
1.0 Introduction

Paragraph 1.1

Representation(s)

31686 AMEC FOSTER WHEELER E&I UK (on behalf of National Grid) (Ms Hannah Bevins) [7042]

Summary:

We have reviewed the above consultation document and can confirm that National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to SPD.

=====

Representation(s)

31774 Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Ms Stacey Weiser) [1801]

Summary:

Cambridge Past, Present & Future have participated in both community consultations held to inform the drafting of the SPD for the Land north of Cherry Hinton site (LNCH). We welcome the ongoing consultation to help inform the development of this site and the draft SPD as a mechanism for providing a framework for future applications and proposals. Whilst the site has been considered appropriate for future development, it is not without its constraints, which are highlighted in the draft SPD.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to SPD.

=====

Representation(s)**31806 Endurance Estates Limited [2466]****Agent: Terence O'Rourke (Greg blaquiere) [7060]****Summary:**

We write to confirm the commitment that the landowners have for these exciting proposals, as set out in the SPD. The landowners are keen to evidence their enthusiasm for this important residential-led mixed-use neighbourhood, by contributing to the SPD process and fully supporting the Land North of Cherry Hinton SPD as currently drafted.

Council's Initial Response**Comments duly noted.****Action****No change to the SPD.**
=====**Paragraph 1.3****Representation(s)****31780 Anderson Group [1383]****Agent: Savills (Mr david henry) [43]****Summary:**

The City Council, the Environment Agency and other local stakeholders are aware that The Anderson Group intend to bring forward shortly comprehensive proposals for its land holdings as part of the wider regeneration of the Land South of Coldhams Lane AMC. At present, the draft SPD does not make any obvious reference to the adjacent LSCL AMC. It thus presents an incomplete picture to the reader of the strategic plans for the area. It is considered that the draft SPD should include due consideration of the LSCL AMC. This deficiency can be remedied by minor modification of the SPD.

Council's Initial Response**Comments duly noted. No change considered necessary.****Action****No change to the SPD.**
=====

Representation(s)**31849 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]****Summary:**

The SPD is compared to the New Housing Developments and the Built Environment Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) for Cambridgeshire.

The JSNA contains evidence review of the built environment's impact on health and has distilled the evidence into the following themes:

- * Generic evidence supporting the built environment's impact on health.
- * Green space.
- * Developing sustainable communities.
- * Community design (to prevent injuries, crime, and to accommodate people with disabilities).
- * Connectivity and land use mix.
- * Communities that support healthy ageing.
- * House design and space.
- * Access to unhealthy/"Fast Food".
- * Health inequality and the built environment.

It is welcomed that the SPD recognises that "where necessary, appropriate mitigation of environmental and health impacts will be required within any proposal to ensure future residents are provided with a satisfactory living environment".

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 1.4**Representation(s)****31781 Anderson Group [1383]**

Agent: Savills (Mr david henry) [43]

Summary:

The purpose of the SPD is stated as being to support policy in both the draft Cambridge City Local Plan and the draft South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. If that is so, then it is appropriate to take into account the adjacent LSCL AMC as a material consideration in the preparation of the SPD. Failure to do so would result in the SPD being deficient in terms of the 'plan led' requirements established by national planning policy.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. No change considered necessary.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31807 Endurance Estates Limited [2466]

Agent: Terence O'Rourke (Greg blaquiere) [7060]

Summary:

The SPD sets out the aspirations for the Land North of Cherry Hinton area and objectives in terms of creating a local centre, providing market and affordable housing, employment, leisure and community facilities, and improved pedestrian and cycle connectivity, as well as guiding principles relating to landscape, biodiversity, water strategy and sustainability, which the landowners support.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 1.8

Representation(s)

31658 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

We welcome the vision for this land to 'reflect and enhance the special character of the surrounding area'. This is an important aim and needs to be reflected throughout the document.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31720 St Andrew's Church (Rev'd Karin Voth Harman) [6898]

Summary:

There is a need for a more compelling narrative for this new development, and the initial consultations led by Snapdragon have to my mind been disappointing in constructing this.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)**31782 Anderson Group [1383]****Agent: Savills (Mr david henry) [43]****Summary:**

The vision for the land north of Cherry Hinton is described as being to create a vibrant, high quality and distinctive extension to the existing settlement, reflecting and enhancing the special character of the surrounding area, whilst working in synergy with Cambridge as a whole. This vision is supported in principle, although it is considered reasonable for the development in seeking to fulfil these aims to have due regard to both its current and proposed surroundings, including the AMC just metres away south of Coldham's Lane.

Council's Initial Response**Comments duly noted.****Action****No change to the SPD.**

2.0 Planning Policy Context

Paragraph 2.3

Representation(s)

31678 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

Figure 4 It would be helpful to put a date under this Plan given its historic status, i.e. having been superseded by the Local Plan.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Agree.

Action

Year to be added to the title of figure 4.



Paragraph 2.4

Representation(s)

31721 St Andrew's Church (Rev'd Karin Voth Harman) [6898]

Summary:

The closure of the airport and loss of jobs would be detrimental to the character of this area and the livelihoods of many. The company is a source of pride to people in the local area, and we support its continued operation on this site. We would not want any development to occur which imagines the eventual filling in with housing of this airfield site.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The SPD brings forward land which is not required for the operational use of the airport. The site landowner is also the landowner of Cambridge Airport.

Action

No change to the SPD.



Paragraph 2.6

Representation(s)

31842 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

The SPD omits to include the planning policy of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mineral and Waste Core Strategy (2011), and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mineral and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012); both of which are part of the adopted development plan for the area.

The Cherry Hinton site which forms part of a larger Area of Search for the potential location of waste management facilities allocated by Policy SSP W1E of the Site Specific Proposals Plan; and this allocation is safeguarded through Policy SSP W8H which designates a Waste Consultation Area over and around the Area of Search.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

Include additional paragraph (2.6) which refers to Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan

Representation(s)

31783 Anderson Group [1383]

Agent: Savills (Mr david henry) [43]

Summary:

The acknowledgement that national and local policy has evolved since the adoption of the Cambridge East Area Action Plan February 2008 is supported. So, as stated within paragraph 1.4 (see above), the draft SPD ought to have due regard to the more recent policies and proposals of the draft City Local Plan, including the adjacent AMC, as well as its South Cambridgeshire counterpart.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Paragraphs 2.8-2.13 make explicit reference to the relevant policies in the emerging plans.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 2.8

Representation(s)

31784 Anderson Group [1383]

Agent: Savills (Mr david henry) [43]

Summary:

It fails to make reference to other significant, material policies and proposals within the emerging Cambridge City Local Plan, contrary to the aims of the SPD set out in paragraph 1.4 of the document, for example.

To remedy this omission, an additional sentence should be added within this section of the SPD to inform the user that; "The emerging Cambridge Local Plan also allocates adjacent land to the south of Coldham's Lane as an Area of Major Change, under Policies 13 and 15 of the draft City Local Plan".

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The cumulative impacts of the development will be assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment and Transport Assessment which are required as part of any future outline planning application.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 2.9

Representation(s)

31795 Natural Cambridgeshire (Mr Philip Clark) [6119]

Summary:

The AAP, LNCH is a small part of a much larger development, with the intention that there would be collective benefits arising from large scale development in this location, e.g. a new country park and wetland habitat within the Greenbelt, community and transport improvements. The LNCH is an independent development, with no idea if, or when, the larger scheme on the airport comes to fruition. The SPD does not place enough emphasis on this bigger picture and should make clearer that the LNCH should be developed with consideration for future development on the safeguarded land, in terms of appropriate mitigation, transportation, views, open spaces, local centres, etc.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The Masterplanning of the wider site area will be considered as part of the pre-application planning process. The delivery of a new country park for the wider region is beyond the remit of this SPD.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31850 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

It is welcomed that the SPD acknowledges both the emerging Cambridge Local Plan, and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan in that in section "2.9 Proposals for residential development will be supported if... "acceptable mitigation of environmental and health impacts (including noise) from the airport can be provided... "

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 2.10

Representation(s)

31583 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

The spine road isn't going to be linking to Cherry Hinton Road - should this be Airport Way?

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The reference to the connection with Cherry Hinton Road is taken directly from the relevant policies in the emerging Local Plans (R47 and SS/3).

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 2.12

Representation(s)

31758 Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Ms Stacey Weiser) [1801]

Summary:

The AAP is a small part of a much larger development with intended collective benefits arising from large scale development in this location, such as a new country park and wetland habitat creation within the Greenbelt, as well community and transport improvements. Our view is that this SPD does not place enough emphasis on this bigger picture and should make clearer that the LNCH should be developed with consideration for future development on the safeguarded land, in terms of mitigation, transportation, views, open spaces, local centres, etc. This is piecemeal development not planned development that Cambridge needs.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The SPD provides an enhanced level of detail for the wider AAP area.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 2.16

Representation(s)

31785 Anderson Group [1383]

Agent: Savills (Mr david henry) [43]

Summary:

Neither Figures 4 nor 5 of the SPD present the reader with the important, relevant contextual information to be found within the Key Diagram of the City Local Plan and on its associated Policies Map. In short, the draft SPD makes a significant "jump" between the Area Action Plan (Figure 4) and the partial information provided by the Proposed Modifications to the emerging Local Plan (within Figure 5). It does not show the proposals of the emerging City Local Plan itself.

The Key Diagram to the Local Plan, as proposed to be modified, should be included as an additional Figure.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Disagree. The SPD should be read in conjunction with the emerging Local Plans, which provide the overall policy context for the area.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 2.17

Representation(s)

31759 Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Ms Stacey Weiser) [1801]

Summary:

We welcome the need to preserve the adjacent wildlife sites and on-site habitats and in particular to treat wildlife site on eastern boundary with sensitivity and to create additional grassland habitat in that location. The wildlife site is noted for perennial flax and crested cow-wheat, which will have specific habitat requirements - it would be helpful if the SPD was clear that any habitat or open space enhancements in this location should not unintentionally have an impact on these plant species and that ideally, they should enable them to spread. An ongoing management contribution to achieve this would be required.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Such detail is beyond the scope of this SPD. A landscape and ecological management plan will be required as part of any future outline planning application for the site.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 2.19

Representation(s)

31839 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

SUPPORT: The principle of secondary school playing fields in the green belt is acceptable to the Education Place Planning team, although it is recognised that there will need to be a balance between providing appropriate boundary treatments, and maintaining the character of the green area.

COMMENT: The local planning authority should satisfy themselves that the greenbelt tests will be met to not prejudice the deliverability of a secondary school.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31722 St Andrew's Church (Rev'd Karin Voth Harman) [6898]

Summary:

We object to green belt land being used for school playing fields unless those fields are opened to the public. There should be benefit to all when greenbelt land is used in this way.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The use of the school playing fields is currently under discussion. Agree this should be referenced in SPD.

Action

Insert additional sentence at end: 'The school playing fields may be accesible to the general public, subject to a Community Use Agreement'.

Representation(s)

31800 Natural Cambridgeshire (Mr Philip Clark) [6119]

Summary:

The school playing fields extend out with the development site and into the Greenbelt. Whilst playing fields are an excepted use of Greenbelt, some school playing fields are increasingly urban in character, utilising artificial surfaces, ball courts, flood-lighting, fencing, etc. The purpose of the Greenbelt in the location proposed for the school fields is to prevent the merging with Teversham and also as a green corridor linking Cambridge with the rural countryside to the east.

We are concerned that the playing fields could significantly erode both of these functions. No indication in the SPD regarding landscaping on the north-eastern and eastern edges of the playing fields. Assuming the wildlife site are on this boundary, then some of the land allocated for school playing towards its eastern boundary should be reserved for landscaping/buffering and should be clearly indicated in the SPD. Ideally, the playing fields in this location should be allocated as a nature area for the school to use for educational purposes.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The site's landscaping/buffering strategy will be addressed as part of the Development Management process. Figure 50 provides an indicative landscape framework plan.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 2.20

Representation(s)

31614 Margaret Starkie [1957]

Summary:

If the school playing field has to be moved into Green Belt it infers that the original provisions for school field have changed contrary to the planning permission

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Planning permission for the site has not been granted at this stage. The inclusion of sports fields in the Green Belt is not incompatible with this designation, provided that the function of the Green Belt unaffected (i.e. maintains proper separation between Teversham and Cherry Hinton and protects the setting of Cambridge).

Action

No change to the SPD.

3.0 The Site and Surrounding Area

Paragraph 3.1

Representation(s)

31786 Anderson Group [1383]

Agent: Savills (Mr david henry) [43]

Summary:

This section fails in its aim by not acknowledging existence of the important AMC immediately to the south of Coldham's Lane, and only metres away from the area covered by the SPD. It is proposed that a new paragraph is added, as paragraph 3.4, to say that 'Land to the south of Coldham's Lane is allocated under Policy 15 of the emerging Cambridge Local Plan as an Area of Major Change. Here regeneration is being encouraged by its appropriate redevelopment and the creation of an urban country park to serve the east of the City'.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The Area of Major Change south of Coldham's Lane is beyond the scope of this SPD and therefore requires no specific reference or additional text other than what is already contained within the SPD.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.4

Representation(s)

31604 Terri Lewis [6891]

Summary:

The are in which the proposed settlement will be is in an already heavily trafficked area. During the morning rush hour it can already take a considerable time to actually get off of my drive at present. With the extra traffic due to this development it will increase already struggling areas with the sheer amount of homes due to be built.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31708 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

Traffic arteries are wholly inadequate to cope with the additional traffic generated.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.5

Representation(s)

31605 Terri Lewis [6891]

Summary:

These services are already stretched and at peak times buses may not be running every 10 minutes. Cambridge is already an area that struggles with its transport services and stretching them further is a concern to all residents in the city. At times it can take nearly an hour to get into town.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application. It is an expectation that existing cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage safer travel for cyclists.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31611 Mrs Linda Godden [6894]

Summary:

The buses are already overcrowded and late every morning due to very heavy traffic along Cherry Hinton High Street, Queen Ediths Way and Hills Road. It can sometimes take 40 minutes just to get along the High Street due to more and more people using the service (which in principle is good but by the time a queue of people are processed, a whole lot more have joined the queue and it gets very frustrating) The inevitable increase in traffic in the High Street fills me with dread.

If all other traffic was banned from the High Street, the Citi 1 buses would be able to run to time (but there would have to be more of them !). The cycle routes would then be safer to use. Although I do not use the number 17 route, I have often thought that it is a shame it only runs as a limited service for the people who do need it.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application. It is an expectation that existing cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage safer travel for cyclists.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31634 Will Lord [6915]

Summary:

A twice daily service is woefully inadequate for the number of individuals who will live on the new development. Relying on bus services as they are is unacceptable.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application. It is an expectation that the bus services and cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage the usage of more sustainable forms of transport.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31709 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

The stops on Coldhams Lane have woefully poor services, that have recently been reduced without consultation.

