



Greater Cambridge Draft Local Plan 2025 – 2045
Response of the Trumpington Residents' Association

CONTENTS

Section and sub-section headings	Page Number
Contents	1
Is the Draft Plan Viable?	3
Transport infrastructure	3
Hospitals	5
Water supply	6
Cambridge Biomedical Campus – Policy S/CBC	7
Failure to define uses that are acceptable in pursuit of the CBC's unique purpose	7
Failure to establish "exceptional circumstances" for development in the Green Belt – part one	9
Resultant over-estimation of demand	9

Exceptional circumstances for CBC further development in the Greater Cambridge Green Belt – justified or not? – part two	10
<p>There is an additional reason why exceptional circumstances are not justified:</p> <p>GCSP and the two councils have misled themselves on the level of harm to the Green Belt were development to be allowed up to a realigned Granham’s Road</p>	10
Proposed realignment of Granham’s Road	14
A fatal flaw	14
A smaller mistake	15
Why is it assumed that the land between the current and proposed alignments of Granham’s Road would be removed from the Green Belt and developed?	16
Improvement of the City edge claimed as a benefit by the CBC Landowners	17
Landowners’ claim to be creating a more defensible edge to the City – should we believe it?	17
There is an alternative to what is proposed in the Draft Local Plan	18
Well-being and social inclusion: New Homes	18
Appendix: Authorized Users of the CBC’s Private Roads	21

NOTE: Text shown in bold italics is a conclusion, proposal or recommendation

NOTE: Text shown in bold italics is a conclusion, proposal or recommendation

Is the Draft Plan Viable?

As it stands, will the Draft Plan be delivered, or delivered without significant adverse consequences? Our assessment is, No it will not.

Without a significant and sustained real terms increase in investment in essential infrastructure, we believe that the Plan will either fail to deliver the very high level of housing and jobs growth it envisages, or, perhaps more likely, our quality of life will continue to deteriorate. By investment we mean not only financial investment but also collective political will and effective community development. As it stands, the Plan is particularly deficient in respect of transport and hospital investment which are addressed below together with water supply.

Transport infrastructure

Transport investment is lagging far behind the high rate of population growth Greater Cambridge has experienced over the last twenty or so years. The City Deal / Greater Cambridge Partnership transport schemes have been frustratingly slow to get off the ground, none of the major schemes having been delivered as yet. We refer in particular to Cambridge South East Transport, the Cambridge South West Travel Hub and the City Access Project. The last of these, which was central to the whole City Deal programme, is dead in the water due to a collective lack of political determination to see it through in amended or altered form following years of public consultation.

The Citizens' Assembly's imperative "be brave be bold and take action", while remaining current, now has a plaintive ring. [Greater Cambridge Citizens' Assembly on Congestion, Air Quality and Public Transport, November 2019] As we said in the 2022 crucial public consultation when echoing the Assembly's exhortation, "The time for action is now". *It still is*. The then urgent need to reduce "traffic congestion by one quarter on current levels", is even greater now. [Making Connections 2022, Response of the Trumpington Residents' Association, 10 December 2022, pages 1 & 2]

The County Council's October 2025 "Transport Evidence" on which the Plan relies concludes that –

“The Emerging Preferred Development Strategy for (the) Draft Plan is capable of being accommodated in the local transport network in Greater Cambridge with appropriate mitigation.” [Paragraph 20.1.2]

And there’s the rub – “with appropriate mitigation”. Principal among “The mitigation assessed as necessary” is “City Access Proxy”, i.e., a substitute for the failed City Access Project. *But there isn’t one!* Nor at present does it appear that there will be one in the foreseeable future. As a direct result, the “200,000+ vehicles crossing the outer boundary of Cambridge between 7am and 7pm each day” is likely to increase not decrease as it urgently needs to, *and the “20% reduction in car traffic planned by the Greater Cambridge Partnership” looks increasingly like a pipe dream.* [10. Infrastructure, Contents, page 660] [It was 25%, not 20% as the Draft Local Plan states, but what is 5% among friends when we are so far away from the traffic reduction that is essential to a decent quality of life?]

