach to renewable and low carbon generation. It may be that this is not completely site wide but it should certainly be considered for substantial areas, for example, combined heat and power plants. While phasing may be challenging in terms of capacity in the early stages, consideration to such provision should be made. • With regard to waste processing facilities, further work in this respect would be supported. 		
Qu42 Renewable & Low Carbon Energy Generation (comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some sort of CHP plant may be appropriate. However, a municipal organic waste processing could be a very antisocial neighbour - put these away from residential areas. • Objection to anaerobic digestion facilities (option B) as these can be very smelly. Support for every building having integral solar PV generation tiles, high quality insulation and double glazing. • Developments should be required to meet the current Building Regulations standards at the point of delivering the development. The removal of the requirement to achieve a 10% reduction due to Low or Zero Carbon standards (LZC's)/passive solar design is however welcome. It would be useful to clarify what is meant by suitable LZC's for the area. All technologies should be technically and economically viable. • The requirement for new waste management processing facilities to carry out a feasibility study for the potential for anaerobic digestion is onerous and inappropriate. The waste management uses proposed for this area through the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan are a Household Recycling Centre (dealing with bulky household waste items) and a permanent inert waste recycling facility; neither of these facilities would be treating organic municipal waste. The only suitable location for anaerobic digestion would appear to be the Water Recycling Centre where sludge treatment works, involving the importation of sludge from elsewhere, is already in place. • Support approach but object to anaerobic digestion in this location due to potential impacts on quality of new community and amenity. • There is no reason why the AAP should not reference the potential desirability of an area based approach towards renewables and low carbon energy generation. However, it may be inappropriate to be overly prescriptive on this particular issue. 		

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 43:**HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

Do you support or object to the proposed approach on Health Impact Assessments, and why?

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
7	6	1	0

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
----------	--

Qu43 Health Impact Assessment (support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensible and an example for the future. • Approach is supported for residential and office/industrial built development; However, prudent to require a Full Health Impact Assessment for all residential development given the mixed use of the area, especially if residential development is located in proximity to the Water Recycling Centre and/or aggregates railheads and other uses which have the potential to give rise to amenity issues. • In the case of future minerals and waste development on CNFE, where activities may largely be conducted outside of a building and are considered compatible with the existing surrounding minerals and waste uses, this should be acknowledged within the proposed approach. It is therefore recommended that the proposed approach is strengthened in relation to residential development and remains as identified for office type built development, with an acknowledgement that minerals and waste uses are excluded from this requirement. • The requirement of requiring a health impact assessment is supported. • The concept of requiring a Health Impact Assessment accords with the South Cambridgeshire local plan (current and proposed) and with the Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Strategy. • Support - Support. The odour footprint needs to be updated following the recent investment in the Water Recycling Centre so that the information and odour zones are up to date.
Qu43 Health Impact Assessment (object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirement for a Health Impact Assessment is overly onerous and is not currently required, or proposed to be required, by Cambridge City Council. The CNFE area is a part of Cambridge City and it is not considered necessary to introduce additional requirements for the production of HIA's in support of planning applications. The production of HIA's incurs additional costs/time which will not assist developers to efficiently deliver the necessary projects required to regenerate the CNFE area. Local Plan polices/EIA requirements already result in the provision of sufficient supporting information for planning applications.

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 44:**ALTERNATIVE POLICY APPROACHES**

Are there alternative policy approaches or policy options you think we should have considered?

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
4	0	0	4

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
----------	--

<p>Qu44 Alternative Policy Approaches (comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bramblefields and Jersey Cudwell need to be protected. • A redevelopment Option 2a, as submitted in answer to Q14 of this consultation, should be considered. Option 2a facilitates a significantly greater number of dwellings near the station, increased Offices/R&D provision with associated increase in job creation and an increased amount of new informal open space. The land is utilised more efficiently, with a balanced mix of land uses at densities which make the best use of the highly sustainable location. A hotel is proposed adjacent to the station and overall early delivery remains achievable. The submitted plan provides further detail.
--	---

CHAPTER 9 – QUESTION 45:

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES

Are there any other policy areas that need to be specifically addressed in the Area Action Plan rather than relying on the Local Plans?