CITI 1 is frequent during the day but unreliable in terms of timekeeping and takes a very roundabout route to station and city centre.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31723 St Andrew's Church (Rev'd Karin Voth Harman) [6898]

Summary:

Point of clarification rather than objection. A bus stop used only once a day in each direction (no 17) should not be considered provision of public transport as it is virtually unusable. We would support an increase to every 10-15 minutes along this route at least during peak times to take the increased population out of their cars.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. It is an expectation that the bus services and cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved as part of the proposals to encourage the usage of more sustainable forms of transport.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31584 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

The bus services should be improved - it can take almost an hour in rush hour to get from the bus stop near St Andrews church to the railway station. The only useful place to get the bus to is Addenbrookes.

The No.17 bus is useless.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application. It is an expectation that the bus service connections between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved as part of the proposals to reduce travel times and discourage car use.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.6

Representation(s)

31710 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

No public transport link to Cambridge north which, in any case, is currently poorly served by train services likely to be of use to the new residents.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application. It is an expectation that the bus services and cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage the usage of more sustainable forms of transport.

Action

No change to the SPD.



Paragraph 3.8

Representation(s)

31635 Will Lord [6915]

Summary:

Cycling infrastructure needs further thought. People will not cycle down to the Tins - they will want to use Coldhams Lane which is extremely busy at peak times and not wide enough for the purposes of shared use between cyclists and cars. I think that widening the road (which seems very feasible given the land adjacent to the majority of the stretch running alongside the airport) is critical for the success of this project.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application.

It is an expectation that existing cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage the usage of more sustainable forms of transport.

Action

No change to the SPD.



Representation(s)

31711 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

Vague 'pie-in-the-sky' nonsense. Coldhams Lane is already a dangerous nightmare for cyclists (I use it regularly) and the additional traffic can only make it worse. Tins footpath is already very well used but roughly surfaced and the narrow doglegged bridge over the railway is dangerous due to speed of cyclists and lack of visibility. Airport Way is useful only if bound for Newmarket Road and north thereof. Experience says that most new resident will use cars.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application. It is an expectation that existing cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage safer travel for cyclists.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.11

Representation(s)

31858 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

The SPD needs to address the need for local employment opportunities further.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Employment considerations are beyond the scope of this SPD.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.12

Representation(s)

31819 Smarter Cambridge Transport [7062]

Agent: Smarter Cambridge Transport (Edward Leigh) [7063]

Summary:

Only way to achieve a large modal shift is to provide a rail station on the existing railway line. We have proposed that a new station be built at the point where Fulbourn Old Drift used to cross the railway line. The south side is readily accessible from Fulbourn and much of Cherry Hinton as well as from northern Cherry Hinton, the proposed new development and Teversham.

The station would also give workers at the local employment sites a practical alternative to driving into work at Peterhouse Technology Park (home to ARM), Capital Park, Fulbourn Hospital, Tesco, etc.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A new rail station would require involvement from other strategic bodies, including the Greater Cambridge Partnership and rail authorities.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.13

Representation(s)

31613 Mrs Linda Godden [6894]

Summary:

When the Folk Festival is on in July, it often feels that Cherry Hinton High Street is over run with extra people....and that is just one weekend a year. A new "village" with 1200 homes (average 2 people per home) is going to be too much.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.14

Representation(s)

31636 Will Lord [6915]

Summary:

All of these schools are oversubscribed.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. School provision needs to be carefully planned to ensure there are enough places for local children. The specification for the educational facilities and the timing of the delivery of the schools will be part of the Section 106 agreement.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31585 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

Two primary schools are not highlighted on the map - Cherry Hinton Primary and Colville Primary.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

Amend figure 11 to identify existing school provision, including Cherry Hinton Primary and Colville Primary.

Paragraph 3.15

Representation(s)

31586 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

"a number of restaurants" is misleading - Cherry Hinton is really lacking restaurants - The Robin Hood is on the far edge, and the Indian restaurant is the only other place (other than fast food outlets).

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31610 Mrs Linda Godden [6894]

Summary:

Tesco in Fulbourn is always really busy. I hope there are plans for it to expand or maybe the new estate will be encouraged to use Sainsburys along Coldhams Lane / Brooks Road (which will probably also need to increase in size)

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The new development will be expected to provide local shops reducing the need for people to travel by car.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31725 St Andrew's Church (Rev'd Karin Voth Harman) [6898]

Summary:

As the map shows, the convenience and retail stores, pharmacy are not easily walkable from this new development and in order to have a high quality of life in this development planning will need to go into what sort of retail facilities are needed 'on site' to deter people from getting in their cars to access the shops and facilities they need.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. It is an expectation that the local centre will provide a retail element. The exact type of uses within the local centre is beyond the scope of this SPD.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31712 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

Existing facilities are wholly inadequate for the number of dwellings proposed. Everyone will get into their cars and head for the supermarkets adding yet more traffic to the already congested roads.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The new development will be expected to provide local shops reducing the need for people to travel by car.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.16

Representation(s)

31606 Terri Lewis [6891]

Summary:

It is a concern that the services that are already available are stretched due to the government cuts to add the additional housing would mean that it may be virtually impossible to gain get an appointment in the Drs surgery when needed as it is already difficult as it is.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The development will need to mitigate its impact in terms of demand on local facilities, including GP services. This can be secured through the S106 process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====
Representation(s)

31607 Dr Alexandra Simperler [6893]

Summary:

There are long waiting times in the surgeries and at Addenbrooke's already. Fulbourn Hospital is a mental health facility, so hopefully not a mainstream facility. What is needed is a new Health Centre plus GP that can do some common medical tests etc. I do not think the existing health structure is sufficient.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The development will need to mitigate its impact in terms of demand on local facilities, including GP services. This can be secured through the S106 process.

Action

Amend Fulbourn Hospital annotation in in Figure 9 to match Addenbrooke's Hospital.

=====
Representation(s)

31609 Mrs Linda Godden [6894]

Summary:

A new Doctors Surgery will be required as the existing excellent Surgery in Fishers Lane is already difficult to get an appointment with.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The development will need to mitigate its impact in terms of demand on local facilities, including GP services. This can be secured through the S106 process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====

Representation(s)

31627 Celine Curtis [6910]

Summary:

3.16 - The existing doctors do not satisfy the needs of the existing population

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The development will need to mitigate its impact in terms of demand on local facilities, including GP services. This can be secured through the S106 process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31633 Will Lord [6915]

Summary:

The doctors surgeries are already nearing/exceeding capacity. Fulbourn hospital is not a hospital in any meaningful sense for this proposal since it only provides specialist support. There is, for example, no A&E and no drop in services.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The development will need to mitigate its impact in terms of demand on local facilities, including GP services. This can be secured through the Section 106.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31726 St Andrew's Church (Rev'd Karin Voth Harman) [6898]

Summary:

As in the previous question, just pointing out the distance and lack of easily walkable routes to surgeries and other medical facilities for this new development.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.17

Representation(s)

31608 Mrs Linda Godden [6894]

Summary:

Already heavy congestion in Cherry Hinton High Street from 7.50 am during the week. Too many cars which hold up too few buses (ie they get caught up in the traffic jams!) and unsafe cycle paths as cars reverse out of driveways straight into the cycle paths and they drive too close to cyclists

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. It is an expectation that the bus service connections between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved as part of the proposals to reduce travel times and discourage car use.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31628 Celine Curtis [6910]

Summary:

3.17 - The bus services (18, 17, 16A) are too infrequent to be of any value

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. This section of the SPD presents the existing provision within Cherry Hinton. It is beyond the scope of the SPD to specify the frequency of bus services. It is anticipated that bus and cycle routes will be improved in the context of the development.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31729 St Andrew's Church (Rev'd Karin Voth Harman) [6898]

Summary:

This map shows that existing bus stops are not close enough to many parts of this new development. In particular there are no bus stops near the site of the proposed new secondary school.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. This section of the SPD shows existing public transport provision within Cherry Hinton. Figure 39 shows the movement strategy for the site and recognises that encouraging travel by bus is a key sustainable transport principle.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.18

Representation(s)

31713 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

The site represents an important buffer between urban development and countryside. This proposal will turn Teversham into a suburb.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The site's Green Belt/landscaping/buffering strategy will be addressed as part of the outline planning application process. It is an expectation that the Green Belt designation should continue to provide clear separation between Cherry Hinton and Teversham.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.19

Representation(s)

31714 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

Most of the site represents productive farmland that should be used for food production. While it may not be of high value for wildlife the hedges and open fields do support a wide range of birds while the area within Airport boundaries supports breeding skylarks, a protected species.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Consideration was given to the loss of agricultural land when the area covering the Cambridge East Area Action Plan (AAP) was first prepared. The site has been allocated for development since the Cambridge East AAP was adopted in 2008, when its sustainability and suitability for development were carefully considered and when it was subject to a public examination. The proposals present an opportunity to enhance biodiversity. It is an expectation that any potential ecological losses are mitigated, and where possible enhanced, as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.20

Representation(s)

31715 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

What is the point of retaining the hedges that form County Wildlife sites when the surrounding land on which the wildlife depends is to be heavily developed. After development they will become largely devoid of wildlife, other than a few garden birds and will cease to be of value.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The proposals present an opportunity to enhance biodiversity. It is an expectation that any potential ecological losses are mitigated, and where possible enhanced, as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.21

Representation(s)

31843 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

Paragraph 3.21 is incomplete '...onsite attenuation provided to mitigate risk to the wider catchment. Maximise and incorporate existing'.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Paragraph 3.2.1 is not incomplete, but split over 3 columns.

Action

Adjust the size of figure 15 so that the paragraph is not split over multiple columns.

Paragraph 3.22

Representation(s)

31802 Natural Cambridgeshire (Mr Philip Clark) [6119]

Summary:

While the open spaces proposed for the development site are local in nature, they will not meet resident's needs for accessing larger open spaces or achieve significant biodiversity gains.

The larger open spaces that residents will access include Wandlebury Country Park and National Trust estates such as Anglesey Abbey and Wicken Fen. This will place increased visitor pressure on these sites, some of which are already struggling with capacity at peak times and which can impact on the biodiversity of those sites. This is not factored into the SPD or the suggested mitigation. We note the AAP concept plan on page 10 shows a new country park - which highlights the need for this kind of space. We are concerned that piecemeal developments such as LNCH and Wing will fail to contribute financially towards the creation of new large public spaces or towards offsetting the impacts on existing sites. We would like to see this addressed directly in the SPD.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The Masterplanning of the wider site area will be considered as part of the pre-application planning process. The delivery of a new country park for the wider region is beyond the remit of this SPD however, the site will need to have regard for the Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Strategy. Impact of increased visitor pressure on recreational areas will be assessed as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31730 St Andrew's Church (Rev'd Karin Voth Harman) [6898]

Summary:

Object to the wording 'close proximity'. We do not think that those in the new development will feel in close proximity to any of these save the small bit of roadside land which is Church End green and has little to offer children, or dog walkers as it lies open to a busy road.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Agree.

Action

Amend first sentence in paragraph 3.22: "There are a number of existing open spaces within Cherry Hinton and the surrounding area, including the following (see figure 16)."

Paragraph 3.23

Representation(s)

31716 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

Skylarks breed on the Airport in the yellow shaded area. This is the only location in Cambridge where this iconic grassland species can still be seen and heard.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The proposals present an opportunity to enhance biodiversity. Substantial ecological losses should be avoided as part of the detailed design of the scheme. It is an expectation that any loss of habitat is mitigated, and where possible enhanced, as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31763 Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Ms Stacey Weiser) [1801]

Summary:

There will be a loss of farmland wildlife as a result of this development which needs to be mitigated off-site. This is only mentioned in the table on p75. We feel that this should be made more explicit and included in the two sections that deal with ecology in the main document.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The proposals present an opportunity to enhance biodiversity. Substantial ecological losses should be avoided as part of the detailed design of the scheme. It is an expectation that any loss of habitat is mitigated and where possible enhanced, as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.25

Representation(s)

31615 Margaret Starkie [1957]

Summary:

The Drift is a habitat for bats and other nocturnal animals and birds

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. An ecological re-assessment will be required as part of the outline and reserved matters planning applications.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.26

Representation(s)

31659 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

Para 3.26 Should mention Green Belt and historic landscape characterisation of the area.

Figure 18 The Teversham Conservation Area should be shown on this plan.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Agree.

Action

Amend paragraph: 'There are no statutory or local landscape designations that cover the site. The site is not within the Green Belt (Figure 18).

Paragraph 3.27

Representation(s)

31766 Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Ms Stacey Weiser) [1801]

Summary:

Whilst there are no listed buildings within or immediately adjacent to the site, there are several in the wider area. One of the key views discussed during the consultations was through views to Teversham church.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. As part of the outline planning application, a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will be required.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31833 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

Whilst we welcome reference to the listed buildings in Cherry Hinton, specifically the Church and Cherry Hinton Hall and the Red Lion Pub, we suggest that it is also important to mention the listed buildings that are much nearer to the site including 67 Church End, a grade II listed 18th century or earlier timber framed plaster and painted building, the striking Mefeking Cottage, and Uphall, also both grade II. Mention should also be made of The Rectory and Teversham Hall, both grade II listed.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

Figure 18 to be updated to identify heritage assets, including 67 Church End, Mafeking Cottage and Uphall, The Rectory and Teversham Hall.

Paragraph 3.28

Representation(s)

31660 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

However, this paragraph should mention the Teversham Conservation Area to the north east of the site.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Agree.

Action

Reference to Teversham Conservation Area to north east of site to be included in paragraph 3.28. Figure 18 to be amended to reference conservation area boundary.

=====
Paragraph 3.29

Representation(s)

31652 Mrs Christine Shaw [5589]

Summary:

There is a conservation area in the village area of teversham which is adjacent to this site

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Agree.

Action

Reference to Teversham Conservation Area to north east of site to be included in paragraph 3.28. Figure 18 to be amended to reference conservation area boundary.