In Trumpington our experience is of increasing not decreasing traffic levels with the adverse impacts on our quality of life this entails. And we do not see with any confidence a prospect of this changing for the better any time soon. Indeed, with the yet higher rate of growth now envisaged in the Draft Local Plan on top of the already high rate associated in our area with the Cambridge Biomedical Campus in particular, we fear it will get worse.

This is fundamental in Trumpington and Cambridge more widely. Cambridge is swamped by its excessive reliance on the private car as a main mode of travel. This is readily observable day in and day out on our roads. It harms our quality of life where we live and in our ability to travel reasonably by public transport which is persistently delayed so that it is not in the least unusual to take well over an hour to travel across Cambridge. With yet more growth planned, this will only get worse. *Unless this is solved, any claim to sustainable transport and effective connectivity has no substance. Yet there is not active addressing or debate of this – just silence. This is an Achilles Heel in the Draft Local Plan. It needs to be sorted out by clear collective thinking and planning – SOON.*

The mitigation measures in addition to the City Access Proxy deemed to be “necessary” for the planned rate of growth to be “capable of being accommodated in the local transport network in Cambridge” include “Cambridge Eastern Access Phase B”, “Cambourne to Cambridge extended throughout the site and on to Papworth Everard”, and “Extension of CSETS via a grade separated crossing of the A11 into Grange Farm to facilitate access to the site”. *None of these seem likely to be in place within a reasonable period of time. And implementation of the much needed Bus Strategy is not even mentioned in the necessary mitigation measures.* Perhaps because its feasibility depends fundamentally on a substitute for the City Access scheme which is effective in reducing the now chronic traffic congestion that undermines the service reliability without which the bus service will continue to decline.

We ask that as a strict condition of the Draft Local Plan with its planned level of accelerated jobs and housing growth proceeding to full approval, there is a firm guarantee

of the transport wherewithal being in place in good time to ensure that the planned 20 per cent reduction in traffic on our road network is achieved well in advance of 2045 and maintained thereafter.

Hospitals

It is remarkable that the “Infrastructure Delivery Plan” meant to underpin the Draft Local Plan is silent on essential hospital investment. We refer to the large sums needed to renew/replace the ageing, physically restricted Addenbrooke’s Hospital within the overall emerging Acute Healthcare Strategy envisaged by the Cambridge University Hospitals (CUH) NHS Trust.

In stark contrast with the £2.3 *billion* estimated as necessary to renew Addenbrooke’s alone [BBC Local News Cambridgeshire, 5.12.2025], the Infrastructure Delivery Plan includes only £24.1 *million* in the “short to medium term” for “Expansion and/or refurbishment of existing facilities” and £54.1 *million* in the “medium to long term” for “4 new modern healthcare facilities to be built”, i.e., exclusively for primary care health facilities. It is of course good that the Plan includes this important primary healthcare investment. Yet we know and have known for some long time that our hospitals have not received the investment that is essential to cope with our rapidly growing population *at the same time* as changing the model of acute health care towards one featuring new “neighbourhood health centres”.

In a report published recently, the CUH NHS Foundation Trust makes the following statement:

“Due to its accelerated population growth, Cambridgeshire is ahead of the National trend in facing increased demand. Census data shows that over the past decade Cambridge’s population has grown by c.18% (against a c.6% national average) and its local population is set to grow by in excess of 60% by 2040 to meet the Government’s ambition for economic growth in this region. *By contrast, hospital facilities have not kept pace with rising demand.* CUH’s emergency department (ED) was built for a quarter of the patients it now services, and over 70% of CUH’s acute estate is classified as being in poor or bad condition. We currently have an acute bed deficit of c.162 beds. This gives us an added impetus for change.” [Report to Scrutiny and Overview Committee, South Cambridgeshire District Council, 8.12.2025] [Our emphasis]

The Trust’s maintenance backlog increased again in 2024/25 to a total of £238 million, including *High and Significant Risk* maintenance of £29 million and £105 million respectively. In answer to our question, the Trust has confirmed that only a proportion of this is in practice funded, and that is funded from the Trust’s hard pressed capital allocation with a high opportunity cost rather than the annual revenue budget which cannot accommodate it. [CBC Ltd Open Forum meeting, 15 December 2025]

Yet account is not taken of this at all in the Draft Plan’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This is not acceptable. Without adequate investment in hospital as well as primary healthcare, the

*Draft Local Plan's ambitions for jobs and housing growth are **unsustainable** given the risks to the local population that are being / will be incurred.*

We ask that as a condition in the Local Plan 2025-45, this major deficiency in hospital infrastructure is satisfactorily remedied before yet more jobs and housing growth are allowed. This should be funded either by those who gain from development or by Government – or both.