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
9	0	0	9

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
----------	--

<p>Qu45 Development Management Policies (comment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be frequent and reliable bus, cycle and pedestrian access to the new Cambridge North station to encourage all residents of North Cambridge to leave cars at home. • A footpath (plus possibly cycle path) from the station to Green End Road would help many local residents to reach the station on foot (or cycle). • Provision must be made for all Cambridge residents to be able to access the new station by public transport. • Consideration must be given to the Private Rented Sector (PRS) market and the contribution which it can make to the successful regeneration of the CNFE area. The Local Plans do not provide sufficient policy support for the provision of PRS and it is essential that the AAP addresses this shortfall. There is an ever increasing market demand for PRS and it will play a key role in meeting the housing shortfall in Cambridge City and the surrounding area. The CNFE area provides a unique and sustainable opportunity to accommodate PRS schemes and the AAP should reflect this. • Phasing of development and the need to review the AAP should development not be meeting with market demands. • Include an Appendix which might list all of the policies in the adopted Local Plan to which regard will need to be had when individual applications are made for development within the CNFE area. • Best practice design for cycling in new developments is fully outlined in Making Space for Cycling, a national guide which is backed by every national cycling advocacy organisation (see http://www.makingspaceforcycling.org/). Support for incorporating the design principles outlined in this document into the planning process for the CNFE AAP. • Appendix 2 includes 'Cambridge WRC: Comparative Odour Potential Assessment 2014'. This should be removed from the AAP. It is not an appropriate guide to the encroachment risk posed by potential new development as it is based on indicative emissions rates for the type of processes that will be installed. Once the new plant is commissioned and
---	--

	<p>actual emissions can be measured we will be able to model the odour impact with more certainty. The Odour Dispersion Modelling Report dated August 2012 is the only applicable evidence to inform the AAP on this issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This document does not adequately address the issues of formal open space provision for sport. Depending on the number of residential units proposed, there will be a policy requirement to provide formal recreation space for outdoor sport to local policy standards. On a tight urban site such as this it may not be appropriate to provide such facilities on site, but provision should be made for suitable off-site provision to meet the need generated by the new residents of this area. • The site must be viewed as one comprehensive scheme, carefully planned and phased, with opportunities taken to maximise the capacity of the site but in a sustainable way. Much of the phasing and works will be market driven as and when demand is available and there needs to flexibility to recognise this, certainly around the timing of various elements and possibly over time of land use allocation. This should, however, reflect a medium to long term view, not short term. • The transport strategy is a key part of this and this extends beyond the Guided Busway and the railway station, which provide an excellent foundation in this respect. Piecemeal and incremental infrastructure improvement should be avoided to bring the whole site forward in a timely and cohesive way.
--	--

CHAPTER 10 – QUESTION 46:			
INFRASTRUCTURE			
Do you support or object to the Councils’ views on Infrastructure, and why?			
Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
10	2	2	6
Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation		
Qu46 Infrastructure (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for this option 		
Qu46 Infrastructure (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to identify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ infrastructure requirements; and ○ viable and appropriately phased funding streams • More specific approach required, in particular with the consolidation/relocation of the Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) 		
Qu46 Infrastructure (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of the AAP needs to minimise the upfront infrastructure costs associated with the early phases of the CNFE to improve overall deliverability. • Obligations need to be clearly set out to ensure parity with the site and the city • Consideration of the aggregates railhead should be included in AAP 		

CHAPTER 10 – QUESTION 47 (Options A or B):

PHASING & DELIVERY APPROACH

Do you support or object to the proposed Options on phasing and delivery approach, and why?