=====
Representation(s)

31661 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

Please amend to scheduled monument, rather than scheduled ancient monument as this is the current NPPF terminology.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Agree

Action

Deletion of word 'ancient'

=====

Paragraph 3.30

Representation(s)

31662 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

We welcome the preliminary archaeological investigations that have taken place. Reporting of the findings may also indicate that preservation in situ may be appropriate in some areas. Advice should be sought from Cambridgeshire County Council HER.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The site's archaeology and impacts on heritage assets will be addressed as part of the outline planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31859 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

The site has been subject to a programme of archaeological evaluation, the results of which indicate that significant archaeological remains survive in the area. Any planning application will require a programme of archaeological excavation, secured by condition, as appropriate methodology for mitigating the development impact.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.32

Representation(s)

31663 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

Wroxham House on Church End is a building of Local Interest. Due to its proximity to the site Wroxham House should be specifically mentioned in this paragraph. It may also be helpful to mention the group of former barns 62 - 66 Church End, currently used as workshops on Church End.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

Update Figure 18 to identify listed buildings including: 67 Church End, Mafeking Cottage and Uphall, The Rectory, Teversham Hall, Wroxham House and 62-66 Church End.

Representation(s)

31840 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

For completeness, the map of surrounding schools, on page 18 of the SPD, appears to omit Abbey Meadows Primary School, which is within the 1600m isochrone and St Philip's Church of England Primary School, just outside of the 1600m isochrone.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

Amend figure 11 to include Abbey Meadows Primary School and St Philip's Church of England Primary School.

Paragraph 3.34

Representation(s)

31665 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

It would also be helpful to address the morphology of Teversham and Church End in this paragraph.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Agree.

Action

Amend first sentence of paragraph: 'The historic core of Cherry Hinton, along with many other typically South Cambridgeshire villages, including Teversham, is organised along a linear high street, with later phases of development extending out from this core'.

Paragraph 3.38

Representation(s)

31699 Mr & Mrs Em and Kev Ritchie [6903]

Summary:

The report notes that housing in Teversham Drift is 'arranged around internal courtyards' and we wish to point out that this generates issues for residents who desire to park their car right outside their property (or as close as), as inevitably the design of this has meant that some residents cannot, and so parking overflows into surrounding main roads such as March Lane, the main highroad of Teversham Drift and Church End.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.45

Representation(s)

31667 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

It could be slightly confusing as to which the key findings are and which are the key precedents on this page.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Agree.

Action

Omit word 'detailed' and replace with 'identified' (first sentence). Replace 'precedents' with 'characteristics' (second sentence).



Paragraph Vernacular

Representation(s)

31666 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

Although some red brick buildings in the wider area, closer to the site many of the properties are in Cambridge brick (see full response for details). Therefore it would be more appropriate to reference this brick. It would also be helpful to reference roof materials.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

Specific reference to be made to Cambridge brick and roof materials.



Paragraph 3.47

Representation(s)

31787 Anderson Group [1383]

Agent: Savills (Mr david henry) [43]

Summary:

Objection is made to the description that the southern edge of the site made within this paragraph. Although it is predominantly characterised by residential streets, this is an incomplete description. Part of the southern edge of the SPD area abuts Coldham's Lane, and is proposed to gain access from it. This frontage faces onto the AMC, which at this point is of a distinctly and prominent commercial character. Therefore, it is proposed that 3.47 should be modified to add at the end of the sentence "except where it abuts Coldham's Lane".

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Current wording considered acceptable.

Action

No change to the SPD.



Paragraph 3.48

Representation(s)

31824 Natural England (Miss Carla Jackson) [5507]

Summary:

Natural England supports the proposal to preserve the adjacent wildlife sites and on-site habitats and to create additional grassland habitats.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.53

Representation(s)

31717 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

The extent of green belt remaining after development will be so narrow as to be effectively meaningless.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The site's Green Belt/landscaping/buffering strategy will be addressed as part of the outline planning application. It is an expectation that the Green Belt designation should continue to provide clear separation between Cherry Hinton and Teversham.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31616 Margaret Starkie [1957]

Summary:

Maintenance of the demarkation with Teversham essential for Cherry Hinton cohesion

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The site's Green Belt/landscaping/buffering strategy will be considered as part of the outline planning application process. It is an expectation that the Green Belt designation continues to provide clear separation between Cherry Hinton and Teversham.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.54

Representation(s)

31788 Anderson Group [1383]

Agent: Savills (Mr david henry) [43]

Summary:

The paragraph fails to identify the LSCL AMC to the south of the SPD's location. It is proposed that the heading to the paragraph should be altered to say 'Safeguarded Land and Area of Major Change'. An additional sentence should then be added to the end of the paragraph to say "Land to the south of Coldham's Lane is identified within the emerging Cambridge Local Plan as an Area of Major Change, for regeneration, appropriate redevelopment, and the creation of an urban country park". This should be shown accordingly on Figure 28 and the title of the Figure modified likewise.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Disagree. No change required.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.55

Representation(s)

31617 Margaret Starkie [1957]

Summary:

Screening should be dense to encourage small flora and fauna to support wildlife

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The proposals present an opportunity to enhance biodiversity. Substantial ecological losses should be avoided as part of the detailed design of the scheme. It is an expectation that any loss of habitat is mitigated, and where possible enhanced, as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.58

Representation(s)

31718 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

How can farmland birds be 'encouraged' after virtually all farmland in the vicinity has been developed. They need farmland, not gardens. This statement is pious nonsense.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The proposals present an opportunity to enhance biodiversity. Substantial ecological losses should be avoided as part of the detailed design of the scheme. It is an expectation that any loss of habitat is mitigated and where possible enhanced, as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31801 Natural Cambridgeshire (Mr Philip Clark) [6119]

Summary:

There will be a loss of farmland wildlife as a result of this development which needs to be mitigated off-site. This is only mentioned in the table on p75. We feel that this should be made more explicit and included in the two sections that deal with ecology in the main document.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The proposals present an opportunity to enhance biodiversity. It is an expectation that any potential ecological losses are mitigated, and where possible enhanced, as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.59

Representation(s)

31653 Mrs Christine Shaw [5589]

Summary:

This area has been flooded recently but as its used as a field that would not have been noticed

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A Flood Risk Assessment will be required as part of any future outline planning application.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31654 Mr Paul Cutmore [4111]

Summary:

As a representative of Cambridge Ramblers Group, we do not object to the development of the land, but we request that the public footpaths be kept open during any works. We also request that a green border be maintained between the development and the footpath. We also ask you to note that Cambridge Ramblers Group, as part of the Ramblers' Association, should in future be included in the statutory consultees for such developments.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.61

Representation(s)

31837 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

The gas main should not run under any part of the school sites, and any agreed school site will need to meet the site specification requirements set out by the County Council.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The gas main route will need to be agreed with the relevant infrastructure providers.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.63

Representation(s)

31655 Mr David Martin [7036]

Summary:

Pollution from aircraft will cause health problems. Especially vulnerable are children. The airport will get busier as Cambridge continues to expand as a Technology Centre with an increasing population, this will add to the risks from pollution. The development is too near the runway to allow dispersal of pollution. Locating a school near a runway, significantly increases the time children are exposed to dangerous pollutants.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The environmental impacts of existing development (including Cambridge Airport's operational activities) on the residential amenity of prospective residents will be assessed as part of any future outline planning application.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.64

Representation(s)

31719 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

How can the introduction of thousands more polluting vehicles have anything other than a detrimental effect on air quality?

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Section 5.37 refers to Air Quality. An Air Quality Assessment will be required as part of any future outline planning application.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.65

Representation(s)

31637 Environment Agency (Mr Tony Waddams) [1273]

Summary:

- We thank the developers for acknowledging that, based on preliminary ground investigation works which have been undertaken at the site,, the site could have soil that is affected by contamination which is associated with current and historical land uses.
- Welcome proposed detailed ground investigation works to delineate the extent of contamination at the site.
- EA would expect that all of our previous comments provided will be addressed as part of any works.
- Infiltration drainage is being considered for the proposed development at the site.
- We thank the developers for acknowledging that the shallow groundwater beneath the site will be considered as part of any surface water drainage strategy.
- Infiltration drainage could provide a pathway to the underlying groundwater, or mobilise any potential pre-existing contamination.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.67

Representation(s)

31702 Mr & Mrs Em and Kev Ritchie [6903]

Summary:

When purchasing a property this side of Cherry Hinton, awareness of the airport and its day-to-day running are an inevitable factor and one that ultimately cannot be used as a negative if purchase goes ahead. Indeed, residents of Cherry Hinton appreciate our unique relationship with Marshalls and the aircraft that use it: we are treated to aerial displays by the Red Arrows (and not just at Marshalls 100 year celebrations) and by the smaller aircraft that dip and glide above us, it provides a useful landmark, is a valued local employer and is part of the village. We were delighted at the award of MoD contracts for the RAF Hercules earlier this year as a way of continuing its presence. We are concerned that this land development will be used in the future as a case study for noise pollution or for highlighting the danger of flying routes above residential areas and that future pressures will be placed upon Marshalls to close. This is not a chicken/egg situation, the airport was here first, and residents would not want to see re-routing of take offs or runway angles, or closure at all.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The SPD brings forward land which is not required for the operational use of the airport. The site landowner is also the landowner of Cambridge Airport. There are no plans to introduce development that will undermine the current or future operations of the airport.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.70

Representation(s)

31656 Mr David Martin [7036]

Summary:

Helicopter flight paths are directly over the development area, will the flight path change? What are the noise implications of night time engine testing on the nearest houses in the development? What are the future development plans for the airport and how will this affect the development in relation to noise?

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The SPD brings forward land which is not required for the operational use of the airport. The site landowner is also the landowner of Cambridge Airport. There are no plans to introduce development that will undermine the current or future operations of the airport. The environmental impacts of existing development (including Cambridge Airport's operational activities) on the residential amenity of prospective residents will be assessed as part of any future outline planning application.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.74

Representation(s)

31770 Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Ms Stacey Weiser) [1801]

Summary:

Aircraft noise, there is a current application for relocation of engine testing shed up near the Newmarket Road but approval of Wing development was conditional on Marshalls moving it. Therefore, consideration of the noise and pollution implications needs to take place.

In addition, we understand that the aircraft flight direction beacon at the southern end of the runway could also be a concern and whether tall buildings (like four stories) at the southern side of the airport would affect their operation. This too should be clarified.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The SPD is being produced in consultation with Marshall, with a view to maintaining the operational safety of Cambridge Airport. Any development proposal on the site as identified by the SPD will need to avoid impacts on airport operations. This matter will be assessed as part of any future outline planning application.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 3.76

Representation(s)

31706 Mr David Garside [7048]

Summary:

Coldhams Lane bridge is not only too low but also too narrow with inadequate footpath widths and no provision for cyclists. There is a need for a cycle track along Coldhams Lane from the proposed site to the Sainsbury's roundabout as the existing one past the health club to the bottom of Mill Road is an unsuitable route for anyone travelling to Sainsbury's or the Beehive Centre for example. These improvements should be a requirement before any further housing is permitted on this site.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. It is anticipated that improvements to the cycle routes beyond the SPD boundary will be secured through the planning process to encourage the usage of more sustainable forms of transport.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31769 Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Ms Stacey Weiser) [1801]

Summary:

There are other constraints or areas of mitigation included in the document that may need additional clarification or guidance. These include; soil contamination, noise, air quality, airport equipment relocations and impact on residential amenity as well as electrical interference. These needs to be addressed in the SPD.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No Change to the SPD.

4.0 Vision and Key Principles

Paragraph 4.2

Representation(s)

31746 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

Meaningless words. Every development in Cambridge has been described as vibrant and high quality. Walk around the endless new estates at Trumpington and Kings Hedges and you will see silent streets, no community facilities and repetitive and unappealing architecture that would not look out of place in the Soviet bloc.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31668 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

We welcome the reference to the need for the development to reflect and enhance the special character of the surrounding area.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31809 Endurance Estates Limited [2466]

Agent: Terence O'Rourke (Greg blaquiere) [7060]

Summary:

The vision for Land North of Cherry Hinton is that of a vibrant, high-quality and distinctive new neighbourhood of Cherry Hinton, reflecting and enhancing the special character of the surrounding area and establishing a new neighbourhood that will be an exciting place with a strong identity, which is supported by the landowners. The proposed residential-led mixed use scheme will represent a considerable benefit to the local area, with high quality facilities that will be provided and made available to the residents and wider community.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 4.3

Representation(s)

31630 Ayleen Ross [6906]

Summary:

Cherry Hinton is divided into 2 areas. One in the city and one area in south Cambs (some in Teversham, some in Fulbourn). Those of us in South Cambs are treated as second class citizens as we do not have access to city facilities. All you will be doing is creating another area of disenfranchised who have no say in their local community and who are continually told that they are NOT CHERRY HINTON!!

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The intention of the SPD is to create a community that is properly integrated with Cherry Hinton and Teversham. The matter of access to city services by residents in South Cambridgeshire is beyond the remit of the document.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31632 Mrs Pamela D. Tucker [6907]

Summary:

Although the vision/aims outlined in 4.3 are admirable, I live as you can see in what was named the "Foxglove" estate and have been there since 1987. We are part of Teversham, in south Cambs. We neither belong to Teversham village or Cherry Hinton. We do not belong after over 30 years. The original plans were altered for our estate and a deal done with the City Council who built houses in Antelope, Buffalo and Panther Way. I cannot see that any of these 'ground plans' will really happen.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The intention of the SPD is to create a community that is properly integrated with Cherry Hinton and Teversham. The matter of access to city services by residents in South Cambridgeshire is beyond the remit of the document.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31743 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

This is just a meaningless claptrap:

1. Open spaces and play areas are part of every development. Community facilities, as we know from the many other developments around Cambridge, are rarely provided in the promised form and even more rarely enforced in the promised form by planners.
2. This will be dormitory development like all the other Cambridge housing developments. There will be minimal social interaction or sense of belonging.
3. A strong green framework can mean different things to different people. Needs definition.
4. If not be centrally located it will not be a centre.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31669 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

We welcome the reference to a strong green framework.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31732 St Andrew's Church (Rev'd Karin Voth Harman) [6898]

Summary:

We completely support these aims but want closest possible attention paid to how these aspirations will come to pass. What will actually make this a 'vibrant community' rather than a dormitory? and how can the design reflect, but improve upon, the design of the rest of Cherry Hinton, much of which is piecemeal and pedestrian?

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31810 Endurance Estates Limited [2466]

Agent: Terence O'Rourke (Greg blaquiere) [7060]

Summary:

While the primary purpose of the proposals is to provide much needed new market and affordable homes and community facilities to meet both the city and district council's needs, the project will also create many other planning benefits for the wider community. Much of the social infrastructure that is proposed will be accessible to the wider public (including schools, local centre, public open space) and transport connectivity will also create better connections for pedestrians and cyclists.