We also ask that before it is finalized the Infrastructure Delivery Plan includes appropriate provision for other missing forms of essential infrastructure particularly “Children and Adult Care Social Services” which are dismissed with faint mention in the Draft Plan. Please refer to paragraph 11.2 which says, “There *may* also be a need to consider the implications of Children and Adult Social Services for healthcare and community provision” – “*may* also be a need to consider” should become “*does* consider”. The *£11 billion of cuts in Rate Support Grant to local authorities in England since 2010* (at 2011 prices), have resulted in, amongst other things, the decimation of the Youth Service and associated youth centres, the total demise of the Sure Start service, and more and more stringent criteria for eligibility to receive adult care services. These services are ESSENTIAL to the “Wellbeing and social inclusion” aspirations of the Draft Local Plan. As is true social housing at truly affordable rents which does not drive out of Cambridge the very people upon whom we rely for our basic services – as the Covid pandemic vividly demonstrated. [See pages 18 & 19 of this response]

If the CBC's Landowners wish to obtain the benefits of further CBC growth, they must be prepared to contribute to the real cost of that growth and not to assume that cash strapped public bodies will come up with the goods. Further expansion must only be allowed if the CBC's Landowners publicly commit themselves to making this contribution. Otherwise, the proposed expansion should not be allowed.

Water supply

We have read carefully the water supply section of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. It seems reassuring. However, while estimated costs are given for key “critical” projects, *there is not an explicit plan for their funding* which there needs to be, particularly for the Fens Reservoir at £1,965 million, and the Water recycling centre effluent re-use scheme at £400 million (not total cost, just funding from the Cambridge Water Company). At a smaller level, there must also be some scepticism about the River Cam abstraction project creating “opportunities for a new surface abstraction from the River Cam”. Like many others in Greater Cambridge, *we will need a lot of persuasion that the depleted River Cam can or should provide such “opportunities”.*

We ask that an explicit funding plan for “critical” water supply projects is adopted and made public to provide necessary reassurance and accountability.

Cambridge Biomedical Campus – Policy S/CBC

Failure to define uses that are acceptable in pursuit of the CBC’s unique purpose, resulting in over-estimation of demand and failure to establish “exceptional circumstances” for development in the Green Belt

Our opposition to the CBC’s yet further expansion into our Green Belt does not result from purblind attachment to preservation of the Green Belt no matter what. *It is the result of a rational and concerned view that neither the CBC in its submissions nor the two councils in this Draft Local Plan establish the “exceptional circumstances” which are the only grounds for further release – for the only incursion into the Cambridge edge of the Green Belt proposed in this Plan. **The prime reason for this is the continued failure of the CBC to define what uses are and are not acceptable in pursuit of its “unique” purpose. This failure is repeated in Draft Policy S/CBC** which states:*

“The Biomedical Campus ... is appropriate for a mix of uses which meet local, regional or national health care needs; or for biomedical and biotechnology research and development activities, related higher education, and sui generis medical research institutes.” [Page 211]

We propose the following amendment:

“The Cambridge Biomedical Campus ... is appropriate for a mix of uses centred on the Campus’s unique function of bringing together clinical care, clinical education and clinical research including medical research institutes which meet local, regional, and national health care needs – together with directly related biomedical and biotechnology research and development activities.”

Why do we propose this amendment?

As we see it, the “unique function” of the CBC is the “tripartite mission” of clinical care, clinical education, and clinical research pursued historically by university hospitals and medical schools whose combined endeavour is sometimes called an Academic Health Science Centre (AHSC). In Cambridge, various aspects of co-location have been critical to the growth and pre-eminence of the AHSC. These include: 1) the location of academic departments within the 1960’s hospital building; 2) the location of clinical school research units adjacent to the hospital; and 3) the location of the office of the Regius Professor of Physic (head of the clinical school) with the hospital management offices on ‘the bridge’.