Respondents		Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
47a	8	4	2	2
47b	11	3	5	3

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
Qu47 Option A Phasing & Delivery Approach (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for Option A
Qu47 Option A Phasing & Delivery Approach (Object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Option B • Option A will encourage ad-hoc development with best options for the early phase and less viable options for later phase
Qu47 Option A Phasing & Delivery Approach (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without proper infrastructure in place with new development existing traffic using the area will be affected
Qu47 Option B Phasing & Delivery Approach (Support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for Option B • Good master-planning needed including ‘participatory master-planning’ and urban design best practice • Need an integrated approach with all upfront design and clear financing agreed
Qu47 Option B Phasing & Delivery Approach (Object)	<p><i>Option B:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a more drawn out process • Abrogates framework to potential private developer and amendments to AAP. • could severely impact on delivery of vision and objectives for the CNFE <p><i>Masterplan</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirement of 1st planning application / phase 1 to produce a masterplan for the whole APP is overly onerous, hindering phase 1, deliverability and reducing flexibility. • Required masterplan for the whole area unnecessary • Difficult to understand why a developer of any area of land within the Plan should be made responsible for providing a masterplan for the whole of the area.

	<p><i>Phasing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phase1 should demonstrate that it can integrate with future phases of development and policy should be flexible enough to facilitate this. Phasing plan unnecessary Unclear where the first phase of development will take place No information regarding phased approach to the development. The redevelopment options are not phasing plans <p><i>Development framework</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development framework should be provided within the AAP, with apportionment of infrastructure requirements identified. The AAP should provide the principles for a development framework against which a specific phase of redevelopment can come forward as part of its own individual, detailed planning application. <p><i>Other</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council need to ensure that all of landowners have been fairly and comprehensively consulted.
Qu47 Option B Phasing & Delivery Approach (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Without proper infrastructure in place with new development, existing traffic using the area will be affected

CHAPTER 10 – QUESTION 48:

PLAN MONITORING

Do you have any comments on Plan Monitoring?

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
7	1	0	6
Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation		
Qu48 Plan Monitoring (support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support (1) 		
Qu48 Plan Monitoring (Comment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CNFE within a statutory safeguarding aerodrome height consultation plan; the MOD requests being consulted with any planning applications within this area to ensure no development exceeds 15.2m to ensure tall structures do not disrupt or inhibit air traffic operations on site. Monitoring needs to be quantifiable and clearly demonstrable if policies are delivering objectives and City’s needs. Failure to meet objectives should lead to alternative development options being considered. 		

CHAPTER 10 – QUESTION 49:

ANY OTHER COMMENTS

Do you have any other comments about the CNFE area and/or Area Action Plan? If you wish to make suggestions, please provide your comments.

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
19	0	1	18

Question	Key Issues from CNFE Issues and Options consultation
----------	--

Qu49 Any Other Comments (object)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serious public money needs to be invested. • Inaccessible location • Anglian Water sewage works and railway sidings hampers development potential • Power line would need to be removed. • Relocation of Stagecoach needed. • New station could increase traffic. • Brookgate would have to develop site in a way that would work coherently with potential future development in the area. • Transport links would need to be improved.
Qu49 Any Other Comments (Comment)	<p><i>Facilities/land uses</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sewage works should remain • Area between rail line and river should be also be considered • New uses proposed will be incompatible with existing uses which do have more potential • The Household Recycling Centre is not supported. • Previous investigations have failed to find an alternative site for the Waste Water Recycling Centre, further investigation needs to take place. <p><i>Amenity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over loss of amenity with aggregate lorry unloading/movements • The impact of the proposed transport interchange and the development of residential and commercial properties on neighbouring villages have not been assessed. However there is a real potential cost to the neighbouring villages in terms of road usage and congestion as the CNFE development proposed will have a significant adverse effect in congestion, pollution and general loss of amenity. <p><i>Transport</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local road needed for aggregate lorries supplying A14 improvements • Delivery of essential transport infrastructure is in doubt • Bridge over railway line needed linking Fen Road, improving access to Chesterton and Fen Road level crossing can be removed. • All options lead to increased traffic in Cowley Road. • Public transport accessibility must be central to the site. • The plans need to be extended to include provision for better public transport and roads within a semi-circular radius of 10 miles from west to East adjoining the CNFE site. <p><i>Phasing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without early re-development of the area around the new station the re-

development of CNFE cannot be achieved

- Delivery of new offices and R&D facilities needs to be flexible in order for it to come forward earlier than anticipated

Other

- Better illustration of the document's objectives needed
- Area is blighted by physical severance caused by infrastructure; this fragmentation needs to be overcome
- Need to include clear references to the opportunities to link CNFE area with Waterbeach New Town
- CNFE redevelopment is highly important for long term growth of Cambridge.