The housing proposed will also be of a high quality that will help contribute towards the housing targets set for the City and District.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 4.4

Representation(s)

31670 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

4.4 We welcome the reference to the development being inspired by the unique characteristics of the existing settlement and surrounding area, with cherry trees and countryside setting and celebrating views. More specificity with respect to the materials palette would be helpful e.g. Cambridge brick and preferred roof materials based on an analysis of the local characteristics.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The detailed design of the development will be considered as part of any future outline and reserved matters planning applications.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 4.5

Representation(s)

31745 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

Can only work if cheap and efficient public transport is provided to tempt residents away from their cars. The existing services will not be in any way adequate to achieve this.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application. It is an expectation that existing cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage safer travel for cyclists.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31733 St Andrew's Church (Rev'd Karin Voth Harman) [6898]

Summary:

Again, we are looking for imaginative thinking here. At the moment the proposals are not suggesting great connectivity between this development and existing Cherry Hinton. Current residents need a reason to go into the new development, and access by car as well as cycle and foot. There needs to be parking for visitors to the new community. There needs to be enough parking for the cars generated by the new housing, so that they don't overflow into existing streets forcing permit systems which begin to erode connectivity. Above all Coldham's Lane needs a bike/pedestrian lane.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application. It is an expectation that the bus service connections between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved as part of the proposals to reduce travel times and discourage car use. It is also anticipated that improvements to the cycle routes beyond the SPD boundary will be secured through the planning process to encourage the usage of more sustainable forms of transport and encourage safer travel for cyclists.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 4.6

Representation(s)

31744 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

How can this support biodiversity? It will destroy existing habitats and the plants and creatures that live in them will, in the main, move away or (more probably) die out due to lack of food and breeding sites. Artificial nest sites and decorative planting cannot replace the existing habitat.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The proposals present an opportunity to enhance biodiversity. Substantial ecological losses should be avoided as part of the detailed design of the scheme. It is an expectation that any loss of habitat is mitigated, and where possible enhanced, as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31671 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

We welcome the reference to historic landscape features and the desire to incorporate the existing countryside walk into a linear park.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31734 St Andrew's Church (Rev'd Karin Voth Harman) [6898]

Summary:

We would like to see some real imagination and forward thinking here -- which becomes part of the identity of this new development. What environmental features or initiatives will people boast of in 10 years time?

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

5.0 Framework Principles and Master Plan

Paragraph 5.1

Representation(s)

31773 Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Ms Stacey Weiser) [1801]

Summary:

Comparison and lessons learned should be given from the newer developments around Cambridge, such as Eddington, NW Cambridge site, Trumpington, CB1, etc. to understand what has worked and what has not. Lessons should be learnt and mistakes not repeated, especially as the traffic and congestion of the area is already considered high. In addition, the design and materials palette need to be contextual and based on local vernacular, not just contemporary because that is the trend at the moment.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application. It is an expectation that existing cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage safer travel for cyclists. The detailed design of the development will be considered as part of any future outline and reserved matters planning applications.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.6

Representation(s)

31835 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

Following a series of workshops, which included both County officers and local members, the consultation draft SPD has been published for comments with a deadline of 2nd October 2017.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

Include reference to Cambridgeshire County Council.

Paragraph 5.7

Representation(s)

31814 Network Rail (Caren Tong) [7061]

Summary:

Network Rail is in more advanced stages in considering the re-opening of Fulbourn station. Therefore, it is unlikely that a new station will also be developed nearby Cherry Hinton due to its close proximity. Further, any new station would need to be built with additional infrastructure such as the doubling of a single line, in order to meet future aspirations to improve train services between Cambridge and Ipswich.

* Network Rail would be pleased to discuss further with the Council and other stakeholder groups, that are interested in expanding the bridge discussed within the workshop.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

=====

Paragraph Movement and transport:

Representation(s)

31834 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

The Council has supported the Cambridge East allocations as part of the broader growth agenda in Cambridgeshire and is actively planning for infrastructure to help facilitate this.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====

Paragraph Social infrastructure:

Representation(s)

31642 Will Lord [6915]

Summary:

All sounds good but please, no more charity shops!

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====

Paragraph Housing:

Representation(s)

31582 Mr Jonathan Thackray [6887]

Summary:

4/5 stories is too high! Cherry Hinton has a current maximum of 3 stories in the flats near Tesco on Yarrow Road. This will substantially alter the character of our village into a more urban area.

This also means far more homes will be built in this area, meaning lots more cars. The roads are already completely full at peak times. The number of homes built on this site should be limited to 3 stories, maximum.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.8

Representation(s)

31816 Smarter Cambridge Transport [7062]

Agent: Smarter Cambridge Transport (Edward Leigh) [7063]

Summary:

The transport proposal for the development proposes two ways to mitigate the increase in trips:

- 1. An increase in local bus services.
- 2. Provision of new or upgraded segregated cycle routes into Cambridge ('the Tins' path and potentially via Coldham's Common to the Chisholm Trail).

Our assessment is that it is most unlikely - and almost certainly unprecedented - that the required large modal shift may be achieved simply by running more buses and upgrading cycle paths.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application. It is an expectation that existing cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage safer travel for cyclists.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31629 Jennifer Taylor [6905]

Summary:

I am perfectly happy with the proposed development even though where I live will be greatly affected. However, I am anxious to stress the GREAT IMPORTANCE of an improved public transport service to the existing homes in the area and of course to homes in the new development. At the moment this area is denied access to the Beehive Centre and the Grafton Centre.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application. It is an expectation that the bus services between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.10

Representation(s)

31649 Mrs Christine Shaw [5589]

Summary:

Amount of traffic in area is very high at present congestion is normal morning and evening- this development will make it worse

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application. It is an expectation that the bus service connections between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved as part of the proposals to reduce travel times and discourage car use. It is also anticipated that improvements to the cycle routes beyond the SPD boundary will be secured through the planning process to encourage the usage of more sustainable forms of transport and encourage safer travel for cyclists.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31657 Mr David Martin [7036]

Summary:

During the morning and evening rush hours Cherry Hinton High Street is a solid Traffic Jam. The road in front of ARM Holdings is also a sold traffic Jam. Both Addenbrooks and ARM are significantly expanding at present. With the addition of this housing estate as well I expect the traffic congestion to significantly increase. What road measures are being taken to mitigate this issue? Could a railway station be opened in Cherry Hinton to connect to Cambridge Main and Cambridge North stations? Could ARM have a feeder road to reduce congestion?

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application. It is an expectation that existing cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage safer travel for cyclists.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.11

Representation(s)

31625 Peter Tribble [6896]

Summary:

I argue that the movement strategy is incomplete, as it does not include rail. Consideration should be given to a railway station in Cherry Hinton/Fulbourn

- near the Tesco Fulbourn site
- which has good road access
- could have a good cycle path along Gazelle Way
- is already a good bus interchange
- has space
- would reduce the need for road traffic to go to the main Cambridge station

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A new rail station would require involvement from other strategic bodies, including the Greater Cambridge Partnership and rail authorities.

Action

Amend figure 14 to identify the disused rail station at Cherry Hinton.

Representation(s)

31690 Mr & Mrs K Phillips [6901]

Summary:

AIR POLLUTION - With so much stationery traffic in Cherry Hinton, in the past few months seems even worse with cars having to wait to pass each other and complete stand still if a bus comes in to the equation, because of the extra wide cycle lanes and 20mph restrictions, with even more traffic the air pollution will increase to unacceptable levels.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. It is important that the site minimises environmental impacts arising from air pollution. This is addressed in section 5.47. An Air Quality Assessment will need to be submitted as part of the outline planning application.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31768 Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Ms Stacey Weiser) [1801]

Summary:

Unless a new development is intentionally designed using grid based or linear approach, a more organic flow can be used. There is no option for where the two new entrances of the site are to be located, therefore there is no real option for a spine road to be designed other than connecting the two points whilst avoiding constraints. This is not the best practice of urban design and seems to force the location of housing and other buildings. In addition, the movement strategy, Figure 39, is poor and should be more explicit and clear.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Options for the primary route and spacing around the development has been based upon robust parcel sizes. The design of and traffic flows in and around the spine road will need to be agreed by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority. The option of a bus gate should therefore be retained to ensure flexibility for any proposed transport solutions for the site.

Action

For clarity, Options A and B should be coloured differently in figure 39.

Representation(s)

31776 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Matthew Bowles) [7054]

Summary:

It is important that the site is not brought forward in isolation, and any transport measures proposed should show due concern for any future interventions required to mitigate any potential larger scale development in the area.

Considerations should include ensuring that the design of this site is cognoscente of the requirements of any potential larger site coming forward being accessed, by not adversely impacting upon potential future alignments for road, public transport and active travel links where this is possible and sensible to do so.

We welcome the opportunity to work with CCiC and SCDC to help progress this.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The Masterplanning of the wider site area will be considered as part of the pre-application planning process. Cumulative transport impacts will be assessed as part of the Transport Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment required as part of any future outline planning application.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31789 Anderson Group [1383]

Agent: Savills (Mr david henry) [43]

Summary:

Although the principles set out in this paragraph are supported, the first bullet point could be misleading by implying that there is only a need to reduce travel by car 'within the development'. This aim should apply both to trips within and beyond the development. The phrase 'within the development' should be deleted in the interests of clarity.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Agree.

Action

First bullet - delete 'within the development'

Representation(s)

31815 Smarter Cambridge Transport [7062]

Agent: Smarter Cambridge Transport (Edward Leigh) [7063]

Summary:

New developments should be aiming for a zero net impact on road traffic. The inevitable increase in car trips generated by the new community must be offset in the existing community by a modal shift from car to sustainable alternatives.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. It is important that the impacts of the development on air pollution are minimised. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy and Air Quality Assessment will be required as part of any future outline planning application.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31845 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

Movement - the 'vehicular access points' on figure 39 are not very clear, these need to be made clearer.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Agree.

Action

Improve legibility of vehicle access points on figure 39.

Representation(s)

31587 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

Consider methods to reduce use of the car, such as centralised parking areas on the edges as has been done in German suburbs:
<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/12/science/earth/12suburb.html>
Also encourage existing Cherry Hinton residents to drive less - offer individual travel plans for existing residents

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.12

Representation(s)

31688 Mr & Mrs K Phillips [6901]

Summary:

* TRAFFIC - Cherry Hinton High Street/ Airport Way and Coldham's Lane are at the moment often at a standstill, with the added addition of a railway crossing that closes at least twice an hour , movement is at the moment not an easy task. The addition of another 1500 houses, even with a spine road the traffic from this development, would have to feed on to the already congested stated roads.

The added factor of a secondary school, would mean movement of at least 1500 staff and pupils every morning and evening feeding onto the already stated congested roads. The primary school would also generate a huge amount of traffic. (We see the traffic each school day for Bewick Bridge Primary School , causing complete standstill of Fulbourn Old Drift and causing non movement from the two adjacent estates of traffic and bikes.

Traffic - With large developments further afield already in the planning, that use the A14 / Airport Way to access Cambridge the impact of this alone will cease all movement in Cherry Hinton. When the A14 is congested or closed due to accidents, at the moment it becomes impossible to cross the High Street. The A14 which affects Cherry Hinton is also not due for an upgrade.

The vast expansion of the Addenbrookes Hospital site will also generate much traffic through Cherry Hinton.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. School provision needs to be carefully planned to ensure there are enough places for local children. Any school development will need to have good sustainable transport links to reduce the need for vehicular movement to and from the site. It is an expectation that bus services and cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage the usage of more sustainable forms of transport.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====

Representation(s)**31748 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]****Summary:**

Both routes are grossly overloaded already at peak times. It can already take 30 minutes to cover the mile from the Church to either the Robin Hood (via High St) or Sainsbury via Coldhams Lane between 8 & 9am. Newmarket Road is little better and about to be subjected to major new developments as well. How can these routes possibly accommodate all the additional traffic to be generated by the proposal? The proposal is absolute lunacy.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application. It is an expectation that existing cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage safer travel for cyclists.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)**31820 Smarter Cambridge Transport [7062]****Agent: Smarter Cambridge Transport (Edward Leigh) [7063]****Summary:**

Both 'spine road' options internally divide the new development and isolate it from the rest of Cherry Hinton. It would be a big mistake to create yet another 'cul-de-sac' development. Two other options should be considered, both providing a new through route between Coldham's Lane and Airport/Gazelle Way. These would displace through traffic, away from north Cherry Hinton (the eastern end of Coldham's Lane, Cherry Hinton High St, and Teversham Drift).

Both options would remove road barriers to permeability for people walking and cycling, which would ensure better integration of the new development.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The design of and traffic flows in and around the spine road will need to be agreed by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority. The movement strategy aims to achieve the best possible balance between connectivity and existing site constraints. A permeable grid will be developed for cyclists, pedestrians and public transport movements.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.13

Representation(s)

31790 Anderson Group [1383]

Agent: Savills (Mr david henry) [43]

Summary:

It is clearly important that a balanced and inclusive view is taken of possible traffic impacts arising from the development of this area. Hence, in acknowledgement of the commitment to the LSCL AMC, for completeness, the list of local junctions that should be included within a Transport Assessment ought to include the junction between Coldham's Lane and Norman Way. This provides an access into both an existing Protected Industrial Site and the AMC. Similarly, it is proposed that the important local junctions at Brooks Road/Brookfields Road, plus the Cherry Hinton High Street railway crossing, should likewise be included.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31828 Mrs Naomi Naomi Goldsbrough [7067]

Summary:

Concerned about traffic - maybe consider additional or alternate access roads to the development. At peak times and with trains already causing long traffic queues, currently the proposed access roads will only add to this causing major congestion. I understand cycle routes are planned, but I fear they will not be fully utilised thus causing traffic issues.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the surrounding area will be required as part of any future outline planning application. It is anticipated that the cycle routes and bus service connections between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to reduce travel times and discourage car use.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31860 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

5.13 should refer to Coldham's Lane/ Barnwell Road not Drive.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Agree to change.

Action

Refer to Barnwell Road not Drive.

Representation(s)

31805 Teversham Church of England Primary School (Mr Anthony Sharpe) [7045]

Summary:

A new Secondary school attracting children from a very wide area and 1200 houses plus the new 1200 houses on Newmarket Road (Wings Estate) will generate a very large increase in the volume of traffic on Airport Way Teversham. It is currently very difficult to enter Airport Way from Teversham village so with this increased volume it will be almost impossible. We want to very strongly urge the planners to design in safe and secure crossings of Airport Way.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31811 Network Rail (Caren Tong) [7061]

Summary:

NR would be interested to view a comprehensive transport assessment (TA) to support further design stages.

A TA would provide clarity of the impact of additional residents upon the transport network, in particular upon the railway stations of Cambridge and Cambridge North, as well as nearby level crossings and over-bridges/underpasses. The crossings on Cherry Hinton High Street and Cherry Hinton by-pass have 34 booked trains per day and currently experience 11,800 and 12,200 vehicles, and 760 and 560 pedestrians per day, respectively. A TA will enable capacity analysis and identify appropriate impact mitigation and upgrade requirements.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.14

Representation(s)

31862 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

The aspiration for encouraging developers to incorporate a traffic calmed environment is welcomed. Particularly the reference to using street design, intersecting cross routes to create a natural reduction in speeds, and setting the spine road speed limit to 20mph. The SPD could consider making the entire development a 20mph zone.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.