A different form of ‘proximity’ that has also been critical to AHSC success is overlapping medical staffing arrangements. University staff work in the NHS on honorary contracts and provide both intellectual leavening and leadership. They use their dual role in research and clinical care to inform and advance their work and reputations. Some NHS staff are also

engaged in research and this often involves collaboration with colleagues in the University. Contrary to what might be assumed, University staff undertake little teaching of medical students, this role being undertaken by NHS colleagues. These arrangements are accompanied by complex funding flows for medical staffing between the NHS and the University. The location of the MRC Laboratory of Molecular Biology (LMB) on the main drive, since relocated to its spectacular fit for purpose premises, has been another historic driver of the tripartite mission. The arrival of GSK in the 1990s with a clinical research facility linked to the main hospital corridor began to add directly related commercial R&D to the picture.

This was the winning organizational configuration advocated in CBC Vision 2020 which made the CBC “unique”, and was being constrained by the hospital being too small to meet the demands of a growing population and an increasingly successful academic partner wanting to do ever more clinical research. [“2020 Vision at Addenbrooke’s: The future of the hospital campus – update July 2004”]

Another constraint at that time was the location of the specialist heart and lung hospital in Papworth Everard. This mitigated against both better integration of services with Addenbrooke’s and the development of cardiothoracic research, to which the University was highly committed. Vision 2020 unlocked the way to the move of Papworth, the Heart and Lung Research Centre, the building of the Addenbrooke’s Treatment Centre, and the move of the LMB to its new building. It made considerable progress, yet a quarter of a century on we are still facing the same demographic challenge, only this time even more so.

The CBC Landowners’ submission ‘The power of proximity’ takes this past and extrapolates it into the future in an entirely uncritical way. It foregrounds the advancement of life sciences industry as a fourth strand of mission, places this strand at the centre, and then argues for a huge increase in scale of this strand. ***Why would anyone simply assume that doing this would accelerate long-standing success in delivery of the tripartite mission? It might do nothing of the sort, or it might have adverse consequences as the hospital is overwhelmed by demand, squeezing out not only adequate care but clinical research. It is not responsible to claim that more of the same will automatically be a good thing, especially when the fourth leg of mission is being accelerated at massive scale. No evidence is provided to support this claim, and we strongly question its validity.***

The ***serious risk*** of the proposed formulation of CBC’s purpose in the Draft Local Plan is that ***it will undermine what has made the CBC “unique”, and is capable of even greater things in the future.*** The risk is that the clinical beating heart of the CBC will be subsumed / obscured and not nurtured by life science development that is not *directly related* to it. *This is why we propose a statement of purpose which restores the CBC’s clinical heart to the centre of the CBC’s unique purpose* including the medical research institutes which have become strangely detached in the formulation proposed in the Draft Local Plan.

The winning organizational configuration of the AHSC described above is effectively marginalized in proposed Policy S/CBC – relegated to “uses which meet local, regional or national health care needs” with “medical research institutes” somehow separate from the clinical centre of the Campus’s contribution, and “biomedical and biotechnology research and development activities” which are not necessarily directly related to the CBC’s central clinical purpose thrust into its very centre. The CBC should not be allowed to become another general life sciences business park obscuring its central clinical purpose. This is why we propose our amendment – to retrieve, restore and nurture the CBC’s unique contribution.

Failure to establish “exceptional circumstances” for development in the Green Belt – part one

The conclusion in the previous paragraph is vital in itself. It is also of great importance in terms of the “exceptional circumstances” argument which the Draft Local Plan attempts to establish for allowing a further 22 hectares to be taken out of the strategically important Greater Cambridge Green Belt – 3 hectares more than canvassed in the “First Proposals” - due, it is stated, to the proposed realignment of Granham’s Road.