Strategy/Delivery

- Fragmented ownerships / multitude of occupiers absolutely necessitate that interests are aligned behind common strategy.
- Lead developer / development agency essential to co-ordinate comprehensive masterplan approach and ensure viability.
- Clearly both future location / operations of Anglian Water and extensive land holdings of Network Rail are fundamental - impacting development potential.

Design

- Existing environmental constraints need to be converted into opportunities.
- Including a strong edge to the city in order to buffer the A14;
- Site should be achieving sufficient critical mass to relocate WWTW and provide access to, and mutual support for high-quality landscapes around it including the river meadows and Milton Country Park.
- A comprehensive plan for a network of streets of appropriate character should ensure that existing bottlenecks on Milton Road do not constrain development.
- Critical that area around new railway station is developed - with excellent access, to avoid prejudicing wider regeneration

Summary of comments received to Options 1 – 4 of the Issues and Options Report

OPTION 1 PROPOSALS

Question 10:

Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 1? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
40	17	15	8

Vision

- Not a strategic vision
- Greater ambition is required to deliver a transformational gateway regeneration scheme.
- Inefficient use of the site
- Does not offer sufficient ambitious vision for this vitally important site
- Option would be appropriate as it leaves provisions for sensible future development of the water recycling site
- Anglian Water's preferred option.
- The most realistic outcome given land ownership, land use and infrastructure delivery constraints associated with AAP site.
- Will not deliver successful regeneration of the wider area, maximise sustainable urban living opportunities or suitable density of development required to exploit the significant investment in the transport.
- Would limit the development potential, the infrastructure and connectivity improvements and the role of the new station

General Land Uses

- Support mixed use approach with emphasis on the area's primary role to avoid dilution of this core/distinctive and valuable focus of the area
- Key and the plan need amending to ensure that plot densification also applies to the St John's Innovation Park.
- Fails to propose any new residential development or a local service hub
- No opportunity for urban living.
- Will not provide a mix of land uses at densities that make best use of the site.
- Inconsistent with the development objectives to create a sustainable community
- Fails to acknowledge the potential for "plot densification" on the Innovation Park.
- Juxtaposition of areas which host very differing use classes will be difficult to control in terms of noise, odour and vibration
- The B1 provision should not feature B1(b) uses.
- Leaves significant area of underused land with non-conforming use

OPTION 1 PROPOSALS

Question 10:

Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 1? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

- Does not maximise the opportunity for a vibrant new employment-led development and maintains the status quo to a very substantial degree save for localised redevelopment of specific plots.
- Support identification of Cambridge Business Park as offices/R&D with potential for intensification

Specific Use Issues

- Remove Waste Water Treatment Centre or significantly modernised to stop any odour-nuisance to neighbours.
- The odour footprint should be updated
- HWRC would be a compatible use with the WRC.
- Household Waste Recycling Centre and inert recycling facility on the Anglian Water site not compatible to the nature and character of the uses on the Innovation Park.
- Definitive line between odour zones seems somewhat arbitrary to defining uses within the CNFE

Transport

- The aggregates area in this option effectively blocks any possible level crossing to Fen Road.
- Support promotion of sustainable transport and movement by improving permeability and access to key routes
- Lack of information about traffic and junction layout does not allow an assessment to be made about the impact on existing businesses.
- Fails to consider pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users, including disabled on buses, by placing a Multi-storey carpark right next to the station.
- Station car park and taxi rank should be sited a minimum of 100 metres away.
- Cowley Road should be pedestrianised
- New pedestrian access points to the Business Park
- Nuffield Road access should be via Milton Road
- Current environment along Cowley Road is very unwelcoming, especially for pedestrians.
- More detailed transport assessment work required

Environment

- Not enough green space
- A great opportunity for providing the City of Cambridge with a new green lung, which could include appropriate leisure opportunities and help to re-balance the current trend to over-development.
- Improved landscaping supported
- Leaves open the option of a sensible future development of the water recycling site that could (and should) include a major new green area (at least 75% of the site).
- None of the current proposals add any significant green open spaces. The only green areas shown are no more than token buffer spaces.
- Great opportunity for providing the City with a new green lung, which could include appropriate

OPTION 1 PROPOSALS

Question 10:

Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 1? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

leisure opportunities and help re-balance the current trend to over-development.