Paragraph 5.16

Representation(s)

31846 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

The spine road design speed should be agreed with Highways Development Control - 20mph seems most appropriate This should actually refer to Highways Development Management or the Highway Authority or County Highways rather than Highways Development Control.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

Substitute 'Highway Development Control/ with 'Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority'.



Representation(s)

31808 Endurance Estates Limited [2466]

Agent: Terence O'Rourke (Greg blaquiere) [7060]

Summary:

We support the flexibility included in certain parts of the SPD, at this stage of the proposals. We fully support the wording of paragraph 2.10, which acknowledges the importance of ensuring flexibility in relation to the function of the spine road, as to whether it provides a through-route to vehicular traffic or not. Whilst discussions with County, City and District councils will continue in respect to the precise nature of the spine road, there is no guarantee at this time that the function of the spine road will be agreed prior to submission of the application.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

Amend last sentence: 'The requirements of the final spine road design will be determined by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority and local planning authorities, as part of the pre-application planning process.'

Paragraph 5.18

Representation(s)

31844 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

The SPD should highlight that the requirements of the final spine road design will be determined by CCC and Local Authorities prior to submission of a Planning Application. The wording in the consultation version is that this will be decided through the planning application process, but the County Council require this to be decided prior to a planning application is submitted, therefore wording should be altered to prior to submission of a planning application.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

Amend last sentence: 'The requirements of the final spine road design will be determined by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority and local planning authorities, as part of the pre-application planning process.'

Paragraph 5.19

Representation(s)

31791 Anderson Group [1383]

Agent: Savills (Mr david henry) [43]

Summary:

This section concerns main vehicular access points to the site. Yet it fails to have regard to the implications of the adjacent strategic AMC. To remedy this omission, it is proposed that an additional sentence is added at the end of the paragraph to read: 'Similarly, the design of the access point will need to have regard to the implications of the forthcoming regeneration of the Area of Major Change on the opposite side of Coldhams Lane'.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. No change considered necessary.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.21

Representation(s)

31623 Peter Tribble [6896]

Summary:

I argue that the Primary road should be a perimeter road. Such a choice:

- doesn't break the community up
- doesn't funnel vehicles to the centre of the development
- no need for pedestrians/cyclists to cross the road to get anywhere (specifically the school)
- provides natural barrier between housing and the airport
- no impact if/when it becomes a "rat run"

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The design of and traffic flows in and around the spine road will need to be agreed by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31767 Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Ms Stacey Weiser) [1801]

Summary:

Most contentious parts of consultations was requirement by the LP Policy for 'spine road' in development. The reason behind this may be due to AAP and about larger site's interconnectivity. This fragmentary approach to development is contextually inappropriate. This is the most rigid and constraining of requirements for site -the road is dictating the development- a tail wagging the dog scenario.

There is still a lack of credible evidence to demonstrate why this must be included, what benefit this will provide for wider transport/congestion and what alternatives there are. How will spine road address thru traffic, prevention of rat runs?

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The design of and traffic flows in and around the spine road will need to be agreed by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority. The movement strategy aims to achieve the best possible balance between connectivity and existing site constraints.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31797 Natural Cambridgeshire (Mr Philip Clark) [6119]

Summary:

We are concerned that the adjacent spine road could subsequently provide an entrance route to future development on safeguarded land to the west - this would require a road that would then cut across the linear park, devaluing wildlife connectivity.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.22

Representation(s)

31757 Mr & Mrs Em and Kev Ritchie [6903]

Summary:

Option A still leaves Church End, March Lane and Teversham Drift as a rat run. Option B will only create another new rat run. This new development places significant importance on access for pedestrians and cyclists. The main access route for cyclists and pedestrians into and out of the development will follow the existing footpath line, meaning that these people will be funnelled into the junction at the base of March Lane and Church End: a blind corner with parking issues on both side of the road, and documented accidents and speeding issues.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The design of and traffic flows in and around the spine road will need to be agreed by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority. The movement strategy aims to achieve the best possible balance between connectivity and existing site constraints.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31727 Mr Christopher Hills [7050]

Summary:

To minimise congestion, the spine road should run along the northern edge of the site (option A), rather than taking a windy route through the centre of the site (option B).

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The design of and traffic flows in and around the spine road will need to be agreed by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority. The movement strategy aims to achieve the best possible balance between connectivity and existing site constraints.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph Disadvantages

Representation(s)

31728 Mr Christopher Hills [7050]

Summary:

What's wrong with the spine road being used as a way of bypassing the Coldham's Lane/High Street junction? It's a good opportunity to reduce congestion there.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The design of and traffic flows in and around the spine road will need to be agreed by the Highway Authority.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====

Paragraph 5.23

Representation(s)

31707 Mr David Garside [7048]

Summary:

Proposed spine road should allow through traffic. Improvements to the height and width of Coldhams Lane bridge and the provision of a cycle track should be a requirement before any development is allowed on the site.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The detailed design of and traffic flows in and around the spine road will need to be agreed by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process. It is an expectation that bus services and cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage the usage of more sustainable forms of transport.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====

Paragraph 5.24

Representation(s)

31643 Will Lord [6915]

Summary:

Support with concerns: A spine road is clearly essential but one consideration if the bus gate option is adopted is the impact on Church End which already has a serious 'rat running' problem and certainly couldn't support any additional traffic. If the spine road is closed to through traffic then Church End needs to be closed too. In addition the double mini roundabout on Cherry Hinton High Street/Church end will likely need to be reviewed.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The design of and traffic flows in and around the spine road will need to be agreed by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority. The movement strategy aims to achieve the best possible balance between connectivity and existing site constraints.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====
Representation(s)

31724 Mr Christopher Hills [7050]

Summary:

A bus gate along the spine road is a very bad idea. If you do then you will be creating 1200 houses, which will probably have more than 1200 cars, and putting them all onto the existing road network. This will create a lot of traffic congestion. The new spine road will be a great opportunity to relieve congestion at the Coldham's Lane/High Street junction by allowing some traffic to bypass it. It's fine to have a 20 mph speed limit and traffic calming on the spine road, but there must not be a bus gate.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The design of and traffic flows in and around the spine road will need to be agreed by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority. The movement strategy aims to achieve the best possible balance between connectivity and existing site constraints. The option of a bus gate offers flexibility for any proposed transport solutions for the site.

Action

No change to the SPD.
=====

Representation(s)

31792 Anderson Group [1383]

Agent: Savills (Mr david henry) [43]

Summary:

Objection is made to the suggestion that a bus gate is a 'possibility 'on the spine road to restrict through connections between Cherry Hinton Road and Coldham's Lane. If this were implemented, then traffic from the proposed development could have a greater impact on Coldham's Lane, especially at the High Street signalised junction. In the absence of sufficient justification, it is proposed that this option is omitted.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The design of and traffic flows in and around the spine road will need to be agreed by Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority. The movement strategy aims to achieve the best possible balance between connectivity and existing site constraints. The option of a bus gate offers flexibility for any proposed transport solutions for the site.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.25

Representation(s)

31626 Councillor Catherine Smart [6904]

Summary:

There is no reference to cycle and pedestrian routes to the new bridge over the river to the Cambridge North Railway Station and the Northern fringe employment site. This needs considering.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Agree that reference should be made to cycle and pedestrian routes to the new bridge over the river.

Action

Extend geographical area to show pedestrian and cycle linkages to Cambridge North station and northern fringe employment site in figure 43.

Representation(s)

31692 Mr & Mrs K Phillips [6901]

Summary:

CYCLE WAYS - The cycle way across the tins to the City centre is well used at the moment, BUT dangerous, due to the very sharp bend up and over the railway line - many cyclist have come to grief at this point. Also because of the steepness many cyclist have to get of to push the bikes over - causing even more hazards, with pedestrians as well the cycle way is not safe.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Improvements to existing cycle routes beyond the SPD boundary can be secured through the Section 106 to encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31775 Nicola Nineham [7051]

Summary:

There do not appear to be any immediate plans to improve cycle provision along Coldhams Lane. This route is already dangerous for cyclists, and an increase in cars, cyclists and construction traffic will make this worse. There should be improvements to the cycle route along Coldhams Lane to address this.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. It is an expectation that existing cycle connections between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved as part of the development.

Action

Insert 'exploring potential improvements to connections'.

Representation(s)

31818 Smarter Cambridge Transport [7062]

Agent: Smarter Cambridge Transport (Edward Leigh) [7063]

Summary:

Inconsistency in the interpretation of planning law: if the SPD cannot make reference to a new railway station, how can it refer to unplanned cycling infrastructure beyond the development site? It is unclear how this will be funded as a development condition or planning obligation.

Examples of improvements needed include:

1. A protected cycle lane alongside Coldham's Lane
2. Improved walking/cycling access to and around the roundabout at Barnwell Rd-Brooks Rd.
3. Improved walking and cycling access around the Barnwell Rd-Newmarket Rd roundabout.
4. Improvements to the cycle links between Cambridge, Cherry Hinton and Fulbourn, making crossing Perne Rd safer.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application. It is an expectation that existing cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage safer travel for cyclists.. The development will need to mitigate its transport impact. This can be secured through the S106 process. Discussions are on going regarding this.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31624 Peter Tribble [6896]

Summary:

It is important that cycle infrastructure is complete. The viability of a route is often determined by its weakest point, not it's strongest.

Specifically here, a segregated path alongside Coldham's lane would link well with existing cycle paths along Barnwell Road and Coldham's lane the other side of the Sainsbury's roundabout.

More needs to be done to improve cycle routes into Cambridge centre, though.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. A comprehensive Transport Assessment and Strategy for the site and its integration with the wider area will be required as part of any future outline planning application. It is an expectation that existing cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage safer travel for cyclists.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31735 St Andrew's Church (Rev'd Karin Voth Harman) [6898]

Summary:

We strongly support the creation of a safe route for bikes and pedestrians along Coldham's Lane between Cherry Hinton High St and the Barnwell Road roundabout, so that there is safe, non vehicular travel to Sainsbury's and so that cyclists can pick up the Coldham's Common route and the Chisholm trail. This would benefit existing residents as well as those in the new neighbourhood and create community cohesion. The Tins Route is not going to be attractive to those in LNCH; it takes them too far west before they head into the city centre and has a pinchpoint.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. It is an expectation that the cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage safer travel for cyclists.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.29

Representation(s)

31644 Will Lord [6915]

Summary:

An upgrade to cycling infrastructure along Coldhams Lane must be considered. Even though the Tins route is available much cycle traffic is likely to run along Coldhams Lane beside the airport, particularly if it is headed towards Newmarket Road, The Beehive etc. This is a narrow, 40mph stretch of road and is already in serious need of upgrade. There is ample space (except under the railway bridge) to make improvements.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. It is an expectation that the cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage safer travel for cyclists.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31793 Anderson Group [1383]

Agent: Savills (Mr david henry) [43]

Summary:

Figure 44 suggests indicative pedestrian cycle routes, including a connection to the TINS route. To achieve this, in a safe and convenient manner, a crossing point would likely be required over Coldham's Lane to Norman Way. Although this is supported in principle, again, this needs to acknowledge the requirement to integrate such proposals effectively with other significant committed and planned developments. In this case, the connection to the TINS route will need to also have regard to the continued operation of the Protected Industrial Area and the intention to regenerate the Area of Major Change.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.30

Representation(s)

31821 Smarter Cambridge Transport [7062]

Agent: Smarter Cambridge Transport (Edward Leigh) [7063]

Summary:

Other roads through the development should be primarily for walking and cycling, as in the Eddington development in North West Cambridge. Vehicle movements should be confined as far as possible to the outer edges of the development, to ensure that the public outdoor space is attractive and safe for people of all ages to move around, and for children to play.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31588 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

Aim for all segregated cycle routes, separate from vehicles and pedestrians.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.31

Representation(s)

31847 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

Figure 45 is small and not clear to read.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Agree.

Action

Increase font size in Figure 45.

Representation(s)

31589 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

Great to have dedicated walking and cycling routes. Best to have segregation between pedestrians and cyclists too (e.g. kerb or change of height of the different sides)

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.33

Representation(s)

31755 Mr & Mrs Em and Kev Ritchie [6903]

Summary:

Unlike Northstow or Orchard Park we do not have the inclusion of a guided busway network built into this development. At the public meeting, officials were keen to persuade that a large development like this will guarantee a public service infrastructure. The harsh reality is that Cherry Hinton residents struggle to use a bus service that for the most part is run as a monopoly by Stage Coach. Bus services to and from Cherry Hinton have been cut and cut again:

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. It is an expectation that the bus service connections between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved as part of the proposals to reduce travel times and discourage car use.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)**31794 Anderson Group [1383]****Agent: Savills (Mr david henry) [43]****Summary:**

The proposal that any strategy for public transport must be lead by the County Council in partnership with local authorities, bus companies and developers is supported. The reference to 'developers' is capable of misinterpretation as being only the developers of the NCH site. It is important to acknowledge that there is need to harmonise proposals with the emerging strategy for the surrounding area as a whole, including the adjacent LSCH AMC. Therefore, it is proposed that after the term 'developers' the phrase is added 'of the NCH site and adjacent strategic proposals'.

Council's Initial Response**Comments duly noted. No change considered necessary.****Action****No change to the SPD.****Representation(s)****31817 Smarter Cambridge Transport [7062]****Agent: Smarter Cambridge Transport (Edward Leigh) [7063]****Summary:**

- There is rarely enough subsidy money to run a high frequency service for the hours that people need it from the time when people start moving into the development to completion (typically a number of years).
- The bus operator is expected to cover a proportion of the operating costs, which makes the service loss-making at the outset.
- The "existing network" uses roads (Cherry Hinton Rd and Hills Rd) that are already very congested at peak times, making bus services unreliable and relatively expensive to operate.
- This is not a recipe for a large modal shift to bus travel.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. It is an expectation that the bus service connections between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved as part of the proposals to reduce travel times and discourage car use.

Action**No change to the SPD.**

Paragraph 5.34

Representation(s)

31590 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

Great to have access to public transport, however, currently you cannot class Coldham's Lane as having a bus route - one bus a day is not enough to be a bus route!