*One key element of this argument is the demand it asserts needs to be met. **But the estimates of demand on which the Draft Local Plan relies are fundamentally flawed.** This is **because** they are based on the open ended definition of what the CBC is for, as reflected in the Draft Local Plan, which fails to centre its purpose on its clinical care, education and research contribution. **The formulation as it stands is undesirably open to life sciences development which is not directly related to the CBC’s central clinical contribution.***

(The failure to establish “exceptional circumstances” is further addressed in the section of our representation that immediately follows the next section, “Resultant over-estimation of demand” – headed “Exceptional circumstances for CBC further development in the Greater Cambridge Green Belt – justified or not? – part two”. *They should be read together.*)

Resultant over-estimation of demand

*Hence the high estimates of demand featured in the CBC’s submissions – particularly Knight Frank’s “Demand and Deliverability” report. **Were the formulation we propose to have been used, the estimates of demand would be lower. This is a key reason why “exceptional circumstances” have not been established for removing yet another 22 hectares from the Greater Cambridge Green Belt** – on top of the 77 hectares already removed (68 of which the TRA supported to nurture the CBC’s unique purpose).*

A telling paragraph in the CBC’s “Demand and Deliverability” submission reads:

“Within the last 5 years the CBC has attracted 765,000 sq. ft of demand, 153,000 per annum on average, which is approximately 33% of the annual average take up across the City. 100% of the space taken up on the CBC is commercial research/laboratory accommodation.” [Knight Frank. Section 7.1, page 7/40]

*Really? 33%? 100%? These percentages vividly illustrate the severe risks arising from potential loss of central/unique purpose. **Because they are not based in a definition in which the CBC’s clinical heart is pivotal, they are not a reliable basis for further physical expansion.** Everyday life science space can / should be found elsewhere in and near Cambridge, not in the precious space alongside / integrated with the CBC’s clinical heart.*

“Exceptional circumstances” for CBC further development in the Greater Cambridge Green Belt – justified or not? – part two

As we show above, the CBC’s submissions and the Draft Local Plan are based in an undesirably open ended definition of what the CBC is for - which fails to centre its purpose in its vital clinical care, education and research contribution. As a result, *the formulation as it stands is **undesirably open to life sciences development which is not directly related to the CBC’s crucial clinical contribution.***

At this point it is important to remember the two councils’ crucial general conclusion:

*“... the councils have concluded that Greater Cambridge’s development needs **do not justify** the exceptional circumstances required to release land from the Green Belt.”*

[Development Topic Strategy Paper, paragraph 8.9, page 222] [Our emphasis]

Why then is it being proposed that the CBC should be the one and only exception to this? Is this justified or not?

*Our principal reason for arguing that the CBC should **not** be the one exception in the Draft Local Plan to the two councils’ general conclusion *is advanced in an earlier section* of our representation. [Page 9] It is that the CBC in its submissions and the Draft Local Plan as well, move unjustifiably away from the CBC’s unique purpose - and that, as a direct result, the CBC’s assessment of demand *is significantly over-stated, as, therefore, is its demand for additional land.* [Pages 9 & 10]*

There is an additional reason why exceptional circumstances are not justified:

GCSP and the two councils have misled themselves on the level of harm to the Green Belt were development to be allowed up to a realigned Granham’s Road

The Draft Local Plan’s “Site Allocations Topic Paper” in relation to the CBC argues:

“3.105 In exploring the potential for the site allocation, the potential benefits of realigning Granhams Road have been considered, which would increase the area of the Green Belt release. This includes reviewing evidence submitted by the site promoters. It is considered that the realignment has the potential to improve the junction layout, providing improved connectivity to the park and ride and road access.

3.106 The revised site boundary (produced by the proposed realignment of Granham’s Road) would require land that forms part of a land parcel that the Green Belt Study identified as ‘very high’ harm, beyond the First proposals site which was classified as ‘high’ harm. The Councils commissioned (from Quod) a supplement to the Cambridge Green Belt Study (2021) to consider the impact of this change. *The alternative scenario assessments for parcels RC10 and RC11 suggest that the realigned course of Granham’s Road would mark the distinction between land in RC11 that would cause ‘high’ harm if released from the Green Belt, and land in RC10 that would cause ‘very high’ harm.* These are the same ratings that were assigned to RC10 and RC11 in the original assessment. *Therefore, despite being located further into the open countryside, the realigned Granham’s Road would still mark the transition from ‘high’ to ‘very high’ harm.”* [Page 108] [Our emphasis]

This is not accurate.