Viability

- Viability testing needed.
- Not the best option, but viable as a solution, with no obvious problems.

Other comments

- The "Household Waste Recycling Centre and inert recycling facility" referred to in Option 1 requires a definition in Appendix 3 (Glossary of Terms).

OPTION 2 PROPOSALS

Question 11:

Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 2? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
41	13	19	9

Vision

- Not a strategic vision
- Does not offer sufficient ambitious vision for this vitally important site
- This quantum of development would be more likely to allow for the development principles outlined in the Issues and Options paper to be implemented.
- Need to demonstrate that this option will not cause negative impacts on existing residents, workers and investors.
- Will not deliver successful regeneration of the wider area, maximise sustainable urban living opportunities or suitable density of development required to exploit the significant investment in the transport.
- Appears to strike a good balance between delivery and ambition however it is not without its own constraints
- Proposes a more balanced mix of land uses and maintains the potential for early delivery, however there remains scope to further improve upon the efficiency of the use of the land

OPTION 2 PROPOSALS

Question 11:

Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 2? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

General Land Uses

- 'Sacrifices' commercial land for more residential land when the emerging Local Plan is not dependent on such development coming forward.
- Will potentially result in the loss of the bus depot
- Support mixed use approach with emphasis on the area's primary role to avoid dilution of this core/distinctive and valuable focus of the area
- Support identification of Cambridge Business Park as offices/R&D with potential for intensification
- St John's Innovation Park should be considered as having the same potential for the intensification of employment provision.
- Re-configured aggregates railhead and sidings supported to replace the existing aggregates railhead lost by the development of the new station.
- The replacement of this railhead is paramount to the continued supply of aggregates for development of both the local and wider Cambridgeshire area.
- Leaves significant area of underused land with non-conforming use (WWTW) which constrains development
- Approve of the housing development, must insist on 40% affordable
- Not clear that area would be attractive place to live and therefore not convinced that this option is appropriate at this time.
- Residential development, particularly near the station is supported as is the proposed increase in Offices/R & D with associated job creation and the development of a local centre.

Specific Use Issues

- Remove Waste Water Treatment Centre or significantly modernised to stop any odour-nuisance to neighbours.
- The odour footprint should be updated
- Definitive line between odour zones seems somewhat arbitrary to defining uses within the CNFE
- HWRC would be a compatible use with the WRC. Exact location of it would need to be the subject of further investigation.
- Replacement bus depot location needed before existing site can be released
- Residential development within the 1.5 odour contour should be removed
- Household Waste Recycling Centre and inert recycling facility on the Anglian Water site not compatible to the nature and character of the uses on the Innovation Park.
- Does not take into account the loss of the golf driving range.

Transport

- The aggregates area in this option effectively blocks any possible level crossing to Fen Road.
- More detailed transport assessment work required
- The provision of a new Heavy Goods Vehicle access is supported to provide a more efficient, direct and safe access to the railhead and other industrial areas.
- Shows heavy goods vehicle access through Stagecoach site. No details on how, where and financing of a relocated bus depot

OPTION 2 PROPOSALS

Question 11:

Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 2? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

- Fails to consider pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users, including disabled on buses, by placing a Multi-storey carpark right next to the station.
- Cowley Road should be pedestrianised
- New pedestrian access points to the Business Park
- Nuffield Road access should be via Milton Road
- Station car park and taxi rank should be sited a minimum of 100 metres away.
- Support promotion of sustainable transport and movement by improving permeability and access to key routes
- Lack of information about traffic and junction layout does not allow an assessment to be made about the impact on existing businesses
- There is significant doubt on whether necessary infrastructure upgrades such as the Milton Road interchange will all be in place on time to meet with the residential, office and R&D sector demands.