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.35

Representation(s)

31645 Will Lord [6915]

Summary:

This may not be the place for this feedback but the bus provision along Coldhams Lane is woefully inadequate for a development of this size. The Citi 1 service is useful for people travelling to certain parts of the city but without improvements to cycling and public transport this development is going to be very car-heavy. Since there are also proposals to redevelop the land south of Coldhams Lane the overall additional pressure on the road will be unsustainable without serious consideration being given to transportation.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. It is an expectation that the bus service connections between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved as part of the proposals to reduce travel times and discourage car use.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.36

Representation(s)

31756 Mr & Mrs Em and Kev Ritchie [6903]

Summary:

Parking is a big issue this side of Cherry Hinton. We have seen previously empty pockets of land being developed and this has provided a squeeze on parking opportunities. Any new development must make parking a priority. It is all very well and good to quote green ideals at the public exhibition but the reality is that most houses have two cars, and sometimes more given the rise of young adults living at home due to exorbitant living costs. Please consider extensive underground parking as an option. Please consider town house styles with parking at ground level.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Cycle and car parking provision will be assessed and addressed as outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31771 Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Ms Stacey Weiser) [1801]

Summary:

More guidance or examples of best practice in relation to car parking would be beneficial. It is not mentioned, but is underground car parking proposed or even an option in this location?

Section 5.73 and 5.74- are minimum requirements. We would want to see optimum.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Cycle and car parking provision will be assessed and addressed as outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31848 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

car parking provision should be compared to needs assessment e.g. car ownership levels. This has not been addressed.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Cycle and car parking provision will be assessed and addressed as outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.37

Representation(s)

31591 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

Consider centralised/edge parking which can be beneficial for deterring people from using their cars e.g. Freiburg in Germany has done it successfully.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.



Paragraph 5.38

Representation(s)

31853 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

The provision of electric charging points within the development is welcomed, however, the provision needs to be more specific and it is suggested the SPD reflects the need for EV charging points in different settings e.g. Residential, Commercial, Carparks etc. also the SPD should reflect the different types of EV charging points (standard and rapid).

It would be beneficial if the SPD had an aspiration that all dwellings are provided with EV charging points.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Electric vehicle charging points and the provision of related infrastructure is an evolving matter with the changing technologies for electric and zero emission vehicles. This level of detail is outside the scope of the SPD, but will be considered as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.



Paragraph 5.40

Representation(s)

31731 Mr Christopher Hills [7050]

Summary:

It is important that street lighting should use full cutoff housings, so that all of the light is sent down onto the ground where it is wanted, and none is sent out horizontally or above the horizontal where all it does is cause glare and light pollution. The new street lights that were installed in Borley Way and elsewhere last year are very bad, they send out lots of light above the horizontal.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. It is important that the development minimises light pollution is minimised. This will be addressed as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.42

Representation(s)

31641 Environment Agency (Mr Tony Waddams) [1273]

Summary:

Outstanding issues: The SPD does not mention provision of potable water supply to the site.

The development lies within the area traditionally supplied by Cambridge Water Company. It is assumed that water will be supplied using existing sources and under existing abstraction licence permissions. The planners should seek advice from the water company to find out whether this is the case, or whether a new source needs to be developed or a new abstraction licence is sought.

We may not be able to recommend a new or increased abstraction licence where water resources are fully committed to existing abstraction and the environment. The location of development should take into consideration the relative availability of existing developed water resources. The timing and cost of infrastructure improvements will be a consideration. This issue should be discussed with the water company.

Every opportunity should be taken to build water efficiency into new developments, and innovative approaches should be encouraged. We support the initiatives mentioned in Section 5.42 which stated that water efficiency and water sensitive design was a key priority for the site.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The supply of water to the development site is the responsibility of the developer. Whilst this is beyond the remit of the SPD, it is an expectation that provision is made for appropriate water supply to the site. This should be established prior to the submission of any future planning application. Water efficiency measures in new development can be addressed secured as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.44

Representation(s)

31618 Margaret Starkie [1957]

Summary:

Consider other forms of energy supply and conservation, including air to water heat sources, solar panels and wind turbine.

Consider heat recovery ventilation systems

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The site's strategy and approach towards energy usage, supply and conservation will be addressed as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31854 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

The acknowledgement that air quality needs to be considered at the design stage (Page 56) is welcomed and the SPD should also consider domestic use of energy as well as energy production i.e. combustion sources within domestic dwellings.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. No change necessary. Paragraph 5.47 recognises that the list is not exhaustive.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.52

Representation(s)

31704 Mr & Mrs Em and Kev Ritchie [6903]

Summary:

There have been historic instances of surface water flooding adjacent to existing drainage ditches which run through the proposed site and into current residential fringes of Cherry Hinton. As acknowledged in the report 'the site is within an area of water stress'. We wholeheartedly support installing any water saving devices, any surface water storage systems or management systems that can be incorporated into the design of buildings and infrastructure.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.54

Representation(s)

31672 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

Whilst we welcome the application of sustainable drainage policies within the development, the potential impact upon buried archaeology should be acknowledged and any strategy designed to minimise the impact on buried archaeology.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Paragraph 3.30 effectively deals with archaeology. Further investigation will be conditioned through the outline planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31638 Environment Agency (Mr Tony Waddams) [1273]

Summary:

Issues requiring further investigation.
 Infiltration sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) such as soakaways, unsealed porous pavement systems or infiltration basins shall only be used where it can be demonstrated that they will not pose a risk to the water environment.

- Infiltration SuDS have the potential to provide a pathway for pollutants and must not be constructed in contaminated ground. They would only be acceptable if a phased site investigation showed the presence of no significant contamination.
- Only clean water from roofs can be directly discharged to any soakaway or watercourse. Systems for the discharge of surface water from associated hard-standing, roads and impermeable vehicle parking areas shall incorporate appropriate pollution prevention measures and a suitable number of SuDS treatment train components appropriate to the environmental sensitivity of the receiving waters.
- The maximum acceptable depth for infiltration SuDS is 2.0 m below ground level, with a minimum of 1.2 m clearance between the base of infiltration SuDS and peak seasonal groundwater levels.
- Deep bore and other deep soakaway systems are not appropriate in areas where groundwater constitutes a significant resource (that is where aquifer yield may support or already supports abstraction).

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The surface water drainage strategy for the site will be addressed as part of the outline planning application process. Technical discussions are on-going.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.60

Representation(s)

31749 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

The Cambridge sewage treatment works is already overloaded leading to complaints about unpleasant odours for many years now. This development, combined with all the others in progress around Cambridge can only exacerbate the problem. There is no mention of any upgrading to overcome the issue, or who is to pay for such upgrading. This should surely be responsibility of the developers who are overloading the system, not the existing users.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The foul water drainage strategy for the site will be addressed as part of the outline planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31639 Environment Agency (Mr Tony Waddams) [1273]

Summary:

EA generally happy with the water quality/wastewater aspects of the draft SPD.
EA fully endorse the statement in Section 5.60: "Ongoing consultation with Anglian Water will be undertaken to ensure the development proposal meets their requirements".
EA would prefer to see an additional "To avoid foul flooding of existing properties, and to avoid pollution of the local water environment, all planning applications should include a Pre-Application Assessment Report from Anglian Water confirming that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate foul drainage from the site or phase of development".

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Agree to proposed amendment.

Action

Additional paragraph (5.61): "To avoid foul flooding of existing properties, and to avoid pollution of the local water environment, all planning applications should include a Pre-Application Assessment Report from Anglian Water confirming that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate foul drainage from the site or phase of development".

=====
Paragraph 5.61

Representation(s)

31761 Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Ms Stacey Weiser) [1801]

Summary:

We welcome the inclusion of green infrastructure within the SPD and an uninterrupted linear park (wildlife corridor) that links with wildlife sites to the south of Coldham's Lane with the Greenbelt/Green Corridor to the north, although we are concerned that the spine road subsequently provides an entrance route to future development on safeguarded land to the west - which creates a road that would cut across the linear park, devaluing wildlife connectivity. The houses adjacent to the linear park are four storeys and to the south - casting shade on the linear park. Consideration of shade/building height/aspect is therefore required.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The landscape framework promoted through the SPD is robust enough to deal with the issues referred to. Any detailed impacts will be assessed through future outline and reserved matters planning applications.

Action

No change to the SPD.



*Representation(s)***31799 Natural Cambridgeshire (Mr Philip Clark) [6119]***Summary:*

We welcome the need to preserve the adjacent wildlife sites and on-site habitats and in particular to treat the wildlife site on the eastern boundary with sensitivity and to create additional grassland habitat in that location. The wildlife site is noted for perennial flax and crested cow-wheat, which will have specific habitat requirements. The SPD should make clear that any habitat or open space enhancements in this location should not unintentionally have an impact on these plant species and that ideally, they should enable them to spread. An ongoing management contribution to achieve this would be required.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. This level of detail is beyond the remit of the SPD. The proposals present an opportunity to enhance biodiversity. It is an expectation that any potential ecological losses are mitigated, and where possible enhanced, as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====

Paragraph 5.64*Representation(s)***31852 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]***Summary:*

There are concerns that the provision of green space may not be sufficient, although the SPD references the policies within each local plan, the labels for pocket parks on the indicative map on page 63 do not match the description on the indicative map on page 43 where they are classed as green corridors, these are not the same and should be clarified.

In addition the dry swales should not be included within the allocation for green space as these may not be available for recreation depending on the condition of the swale e.g. in exceptional flood circumstances.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Swales are not included as part of the open space calculations.

Action

Update of figure 38 to reflect the nature of the greenspaces.

=====

Paragraph 5.65

Representation(s)

31592 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

Play areas need to be easily accessible for the existing Cherry Hinton residents south of the site - there are currently no play areas north of Coldhams Lane (and only a poor quality play area south of Coldham's Lane).

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====
Paragraph 5.67

Representation(s)

31676 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

We would also suggest that the brief could refer to the need for high quality design and good practice in relation to the public realm. We would refer you to our regionally specific advice in 'Streets for All East of England' <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/streets-for-all-east-of-england/> More information and advice on the above can be found on our website via this link: <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/caring-for-heritage/streets-for-all/case-studies/>.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====
Representation(s)

31736 St Andrew's Church (Rev'd Karin Voth Harman) [6898]

Summary:

Whilst much of the plan looks good, there doesn't seem to be any area in which kids could kick a football around. Or play a game of netball, or do some skateboarding. Imperative then that the playing fields of the secondary school are accessible to local young people at weekends and school holidays.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The provision, layout and management of open spaces, will be addressed as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====

Representation(s)

31750 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

Given the ghastly nature of the 'high quality' station square that has been foisted upon Cambridge the heart sinks at the sight of these words. What is meant by a highest quality square? It can mean all things to all men. On the station experience, to Cambridge planners, it means a vast expanse of hard paving with a few token trees set in a wind tunnel between bland and unappealing architecture.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====
Paragraph 5.70

Representation(s)

31597 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

Ensure that there are regular benches along the green corridors to enable older people to use them for walking, with opportunities for rest. Benches are really important to enable more people to walk.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====
Representation(s)

31796 Natural Cambridgeshire (Mr Philip Clark) [6119]

Summary:

We welcome the inclusion of green infrastructure within the SPD and in particular an uninterrupted linear park (wildlife corridor) that potentially links with wildlife sites to the south of Coldham's Lane with the Greenbelt/Green Corridor to the north.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31823 Natural England (Miss Carla Jackson) [5507]

Summary:

We support the inclusion of green infrastructure within the SPD, including an uninterrupted linear park that potentially links with wildlife sites in the wider countryside.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.71

Representation(s)

31620 Mrs Karen Hosking [6895]

Summary:

Pocket parks are great but there also needs to be a central green area for the community. This should be attached to a community centre or community cafe/church to best utilise this area and aid community cohesion. This is less likely in scattered pockets.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The central square area is connected to the wider green area. It is the intention that pocket parks and the linear park will be linked, creating a comprehensive green network.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31777 Mr Robin Greenwood [7052]

Summary:

I'd like to urge the Council to ensure that sufficient space is devoted to recreational and social areas and to multi-purpose buildings that the community can use for leisure activities.

As a member of St Andrew's parish church in Cherry Hinton I am keen that the new community should have space/s that all faiths can use for religious and community development purposes. I envisage St Andrew's engaging in the organisation of faith space there, acting as a bridge between the old and the new communities.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The provision of community rooms and links to existing provision will be considered as part of the future outline planning application and can be secured through the Section 106 process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31851 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

It is welcomed that in addition the 5.71 of the Open space and recreation section within the SPD states that the development should "also encourage healthy lifestyles and the use of sustainable travel modes, such as cycling."

Council's Initial Response

Comment duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.75

Representation(s)

31762 Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Ms Stacey Weiser) [1801]

Summary:

We have concerns regarding the location of the school playing fields which extend into the Greenbelt. Playing fields are urban in character, utilising artificial surfaces, ball courts, flood-lighting, fencing. The purpose of Greenbelt here is to prevent the merging with Teversham and green corridor linking Cambridge with east countryside. Fields could significantly erode both of these. We see no indication in SPD regarding landscaping on the NE and eastern edges of fields. The land allocated for school towards eastern boundary should be reserved for landscaping/buffering as part of the playing fields could be a nature area for the school.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The site's Green Belt/landscaping/buffering strategy will be addressed as part of the outline planning application. The inclusion of sports fields in the Green Belt is not incompatible with this designation, provided that the function of the Green Belt unaffected (i.e. maintains proper separation between Teversham and Cherry Hinton and protects the setting of Cambridge).

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31593 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

Access to facilities at the secondary school would be great. The existing sports pitches in Cherry Hinton are quite far away (and have poor cycle links to as the cycle routes on the High Street are not good).

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.77

Representation(s)

31594 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

Great to have new play areas, including for existing resident as there are limited options this side of Cherry Hinton. Ensure that they are easily accessible by walking and cycling for existing residents.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====
Representation(s)

31646 Will Lord [6915]

Summary:

Play facilities will be critical to the success of the development.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====
Paragraph 5.78

Representation(s)

31764 Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Ms Stacey Weiser) [1801]

Summary:

Open spaces proposed for development are too local and won't meet resident's needs for larger open spaces or achieve biodiversity gains. Sites like Wandlebury CP and NT estates (Anglesey Abbey/Wicken Fen) will have increased visitor pressures and are already struggling with capacity and impact on the biodiversity.