LUC (Land Use Consultants) is the organization commissioned by the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service to assess the Greater Cambridge Green Belt in the context of the emerging Draft Local Plan. They produced the “Cambridge Green Belt Study 2021” endorsed by the GCSP and the two councils. This remains a foundation of the Draft Local Plan. LUC is, therefore, an authoritative source. In “Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Response to CBC submission on justification for realigning Granham’s Road”, October 2024, commissioned and endorsed by South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council, LUC comments on Quod’s (on behalf of CBC) assessment reproduced above as follows:

“2.4 LUC agrees that the triangle of land would be weakened in Green Belt terms (see paragraph below), but it does not follow that strengthening the new Green Belt edge to compensate for this is a benefit of realigning the road. If the cause of the weakening of the Green Belt is the realignment of the road, then the realignment of the road should not be seen as a benefit that will offset this harm. Instead, the weakening of the GB that would result from road realignment needs to be considered as an adverse impact, to be set against any potential benefits in terms of highways movement and additional campus development...

2.15 RGR’s (Realignment of Granham’s Road’s) conclusion is that a ‘relatively limited’ contribution to Purpose 1 and a ‘moderate’ contribution to Purpose 2 and to Purpose

3, combined with a ‘minor-moderate’ additional impact on adjacent GB land, equates to ‘low’ harm’.”

2.16 ***This conclusion is a misapplication of the methodology.*** In terms of the constituent elements the only one we differ on is that contribution to Purpose 1 should be ‘moderate’ rather than ‘relatively low’, *and even with those ratings the level of harm has been significantly understated.*” (by Quod)... [Our emphasis]

2.19 The picture would be different if the assessment was of the additional harm of releasing RC11b as well as RC11a, instead of just releasing RC11a. In this respect, as we have given a ‘high’ harm rating to both, it could be suggested that there is no additional harm. However, this would be a misinterpretation of what the harm ratings are providing, as harm to the Green Belt is a product not just of harm ratings but of the extent of land released. Clearly the release of a larger area is affecting the Green Belt more than release of a smaller area, but in this case that additional release would not constitute a step-change in terms of impact on the Cambridge Green Belt purposes.

2.21 The arguments regarding a stronger City edge and planning positively in order to reduce the risk of later unplanned development could be challenged – noting that a strengthening of the Green Belt and GI are already requirements for any release of additional land for CBC development under First Proposals Policy S/CBC. Rounding off the urban edge so that it aligns across Babraham Road would leave a stronger distinction between the new urban edge and the Green Belt in the RC11b area but, as demonstrated in the analysis above, RC11b is not ‘weak’ Green Belt. *It is hard to argue that removing land from the Green Belt, rather than strengthening the boundary along the current alignment of Granham’s Road, would in any way strengthen the Cambridge Green Belt. The proposed realignment would create a slightly more direct link to the proposed new southern entrance to CBC, and therefore a shorter Green Belt edge, but the current Green Belt edge could be strengthened similarly albeit perhaps at the expense of some development floorspace.*” [Our emphasis]

2.23 ***To conclude, in weighing up the arguments we would suggest that the harm to the Green Belt purposes that should be taken into account is the ‘very high’ harm associated with the current contribution of land in RC11b,*** but that the factors weighing against this harm should be i) the need for additional floorspace, but also ii) any highways/traffic benefits of road realignment and iii) the lack of significant additional impact on adjacent Green Belt land that would result from development of land in RC11b and creation of a new boundary along a realigned Granham’s Road.” [Our emphasis]

Therefore, LUC’s commissioned and councils’ endorsed assessment shows the opposite of what the two councils claim in the Site Allocations Topic Paper and rely on in their

subsequent judgement. Instead of being based as it currently is in *the inaccurate assessment by the GCSP / two councils that “... despite being located further into the open countryside, the realigned Granham’s Road would still mark the transition from ‘high’ to ‘very high’ harm”*, as the two councils claim, [paragraph 3.106] **the Draft Local Plan should be based on the accurate conclusion that the harm to the Green Belt purposes that should be taken into account is the ‘very high’ harm associated with the current contribution of land in RC11b**.”[Paragraph 2.23] [Our emphasis]

We believe that on this crucial point in the Draft Local Plan GCSP and the two councils have misled themselves, and should reassess their position on the basis of LUC’s accurate assessment which they commissioned and have endorsed, that development up to a realigned Granham’s Road would cause Very High Harm to the Green Belt not High Harm as they have assumed. We ask them to do so.