Environment

- Improved landscaping, and a 'green boulevard' along Cowley Road
- Support proposed increase in informal open space provision, but could be improved.
- Leaves open the option of a sensible future development of the water recycling site that could (and should) include a major new green area (at least 75% of the site).
- None of the current proposals add any significant green open spaces. The only green areas shown are no more than token buffer spaces.
- Great opportunity for providing the City with a new green lung, which could include appropriate leisure opportunities and help re-balance the current trend to over-development.

Viability

- Viability testing needed
- Option most likely should Option 3 not be feasible or viable

OPTION 3 PROPOSALS

Question 12:

Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 3? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

OPTION 3 PROPOSALS

Question 12:

Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 3? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
43	11	21	11

Vision

- More considered option than 1 and 2
- Need to demonstrate that this option will not cause negative impacts on existing residents, workers and investors.
- Urge the local authorities and Anglian Water to work together to find solutions that would allow it to be achieved.
- Option too ambitious and will never happen.
- A better option than 1 or 2 but density approach is flawed
- Waste water consolidation does not provide for enhanced balance of uses and delivery of place that supports sustainable urban living with well balanced mix of uses.
- current zonal planning of the residential areas as shown on the plan needs additional design
- The area will benefit more from strategic long term transformation

General Land Uses

- Support mixed use approach with emphasis on the area's primary role to avoid dilution of this core/distinctive and valuable focus of the area
- Replacement of railhead paramount to continued supply of aggregates for development of both local and wider Cambridgeshire area.
- Approve of the housing development, must insist on 40% affordable
- Option 3 is a stepping-stone to this option and could be an interim solution. Further housing could be added later.
- Support identification of Cambridge Business Park as offices/R&D with potential for intensification
- The imbalance between residential and employment uses coupled with the focus on industrial and storage development will not lead to the successful regeneration of the wider area.
- Further B1 and research and development uses would complement the area around the St John's Innovation Park and at Cambridge Business Park

Specific Use Issues

- Remove Waste Water Treatment Centre or significantly modernised to stop any odour-nuisance to neighbours.
- Not advisable to relocate the Water Recycling Centre and no alternative site suggested.
- The reconfiguration of the Waste Water Recycling Centre site is not realistic within the plan period. The option is unproven
- Object to indicative location of Household Recycling Centre. Should be located further to the east within B2/B8 uses not adjacent to Offices/R&D

OPTION 3 PROPOSALS

Question 12:

Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 3? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

- Partially support reducing the area covered by WWTW, but object to proposed B2/B8 uses adjacent to Vitrum Building / St Johns Innovation site.
- Inappropriate to have HWRC use in close proximity to B1 offices and research and development uses as a result of noise, dust and other environmental impacts.
- Improvements to the Water Recycling Centre are welcome so long as this does not delay improvements to the area nearer the station.
- No evidence that the Water Recycling Centre could be suitably contained to make the site an attractive area to live.
- New residential space around the station and on Nuffield Road would create a better balance of activities and increase the sustainability credentials in this part of the City
- Re-configured replacement bus depot location needed before existing site can be released. No details on how, where and financing.
- Aggregates railhead and sidings is supported to replace the existing aggregates railhead lost by the development of the new station.
- The odour footprint should be updated
- Loss of the golf driving range not taken into account
- Important that plan objective to maximise employment opportunities is afforded across the existing employment areas

Transport

- The aggregates area in this option effectively blocks any possible level crossing to Fen Road.
- Keen to see industrial traffic moved away from Cowley Road
- New heavy goods vehicle access is supported but may not be deliverable as it primarily serves land owners other than the City Council mainly on whose land it is sited
- Northern access road must be completed in order to facilitate further growth.
- Shows heavy goods vehicle access through Stagecoach site. No details on how, where and financing of a relocated bus depot
- Improved Cambridge Business Park links are good. Consideration should be given to improving these further and opening the site up more to the north and east so better integrated with the wider CNFE.
- The promotion of sustainable transport and movement by improving permeability and access to key routes
- Lack of information about traffic and junction layout does not allow an assessment to be made about the impact on existing businesses.
- Station car park and taxi rank should be sited a minimum of 100 metres away.
- Transport investment not exploited.
- Fails to consider pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users, including disabled on buses, by placing a Multi-storey carpark right next to the station.