This is not factored into the SPD or the suggested mitigation. The AAP concept plan on page 10 shows a new country park highlights the need for this space. Concerned that piecemeal developments will fail to contribute financially towards new large public spaces or offsetting on existing sites. Address directly in the SPD.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The delivery of a new country park for the wider region is beyond the remit of this SPD.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31827 Natural England (Miss Carla Jackson) [5507]

Summary:

The development should provide sufficient informal open space to meet the additional and growing recreational demands of new (and existing) residents and to deliver biodiversity net gain. Natural England advises that additional off-site green infrastructure provision is likely to be required to meet these needs.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31595 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

Good to have information open space. Allow some to be off-lead dog walking areas.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.79

Representation(s)

31751 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

There had to be something supportable somewhere in the proposal. This is the first commonsense proposal I have seen. Pity it has not been adopted for all the other developments.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.80*Representation(s)***31631 Douglas Taylor [6909]***Summary:*

Assurance of sustainable public transport - good connections to current cycle ways into the city.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.83*Representation(s)***31698 Susan & Richard Sewell [6902]***Summary:*

We note with interest the SPD for the land in Cherry Hinton, currently part of the south-eastern corner of Cambridge Airport's airfield. We have been conducting the Breeding Birds Survey (BBS) on behalf of the British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) in that area for the past 4 years. The airfield itself is a valuable habitat for skylarks, and the hedgerow along the eastern boundary of the proposed site (on Airport Way, particularly the part adjacent to the junction with Gazelle Way), which I believe is part of the County Wildlife Site, consistently harbours populations of both whitethroat and lesser whitethroat during the breeding season. This year, a pair of nesting linnets were also recorded in this area.

We would like to request that these important hedgerows are preserved both during the construction at the development, and as part of the final developed site. It appears from the plans that this area is designated as an "open space" for public recreational access. Retaining these hedgerows would presumably help create a boundary to these areas, as well as enhancing the ecological diversity of the area, and would be entirely in keeping with the concept of public recreation in a green open space.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The proposals present an opportunity to enhance biodiversity. It is an expectation that any potential ecological losses are mitigated, and where possible enhanced, as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31752 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

New habitats, however well intentioned, can never replace the existing in terms of biodiversity and wildlife while retention in isolation will result in substantial loss due to loss of adjacent feeding areas. Retention in the whole is the only effective measure to maintain existing biodiversity.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The proposals present an opportunity to enhance biodiversity. Substantial ecological losses should be avoided as part of the detailed design of the scheme. It is an expectation that any loss of habitat is mitigated, and where possible enhanced, as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31822 Natural England (Miss Carla Jackson) [5507]

Summary:

This site lies within an area where Natural England believes development should contribute towards delivery of landscape scale biodiversity net gain, in particular enhancement of chalk grassland and woodland and farmland bird habitat.

Natural England supports the proposal to preserve the adjacent wildlife sites and on-site habitats and to create additional grassland habitats.

Ecological impacts, including on farmland species, should be appropriately mitigated and enhancements incorporated to demonstrate delivery of net biodiversity gain, to meet NPPF requirements and the needs of people and wildlife.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The site's strategy and approach towards ecology and biodiversity will be addressed as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.86

Representation(s)

31753 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

The existing developments around Cambridge are already providing far too many apartments. This results in ghettos of young 'professionals' for whom the apartment is nothing more than a crash pad between commutes to work and leisure activities elsewhere. Result - comatose 'communities'. If the development is to go ahead it should provide more, lower density, traditional family housing.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The site's housing mix will be agreed as part of any future outline planning application.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.87

Representation(s)

31596 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

Good to have highest density housing around the centre to support local shops, and encourage walking.
Lower density near the existing settlement would also be suitable.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.88

Representation(s)

31695 Mr & Mrs K Phillips [6901]

Summary:

Residents observed that If the houses were already there - would an airport be allowed to be built so near to them - I think not. The resident questions why has some one come along with this plan?

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The site identified is within the non operational land for Cambridge Airport. The size of the site is limited by airport operational safety concerns.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31856 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

The needs of disabled or older people and other marginalised groups should be taken into account in all aspects of the masterplan including, but not limited to, the design of green space, transport connectivity etc.

The requirement that the development should include a mix of dwelling sizes, types and tenures to meet projected future household needs within Cambridge including integrated housing, and dwellings designed to provide adaptability and flexibility is welcomed.

The SPD could go further and recommend the proportions of dwellings that are built to the Government's 'Approved Document M' standards.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Reference within the SPD to 'Approved Document M' (which relates to Building Regulations) is considered unnecessary.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31687 Dr Timothy Newton [6900]

Summary:

Strongly support new housebuilding in Cambridge from a resident's perspective. From the perspective of an academic at the University, I am likely to leave the city in the future unless house prices become affordable. Many people across the city will benefit from more house building.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.89

Representation(s)

31619 Margaret Starkie [1957]

Summary:

Essential that this site has 40% integrated affordable housing, especially as the 40% target was not reached for the Wing development

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Paragraph 5.89 refers to the 40% affordable housing threshold. This quantum will also be tenure blind, to ensure it is fully integrated into the whole development.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31621 Mrs Karen Hosking [6895]

Summary:

Cherry Hinton needs affordable housing, this is currently lacking in the city and there is a clear current need in Cherry Hinton to provide housing for essential workers who are unable to afford current prices and are being pushed out of Cambridge or are now social excluded. It is essential this aim of 40% is met or improved upon.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Paragraph 5.89 refers to the 40% affordable housing threshold.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.90

Representation(s)

31861 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

There is no aspiration within the SPD to tackle crime through innovative design.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. No change considered necessary. Section 5.99 (Character & Form) reference a number of key Local Plan policies which seek to ensure the site is designed to a high standard which, including the creation of safe, urban environments.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.92

Representation(s)

31691 Mr & Mrs K Phillips [6901]

Summary:

Schools - I am amazed that you have even thought to build schools so close to an airport, aviation pollution, levels of noise, distraction . What health will the pupils be in after years in those conditions.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The environmental impacts of existing development (including Cambridge Airport's operational activities) on the residential amenity of prospective residents (including sensitive uses such as schools) will be assessed as part of any future outline planning application.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31754 Mr & Mrs Em and Kev Ritchie [6903]

Summary:

It concerns us that a shortage of school places has been used to justify the inclusion of a primary school and secondary school in this development. Currently, Cherry Hinton has 4 primary schools all of which have undergone significant expansion schemes in recent years. This area of Cherry Hinton is currently served by two secondary schools one of which, Bottisham Village College, has had plans to extend each year group by three form entry and its buildings as a result. Both are part of the same Multi Academy Trust and so form a 'monopoly' this side of the city.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. School provision needs to be carefully planned to ensure there are enough places for local children. School provision will be assessed and addressed as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31829 Mrs Naomi Naomi Goldsbrough [7067]

Summary:

I am concerned that if the school is built and finished before the housing development, many children from Cherry Hinton could be tempted to attend due to it being a new building and inevitably having better resources. Has the impact on the existing schools been considered with regard to this? I have also heard that the school (s) could be private school (s) and if this is the case it's unlikely the school will be serving the community of Cherry Hinton.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. School provision needs to be carefully planned to ensure there are enough places for local children. School provision will be assessed and addressed as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31836 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

Education officers generally support the principles set out for education provision and the locations of the schools. However, there does remain a need to retain appropriate flexibility around the building location for the primary school. Both in terms of the site itself, and the surrounding area.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31803 Teversham Church of England Primary School (Mr Anthony Sharpe) [7045]

Summary:

The proposed new primary school (2FE) will be just 600 metres from our primary school. We are very concerned that another school is proposed in addition to Cherry Hinton C of E Primary, Bewick Bridge Primary, Wings Primary and Spinney Primary. If this school is built before it is known that there are no available spaces in the current schools, the education of the children in these schools will be put at risk as the financial viability of these schools will be under threat. We are not objecting unless there are school places available in local schools or that the school is built before the houses are occupied.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. School provision needs to be carefully planned to ensure there are enough places for local children. School provision will be assessed and addressed as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.93

Representation(s)

31598 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

Do not open a new primary school too early.
Do not allow developer to use S106 contributions for schools - should be from DfE.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31737 St Andrew's Church (Rev'd Karin Voth Harman) [6898]

Summary:

Given the number of unfilled places in the existing local primary schools, it is questionable whether the provision of a primary school on this site is in the best public interest and represents best value for the taxpayer. The effect of a 2FE rather than single form entry primary risks making at least one of the existing schools unsustainable. In addition, primary school playing fields rarely serve the whole community as they are fenced off.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Education officers generally support the principles set out for education provision and the locations of the schools. School provision needs to be carefully planned to ensure there are enough places for local children. School provision will be assessed and addressed as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process. Any access to school sports facilities will be secured with a Community Use Agreement.

Action

Amend paragraph 2.19 to include reference to ensure community access to school playing fields is secured with a Community Use Agreement.

Representation(s)

31804 Teversham Church of England Primary School (Mr Anthony Sharpe) [7045]

Summary:

The proposed Airport way development plans show new cycle paths from the new houses to the door of our school Teversham C of E Primary which has not yet been expanded. It would surely be more logical and economically wise to expand a recently Ofsted inspected "Good" school that is within walking distance on newly provided pathways. Because of our special ethos and caring reputation we expect to attract many children from this new community. We are not objecting unless there are school places available in local schools or that the school is built before the houses are occupied.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Education officers generally support the principles set out for education provision and the locations of the schools. However, there does remain a need to retain appropriate flexibility around the building location for the primary school. Both in terms of the site itself, and the surrounding area. School provision will be assessed and addressed as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31838 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

The 2.3 hectare primary school site is sufficient to accommodate a 2 form of entry (420 place) school, and sufficient to meet the needs of the proposed development on this site. Officers have encouraged the inclusion of additional safeguarded land to future proof the primary school site for expansion, should the adjacent land come forward for development in the future.

The primary school will include provision for early years. Officers would encourage any development of this nature to also consider provision for a commercially operated nursery.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. School provision needs to be carefully planned to ensure there are enough places for local children. School provision will be assessed and addressed as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.94

Representation(s)

31738 St Andrew's Church (Rev'd Karin Voth Harman) [6898]

Summary:

We want this school to be as small as possible to prevent the traffic jams that will result from children being delivered from all over Cambridgeshire to a highly academic school, which is not located on any public transport route. There is no market need for a large secondary school in this area, and the new development will not produce teenagers for some considerable time, since young families are most likely to be moving into new housing. This school should thus be delayed as long as possible.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. School provision needs to be carefully planned to ensure there are enough places for local children. It is not sustainable planning to restrict school size. Any school development will need to have good sustainable transport links to reduce the need for vehicular movement to and from the site. It is anticipated that the bus services and cycle routes between Cherry Hinton and other destinations will be improved to encourage the usage of more sustainable forms of transport.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31841 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

It seems unnecessary, in paragraph 5.94, to state that the secondary school will be a minimum of 6FE to ensure it is educationally and financially viable. Simply state the secondary school will be a minimum of 6 forms of entry (900 places) to serve the SPD site and surrounding areas.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31599 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

A much improved bus service is needed if such a large school is to be built.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.96

Representation(s)

31685 Crime Prevention Design Team Cambridgeshire (Ms Carol Aston) [7041]

Summary:

The Cambs Crime Prevention Design Team considered that the draft SPD addresses paragraphs 58 and 69 of the NPPF. No further comments, observations or recommendations.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.



Paragraph 5.97

Representation(s)

31647 Will Lord [6915]

Summary:

Cherry Hinton High Street's 'offer' is not particularly compelling as it is so I think competition might be helpful. It would be good to see some higher quality cafes, restaurants and/or local shops. What should be definitely be avoided is further charity shops and (in particular) betting shops.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The provision of new shops on the site will be assessed and addressed as part of the Development Management process.

Action

No change to the SPD.



Representation(s)

31830 Mrs Naomi Naomi Goldsbrough [7067]

Summary:

Community Centre - We have an exciting Village Centre in the heart of Cherry Hinton where residents like myself, who live less than a mile away from it, cannot access the discounted rates it offers for exercise classes, for example, because I live in a different local authority area (South Cambs). This is ridiculous considering I personally, am extremely involved in the Cherry Hinton community by being a childminder, involved in the parish church and vice chair of Bewick Bridge Friends Committee. So will you ensure the new Community Centre is available for all in an equal manner?

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The new development will be expected to provide local community facilities. These need to be 'multi-functional' to provide the greatest flexibility to maximise their benefit to the local community that they serve. They will be open to all residents from either Cambridge or South Cambridgeshire. Community facilities provision will be assessed and addressed as part of the Development Management process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====
Representation(s)

31600 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

Great to have new facilities. Avoid fast food outlets and charity shops as these are already well catered for on the High Street.
A cafe, pub or restaurant is what is really needed - somewhere that people can meet socially, perhaps similar to what the Fulbourn Centre has (?)

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.
=====

Representation(s)

31739 St Andrew's Church (Rev'd Karin Voth Harman) [6898]

Summary:

We support community facilities that form bridges between existing and the new community so that it comes to think of itself as an extensive of Cherry Hinton Village. We urge planners to consider what kind of facilities might achieve this purpose. We are happy to serve as a 'link organisation' since geographically St Andrew's is at the border of the two communities, and historically, this church has knit together the community, and has a track record of almost 1000 years in creating and caring for this place.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Access to community facilities will be assessed and addressed as part of the Development Management process. Cambridge City Council is normally directly involved with organising community development activities as new residents begin to occupy the properties.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.98

Representation(s)

31696 Mr & Mrs K Phillips [6901]

Summary:

The scheme seems to have not mentioned Doctors surgery and Dentist provision, which at this moment is in Cherry Hinton at crisis point.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The new development will be expected to contribute to additional local facilities including provision for GP and dentist surgeries to meet demand generated by new residents.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31778 convenience store (Mr Ronak Patel) [7057]

Summary:

Concerned about the proposed new stores indicated on the plans. I propose restrictions on the use of the proposed units and/or ability to keep it in the hands of local independent business person.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. It is an expectation that the local centre will provide a retail element. The exact type of uses within the local centre is beyond the scope of this SPD.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31831 Mrs Naomi Naomi Goldsbrough [7067]

Summary:

St Andrew's Parish Church - placed between the existing Cherry Hinton and the planned new development- the church will be key in providing links between the Community and I urge this to be a consideration when planning communal buildings and their purpose. The church will be very valuable in the integration of the existing and proposed development and this needs to be considered going forward.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Community facilities provision will be assessed and addressed as part of the Development Management process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31741 St Andrew's Church (Rev'd Karin Voth Harman) [6898]

Summary:

We support this aspiration but know that if the needs of future residents are to be planned for, people must be in place to listen to whoever moves in and to run the groups and events that will help a community to form. Building a community hall is not enough. We will be on the ground, and would like to help manage and direct community facilities. We would like an acknowledgement in planning that people have spiritual needs and emotional needs which different faith groups are well placed to address, and the Church of England well placed to coordinate.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The new development will be expected to provide local community facilities. These need to be 'multi-functional' to provide the greatest flexibility to maximise their benefit to the local community that they serve. Community facilities provision will be assessed and addressed as part of the Development Management process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.100*Representation(s)***31701 Mr & Mrs Em and Kev Ritchie [6903]***Summary:*

The report makes mention of potential further housing developments along 'safeguarded land' by Coldham's Lane. This, coupled with the proposed development opposite by the Anderson Group will mean that Cherry Hinton will be joined to Cambridge and Romsey along this arterial link, thereby losing its 'separate village identity', something that this report highlights as important: 'The proposals must create a clear identity that is cognisant of the 'village' character that existing resident of Cherry Hinton cherish'. We echo this and do not want Cherry Hinton to lose its village feel. This corner of Cherry Hinton has already seen division between the districts of City and South Cambs made more visual with the new village sign opposite the NISA shop to mark a boundary.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

*Representation(s)***31694 Mr & Mrs K Phillips [6901]***Summary:*

Cherry Hinton and Teversham will both lose their identity and just become urban sprawl. The residents of these areas have already taken on board many new homes, expanded and welcomed newcomers.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The site's Green Belt/landscaping/buffering strategy will be addressed as part of the outline planning application process. It is an expectation that the Green Belt designation continues to provide clear separation between Cherry Hinton and Teversham.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.101

Representation(s)

31740 St Andrew's Church (Rev'd Karin Voth Harman) [6898]

Summary:

We want to underscore how important it is to the active residents of Cherry Hinton that this 'village identity' is somehow carried through to the new development, which should be a new 'neighbourhood' of our village. We think the name should be something like 'North Cherry' so that the link is made very obvious. There is a strong sense of place in Cherry Hinton and we hope we can import this to the new development. We hope there will be funding for community development experts to help new residents get involved in existing civic organisations and events.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. It is important that the development is seen as an extension to Cherry Hinton and not a village in its own right. Community facilities provision will be assessed as part of any future outline planning application. No decision has yet been taken regarding the name of the site, and will be considered in due course.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.102

Representation(s)

31673 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

5.102 This paragraph is grammatically unclear.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Agree that greater clarity is required.