Until they do this, they should NOT regard their case for exceptional circumstances for release of Green Belt land to have been established. To establish or otherwise those circumstances, the two councils must also carefully assess and respond to the argument we advance in the preceding section that the estimates of demand for space on the CBC are significantly over-stated being based in a distortion of the CBC’s unique purpose which, if adopted, would in fact undermine it. We ask GCSP and the two councils to thoroughly reassess this crucial matter and to publish / issue that reassessment for full public consultation before making a decision prior to the public inquiry.

Let us be clear. An accurate reading of the Draft Local Plan evidence shows that the 19 hectare expansion of the CBC up to the current alignment of Granham’s Road tentatively proposed in the “First Proposals” would be at a cost of **High Harm** to the Green Belt. Whereas the 22 hectares expansion of the CBC up to a realigned Granham’s Road proposed in the Draft Local Plan would be at the cost of **Very High Harm** to the Green Belt.

For the reason we have given, we do not believe that either the 19 or the 22 hectare expansions into the Green Belt meet the “exceptional circumstances” test for removing land from the Green Belt. **However, our objection to the 22 hectare removal is considerably greater than the 19 hectare removal because the 22 hectare removal would cause Very High Harm to the Green Belt. The claimed transport / traffic benefits of realigning Granham’s Road** - though not insubstantial in terms of “rationalising junction arrangements” and improving “integration between CBC and Babraham Park and Ride” - **in no way justify causing Very High Harm to the Green Belt.** [Quod. Realignment of Granham’s Road. Page 7]

Proposed realignment of Granham's Road

A fatal flaw

Whatever its merits, there is ***a fatal flaw*** in the CBC Landowners' proposal to realign Granham's Road – and hence in the Draft Local Plan Policy S/CBC, "Movement". [Page 216]

On Christmas Eve the Association was told by Stephen Kelly, the two councils Joint Director of Planning, that after careful assessment, the CBC despite asserting publicly as long ago as 2017 "we are not a short cut", has no effective means of ensuring that only users authorized under the "Cambridge Area G Traffic Regulation Order, Section 31, Prohibition of Driving" can use the CBC's private roads. That the current ANPR system is not fit for purpose, and "a more robust and contemporary solution will be required looking forwards" [Email dated 24.12.25 from Stephen Kelly] - *a solution for which the CBC's Landowners, and no-one else, are directly responsible*. [See Appendix to this response for the Traffic Regulation Order specification of those authorized to use the CBC's private roads]

This is of strategic importance. The "Addenbrooke's Access Road" located in Trumpington together with the CBC's unenforced private roads are being used in effect as a Cambridge Southern Relief Road - which has not been built - and was roundly seen off as a proposal using a different route in the early 1990s. *As a direct result*, the level of traffic and associated nuisance on Addenbrooke's Road, and linked roads such as Shelford Road, is way above what was planned for the access road to Addenbrooke's Hospital; and was assumed in the "Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Development Framework" [January 2006, pages 26 - 27] within which the developments of Trumpington Meadows, Glebe Farm and Clay Farm have recently been established.

This is entirely unacceptable to us – as it should also be to the CBC's Landowners whose direct responsibility it is to stop the CBC's private roads being used by 2,000 plus unauthorized users every day. A responsibility in which they have failed for more than a decade - and continue to fail at the very time when Cambridge South Station will open this summer drawing yet more unauthorized users on to the CBC's private roads – and the Addenbrooke's Access Road.*

* As part of the CBC's Movement & Transport Strategy to Support Spatial Framework (including expansion land), the authors KMC Transport Planning reported in 2022 under "Existing Demand Flows":

"3.4.4 An assessment of rat running was also conducted at the main entrances to CBC on Thursday 12th October 2017. Data was collected between 09.30 and 11.30, 11.30 and 13.30 and 16.30 and 18.30. It found that there is a significant level of traffic between Hills Road and Addenbrooke's Road throughout the day, with

approximately 1,680 vehicles travelling between the two entrances in under 10 minutes.”

If allowance is made for the unobserved entrance at the junction of Robinson Way and Long Road, it is likely that at that time 2,000 or more unauthorized vehicle drivers used the CBC’s private road network each day. This is likely to have increased since then.