Environment

- Support improved landscaping and 'green boulevard' along Cowley Road
- Put green protected open space over the busway and create public spaces around the station

OPTION 3 PROPOSALS

Question 12:

Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 3? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

relating to the new residential uses.

- None of the current proposals add any significant green open spaces. The only green areas shown are no more than token buffer spaces.
- Great opportunity for providing the City with a new green lung, which could include appropriate leisure opportunities and help re-balance the current trend to over-development.

Infrastructure

- It is not clear that the sewage works can provide sufficient capacity and how any increase in capacity if needed, would be handled or located

Viability

- Significant viability concerns
- Doubt that this option is viable
- Concerned about viability and deliverability of Option 3, which is reliant upon the upgrading and reduction in area of the Water Recycling Centre - a significant issue – questioning the deliverability
- The land currently within the Waste Water Recycling Centre identified for re-use would be heavily contaminated and costs of remediating that land would not be attractive to investors given that the returns gained from the development would be for B2 and/or B8 Uses.
- Significant highway works due to the increased quantum of development will further affect viability and deliverability.
- need to confirm the rationalisation of the water recycling plant is feasible, viable and would not delay development on the remainder of the site.

OPTION 4 PROPOSALS

Question 13:

Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 4? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

Respondents	Support (incl. qualified)	Object	Comment
46	11	24	11

Vision

- Need to think strategically and holistically

OPTION 4 PROPOSALS

Question 13:

Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 4? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

- Need to demonstrate that this option will not cause negative impacts on existing residents, workers and investors.
- Removal of WWTW means area can be looked at/redeveloped properly without restriction
- Comprehensive planning difficult due to the differences in site phasing resulting in piecemeal development contrary to the proposed CNFE vision.
- Overarching objective to create a transformative gateway with a strong employment focus should remain consistent
- Option will be heavily constrained by efforts to relocate the Water Recycling Centre.
- The current zonal planning of the residential areas as shown on the plan need a more detailed urban design framework.
- Delivery of this quantum of development could allow for the development principles outlined in the Issues and Options paper to be implemented.
- CNFE is rightly identified largely for employment uses, with the more residential themes being located in and around any new railway station.
- Would support the proposal for a mixed use site, with more housing meeting the City's objectives - subject to the issues about connectivity being addressed. There could be more residential included in this option.
- Unlikely to occur, so focus effort on achievable solution

General Land Use

- Support mixed use approach with emphasis on the area's primary role to avoid dilution of this core/distinctive and valuable focus of the area
- Option should maximise housing provision and open spaces
- Density needs to be maximised in order to make the development as efficient as possible.
- Support identification of Cambridge Business Park as offices/R&D with potential for intensification
- Support removal of WRC and proposed B1/R&D uses opposite St Johns Innovation Centre.
- Proposed mix of land uses is unbalanced and Option 4 will not facilitate early delivery.
- The development outcome would be for 630 dwellings in an area which would provide for 27,600 jobs. This is not considered to be a sustainable balance of homes to jobs.
- Exacerbated imbalance between residential and employment uses and coupled with the focus on industrial and storage development will not lead to the successful regeneration of the wider area.
- The new condition created and inappropriate emphasis of B2/B8 uses within City boundary does not maximise opportunity created by the complete re-location of the WWTW.
- Concerned process of relocating Water Recycling Centre will delay the regeneration of the area nearer the station.

Specific Use Issues

- Support the associated need to relocate the water recycling centre and in principle any general improvement to the treatment works
- Strongly object to moving the sewage works - huge investment has already been made into the existing site and would be likely to use greenfield site elsewhere

OPTION 4 PROPOSALS

Question 13:

Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 4? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

- Alternative site for WRC has not been identified.
- No operational or regulatory reasons to justify relocation of WRC. Anglian Water is unable to include such relocation in its business plan.
- Evidence has not been provided to illustrate that moving the Water Recycling Centre is financially viable.
- Object to indicative location of Household Recycling Centre. Should be located further to the east within B2/B8 uses not adjacent to Offices/R&D. Use is not compatible with adjacent B1 offices and research and development uses.
- Re-configured replacement bus depot location needed before existing site can be released. No details on how, where and financing.
- Residential accommodation on this site beyond that in options 1 to 3 would be inappropriate in view of odour problems and undesirability of making population of Cambridge even bigger than it already is.