Action

Wording to be amended to read 'The initial vision and design principles outlined in this SPD will form the basis for creating a new extension to Cherry Hinton, with a strong identity.'

Paragraph 5.103

Representation(s)

31700 Mr & Mrs Em and Kev Ritchie [6903]

Summary:

The new plans offer no housing of one storey e.g. bungalows, and yet the character and form of this area of housing around Teversham Drift comprises a significant community of one storey residences. The new plans offer no care home or senior citizen sheltered housing. Whilst we accept that this may at the moment fall under the 'social housing' requirements by law of new developments, it concerns us that single storey dwellings have been left out. The largest growth demographic in Cambridgeshire is in the 65+ and 80+ age brackets and yet no specific provision has been made for this group, whereas other demographic groups are named in the report.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The detailed housing mix will need to be the subject of detailed discussion with Council officers to identify the appropriate range of housing. The developer has indicated that an element of older people's housing could be provided within the development, which would be supported.

Action

Last sentence in paragraph 5.88 to be amended to read: 'The site may provide an opportunity for providing specialist homes including for the elderly, subject to local identified needs.'

Representation(s)

31747 Mr Keith Cowley [7049]

Summary:

4-5 storey buildings will be wholly out of keeping with the rest of Cherry Hinton and Tevesham.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The tallest buildings will be located towards the centre of the site, away from the highest ground, to minimise visual impact.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31765 Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Ms Stacey Weiser) [1801]

Summary:

We have concerns about heights of the proposed central buildings. They are shown at four storeys, which in this particular context would be alien. The only buildings near the site that are of that height are within the airport site itself. The site is mainly flat and the surrounding buildings are mainly residential of two storey. Therefore, a doubling of height would be a dramatic difference and should be reconsidered to minimise visual impact.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The tallest buildings will be located towards the centre of the site, away from the highest ground, to minimise visual impact. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will be required as part of any future outline planning application.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31798 Natural Cambridgeshire (Mr Philip Clark) [6119]

Summary:

We are also concerned that the houses adjacent to the linear park will be four storeys and to the south - potentially casting shade on the linear park. Consideration of shade/building height/aspect is required.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The site's landscaping/buffering strategy and light/shading impact of any new development on any neighbouring green spaces will be addressed as part of any future outline and reserved matters planning application.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.110

Representation(s)

31648 Will Lord [6915]

Summary:

The development at Neath Farm Court, which places houses around a shared green space has been a successful model for safe play and community cohesion.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.111

Representation(s)

31703 Mr & Mrs Em and Kev Ritchie [6903]

Summary:

It concerns us that there may have to be a major re-routing of gas supplies during this work, and we do not wish our gas supply to be disturbed, suspended or face any related issues without prior notice and financial recompense.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The gas main route will need to be agreed with the relevant infrastructure providers.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.114

Representation(s)

31674 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

Figure 52 The secondary school building zone is not particularly clear on the plan. We would suggest using a different colour.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Agree.

Action

Graphic (figure 52) to be amended to better identify the secondary school building zone.

Representation(s)

31812 Network Rail (Caren Tong) [7061]

Summary:

- * Network Rail finds the increased usage of level crossings and/or bridges appropriate to be detailed within both the Summary of Constraints and Key Development Principles sections.
- * Investigation into the development's impact upon usage of these infrastructures would enable Network Rail to realise if and how they need to be improved. Such improvements could be the development of a new bridge or upgrading the level crossing system used, for example.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph Constraints and challenges

Representation(s)

31601 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

Traffic on Coldham's Lane also needs speed reducing - it is meant to be 20mph but most cars are over 30mph and many are over 40mph. Consider including physical changes to slow traffic on that road, especially if volumes will increase. Many children walk, cycle and scoot to school along the pavement of Coldham's Lane. Fast moving traffic is dangerous - construction traffic, and residential.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The impact of traffic beyond the SPD boundary will be considered as part of the outline and reserved matters planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====

Paragraph Opportunities

Representation(s)

31651 Mrs Christine Shaw [5589]

Summary:

This application is focused on cherry hinton, where is consideration for the village area of teversham? This area will be spoiled by this development by traffic and noise, with no benefits to the population of the village area.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The environmental impacts of existing development on the residential amenity of existing residents will be assessed as part of any future outline planning application.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====

Representation(s)

31602 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

An obvious gateway to Cherry Hinton along Coldham's Lane could be used to slow traffic along that road (many of which travels at 40mph despite the 20mph speed limit). Opportunity to improve cycle route along Coldham's Lane will reduce car traffic.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

No change to the SPD.

=====

Paragraph Key development principles

Representation(s)

31675 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

Archaeology whilst archaeology is briefly mentioned in the planning obligations requirements table and also para 3.30, given the potential archaeological sensitivity of the site we consider that archaeology should be given more consideration in the SPD. It is important that any future development considers the location of archaeology and is designed to minimise the impact upon these heritage assets.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Paragraph 3.30 effectively deals with archaeology. Further archaeological investigation can be secured through the outline planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31857 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

The SPD could reflect the need to address obesogenic environments that encourage people to eat unhealthily and not do enough exercise by encouraging healthy lifestyle choices through innovate design.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. It is an expectation that a Health Impact Assessment will be submitted as part of any future outline planning application.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.115

Representation(s)

31832 Smarter Cambridge Transport [7062]

Agent: Smarter Cambridge Transport (Edward Leigh) [7063]

Summary:

Investment should instead be focused on making sustainable transport options more convenient, safe and attractive.

Transport data is essential in order to assess the transport impact of this development, and how effective different mitigations may be.

It is imperative that safe and convenient walking and cycling routes to local amenities and bus stops are open from the moment that people start moving in. They must remain open and safe to use throughout the construction period.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The detail is beyond the scope of the SPD. On going wider projects currently gather transport data as part of the Greater Cambridge Partnership. Phasing will be considered as part of the outline planning application to ensure that routes are safe and usable.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Paragraph 5.116

Representation(s)

31693 Mr & Mrs K Phillips [6901]

Summary:

A concern about how this SPD fits with recent Government White Paper - New Planning - "The onus should be on good design, realistic local and neighbourhood plans, and should focus on areas that can accommodate it".

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Policy R47 of the emerging Cambridge Local Plan identifies the requirement for an SPD at Land North of Cherry Hinton. The SPD has the intention of providing a framework for overall development and setting out, at a high level, the expected quality of the urban extension. This approach is consistent with the Government White Paper 'Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places'.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31855 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

The statements regarding s106 monies for 'primary health care facilities' on page 75, needs to be wider. The category of infrastructure should be 'health care facilities' rather than 'primary health care facilities' in order to allow different sectors of the NHS to decide what type of provision would best suit that location i.e. primary and community care provision. In addition the location of any expansion, or new facility may not be within Cherry Hinton so it might be better to reword the requirement to allow a flexible location.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The development will need to mitigate its impact in terms of demand on local facilities, including GP services. This can be secured through the Section 106 process.

Action

Paragraph 5.115 to be redrafted to reflect current position. The table (on page 75 of the consultation document) to be updated to reflect County Council's requirements; referring to 'health care facilities' rather than 'primary health care facilities'.

Paragraph 5.117

Representation(s)

31603 Ms Anna Le Gouais [6888]

Summary:

Do not allow the primary school to open at the start of the development - there are plenty of primary schools in Cherry Hinton and the surrounding area which are currently not full and losing pupils to the new school will seriously harm them. (Cherry Hinton CoE Primary, Colville, Bewick Bridge, Teversham, Fen Ditton all have spaces, including potential for another class intake at Colville.)

Also do not allow S106 contributions to be spent on a school - the Department for Education should fund new schools, not developers. The S106 should be spent on other community facilities.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The specification for the educational facilities and the timing of the delivery of the schools will be part of the Section 106 agreement.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31742 St Andrew's Church (Rev'd Karin Voth Harman) [6898]

Summary:

We would invite you to consider whether the anticipated spend of section 106 money will be the optimal use of these funds for either the new or existing communities in the local area. We do not want the situation currently occurring in the university's North Cambridge development where a primary school was opened too soon because section 106 monies had to be spent. There may be more imaginative ways to build community than the standard school build.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The development will need to mitigate its impact in terms of demand on local facilities. This can be secured through the S106 process. Discussions are currently taking place regarding the provision of community facilities.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31813 Sport England (Mr Philip Raiswell) [210]

Summary:

Sport England support the principle of provision for community indoor sports facilities being secured.

Swimming pools may take the form of enhancements to existing facilities. Sports hall provision could be incorporated into the new secondary school, with secured community access.

SPD should include reference to The Cambridge and South Cambs Sports Facilities Strategies (2016) to help inform requirements.

Sport England's Sports Facilities Calculator calculates the development will create demand for 0.85 sports court (pro-rata cost of £566,415), 29.91m2 of water space (pro-rata cost of £573,433) and 0.12 artificial grass pitch (pro-rata cost of £124,465 - 3G pitch).

Sport England would recommend that the SPD is amended to state that indoor sports provision should be based on existing robust evidence and the use of Sport England planning tools such as the Sports Facilities Calculator.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Agree to proposed amendment.

Action

Include reference to the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Sports Facilities Strategies (2016).

Paragraph 5.118

Representation(s)

31779 NHS England (Ms Kerry Harding) [5842]

Summary:

The proposed development will impact on the NHS funding programme for the delivery of primary healthcare provision within this area and specifically within the health catchment of the development. NHS England would therefore expect these impacts to be fully assessed and mitigated.

Table 1 provides a summary of the capacity position for the GP Catchment Practices (2km radius) once the additional floor space requirements arising from the development proposal are factored in, including an estimate of the costs for providing new floor space and/or related facilities.

There is a capacity deficit in the catchment practices and a developer contribution of £435,252 would be required to mitigate the 'capital cost' to NHS England for the provision of additional primary healthcare services arising directly as a result of the development proposal.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The development will need to mitigate its impact in terms of demand on local facilities, including GP services. Discussions are currently taking place.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31863 Cambridgeshire County Council (Mr Stuart Clarke) [1032]

Summary:

The incorporation of cycle links, and the access to public transport is welcomed but the s106 requirements (page 75) could be widened to increase the uptake of cycling and walking within, and from the development. For example, any emerging travel plan should include personal travel plans, cycle purchase vouchers etc. In addition the connectivity considerations need to relate to the provision of adequate cycle parking facilities in both commercial buildings and domestic dwellings.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Any planning obligation secured under the Section 106 process must meet the relevant tests, in that they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, are directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonable related in scale and kind. Further discussion regarding the detailed Section 106 package will be required as part of the outline planning application process.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Representation(s)

31640 Environment Agency (Mr Tony Waddams) [1273]

Summary:

Outstanding issues: Waste hierarchy and the promotion of waste prevention

The document recognises the importance of both strategic household waste recycling centres and individual household waste and recycling receptacles. It is stated that the requirements for these will come through the financial contributions towards new strategic facilities being delivered off-site and procured by the County Council. The individual household waste will come through financial contributions which will be confirmed at the outline pre-application process. There needs to be consideration of the waste hierarchy and the promotion of waste prevention measures, so opportunities for waste minimisation, reuse and recycling are realised at the earliest stage.

Cambridge City Council should, through the Plan document recognise the requirements of the Waste Planning Authority in identifying potential sites for facilitating waste management operations and wider consideration should also be given to local capacity for managing the waste streams associated with development and occupancy thereafter.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. Any planning obligation secured under the Section 106 process must meet the relevant tests, in that they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonable related in scale and kind. Further discussion regarding the detailed Section 106 package will be required as part of the outline planning application process.

Action

Additional paragraph (2.8) which refers to Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan

Representation(s)

31772 Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Ms Stacey Weiser) [1801]

Summary:

The document mentions the 40% affordable housing policy, but states that this is subject to viability. This should not be negotiable, especially given the affordable housing crisis in Cambridge. Alternative ownership options should also be explored. Due to the location and proximity of the site to employment centres, a key worker option could also be beneficial. The SPD must stress the importance of achieving 40% affordable.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted. The SPD does not set any new affordable housing policy. This is a matter for the Local Plans which both require 40% affordable housing subject to site viability. The 40% threshold is already referenced in paragraph 5.89. This quantum will also be tenure blind meaning it will be fully integrated into the whole development.

Action

No change to the SPD.

Appendix 1: Glossary of Key Terms

Paragraph Appendix 1: Glossary of Key Terms

Representation(s)

31677 Historic England (Mrs Debbie Mack) [5828]

Summary:

Glossary - We would suggest that the terms, 'Heritage Assets', 'Conservation Area', 'Scheduled Monument', 'Listed Buildings' and 'Locally Listed Buildings' are added to the glossary.

Council's Initial Response

Comments duly noted.

Action

Include the following terms: heritage assets, conservation area, listed buildings, locally listed buidlings.