Transport

- New heavy goods vehicle access is supported but may not be deliverable as it primarily serves land owners other than the City Council mainly on whose land it is sited
- Improved Cambridge Business Park links are good. Consideration should be given to improving these further and opening the site up more to the north and east so better integrated with the wider CNFE.
- Fails to consider pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users, including disabled on buses, by placing a Multi-storey carpark right next to the station. Shows heavy goods vehicle access through Stagecoach site. No details on how, where and financing of a relocated bus depot
- Station car park and taxi rank should be sited a minimum of 100 metres away.
- Concern about traffic impact
- Lack of information about traffic and junction layout does not allow an assessment to be made about the impact on existing businesses.
- Transport investment not exploited

Environment

- Support improved landscaping and 'green boulevard' along Cowley Road
- The Waste Water Recycling Centre would be heavily contaminated and costs of remediating that land would not be attractive to investors.
- None of the current proposals add any significant green open spaces. The only green areas shown are no more than token buffer spaces.
- Great opportunity for providing the City with a new green lung, which could include appropriate leisure opportunities and help re-balance the current trend to over-development.

Infrastructure

- Entirely reliant upon relocation of the Water Recycling Centre offsite. The viability of this is

OPTION 4 PROPOSALS

Question 13:

Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 4? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

unknown and there are significant technical, financial and operational constraints.

Viability

- Likely to encounter more delivery risks associated with the potential relocation of the WRC (identifying a site, funding and timing) and this could impede the overall development.
- Sub-optimal (unviable) land uses provided on valuable site provided by WWTW relocation.
- Significant viability concerns.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON OPTIONS 1 TO 4

- Question the apparent mutual exclusivity between residential and employment uses within the redevelopment options. Plan for a balance between these two uses to reduce the need for travel and the tidal nature of the trips to and from the development.
- Car park development should not be 600 capacity (as it is proposed), but 6,000 car park. Otherwise residents of the surrounding area will be affected.
- Much more residential required; over supply of offices once CB1 is finished
- New orbital bus route for Cambridge
- All reliant on link roads to Fen Ditton and Wadloes Road.
- Undertaking low and medium development can be done immediately without the need to wait for AW to relocate (something which is not viable). There is an immediate demand for B1(c), B2, B8 space within the city and without this site being developed immediately these occupiers will be forced to leave the city. Moving occupiers from Clifton Road, The Paddocks etc will also free up Brownfields sites for residential within the city. Cowley Road is the only site for them within Cambridge.
- Priority should be given to improving the smelliest parts of the Wastewater Treatment Plant's operation, which now seems to be the open storm tanks that smelly water goes into when it rains hard after a long dry spell. This type of weather will become more common, and there seems to be no justification for having the waste tanks open to the air. They should be covered and the air extracted should be scrubbed so that the smell is removed.
- More affordable residential housing with green spaces, shops, banks, post office etc
- More car parking space on the site if this project is going to reduce traffic on the M11 going south, the A14 going east and west and the A10 going north. The whole idea is to get people on to the main railway for the long journey.
- Option 2a, an enhanced medium level of redevelopment would facilitate a significantly greater number of dwellings near the station, increased Offices/RD provision with associated increase in job creation and an increased amount of new informal open space. It would facilitate more efficient use of the land, with a balanced mix of land uses at densities which make the best use of the highly sustainable location. A hotel is proposed adjacent to the station and overall early delivery remains achievable.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON OPTIONS 1 TO 4

- Residential development needs careful consideration given the Water Recycling Centre (Options 1-3), strategic aggregates railheads (Options 1-4) and waste uses (Options 1-4). These facilities and proposed waste management uses, have consultation / safeguarding areas designated by adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan. These Areas seek to prevent essential existing / planned facilities being prejudiced. If residential development is proposed it should be located away from these uses, and demonstrate that existing and allocated waste management / aggregate facilities will not be prejudiced.