And what now are the CBC’s Landowners proposing on top of all this? Their proposal is -

“1) Improved Highway Movement and Connectivity in the South

• The context: A new southern access to CBC would transform connectivity in the south of the city by:

- creating a new opportunity for buses to bypass congestion along Babraham Road and access the city centre via the existing segregation afforded by the Guided Busway system.

- reducing the number of private cars using the Hills Road entrance, relieving pressure on the Hills Road entrance to the campus.”

[“Realignment of Granham’s Road”, CBC Landowners’ Submission to the Draft Local Plan, Quod, January 2024]

The means of achieving this is the proposed realignment of Granham’s Road, *accessible to the private motor vehicle – cars, vans, and lorries - as well as buses* - allowing private motor vehicle users to access the CBC’s private roads freely ***whether or not they are an authorized user***. In other words, creating an unofficial, unapproved, uncontrolled Cambridge Southern Relief Road – *fundamentally undermining* the Southern Fringe Area Development Framework and the Traffic Regulation Order prohibition of driving by unauthorized users on their own private roads. ***Frankly, you could not make it up!***

Unless the CBC Landowners devise and implement a robust contemporary solution to ensure that the CBC’s private roads are only used by authorized users – and no-one else – the proposal to realign Granham’s must be a non-starter. If the two councils are in any way minded to allow the realignment of Granham’s Road in the new Local Plan, it must be on the strict condition that the CBC landowners have devised, tested, and implemented a modern system which stops unauthorized users using the CBC’s private roads. If this condition is not met, the proposed realignment of Granham’s Road must not be allowed.

A smaller mistake

A smaller point but nonetheless important. The CBC Landowners propose to realign Granham’s Road thus creating -

“A new southern access to CBC” transforming connectivity in the south of the city by:

- “creating a new opportunity for buses to bypass congestion along Babraham Road and access the city centre via the existing segregation afforded by the Guided Busway system.” [CBC submission, Quod. Realignment of Granhams’ Road, page 6]

This appears to propose that ordinary non-guided busway buses could use the busway through the CBC and onwards towards Cambridge Station. *There is a significant flaw in this proposal: it is not possible for double decker buses to use the southern section of the guided busway as they cannot be accommodated under Long Road and Hills Road bridges.*

Why is it assumed that the land between the current and proposed alignments of Granham’s Road would be removed from the Green Belt and developed?

Another aspect of the CBC Landowners’ proposal to realign Granham’s Road is worthy of note. This is the assumption, also reflected in the Draft Local Plan, that the “triangle of land” thus created between the current and proposed alignments of Granham’s Road would somehow inevitably be removed from the Green Belt. **WHY?**

As the CBC Landowners acknowledge but immediately dismiss, this is in no way inevitable as the realignment could be achieved at the same time as leaving the triangle of land in the Green Belt. [“Realignment of Granham’s Road, page 2] Given the arguments made above, ***if Granham’s Road is realigned we see no compelling reason to remove this additional three hectares of land at Very High Harm to the Green Belt*** in addition to the just under 19 hectares canvassed in the First Proposals. ***And we object to it strongly.***

By the way, it is not clear why the CBC Landowners state that this area of “developable land” is 5.8 hectares thus producing a total removal from the Green Belt of 25.84 hectares. [“Realignment of Granham’s Road, pages 15 & 16/35]. Whereas, GCSP / two councils assess the area of land to be three hectares thus producing, if approved, a total new removal from the Green Belt of 22 hectares. [Policy S/CBC, paragraph 3.2.24, page 220] This hardly serves to bolster our confidence in the CBC Landowners’ realignment submission.

A confidence further diminished by the Landowners’ stated intention to “... *create a prominent gateway site for the campus and the city*” in this most sensitive of locations causing, as we have seen, “Very High Harm” to the Greater Cambridge Green Belt. [Page 16/35] This proposal is, to say the least, insensitive. It would not be the CBC that would be honouring the Green Belt by gracing it with the CBC’s presence. The Green Belt would be honouring the CBC at Very High Harm to itself.

Therefore, the Landowners’ proposed southern entrance to the CBC should be humble, unobtrusive and carefully landscaped so as not to add to the Very High Harm the CBC would be doing to the Green Belt. We are strongly opposed to a prominent gateway being created in this location. If agreed, it should be unobtrusive and blended into the landscape of Cambridge City edge.

Improvement of the City Edge claimed as a benefit by the CBC Landowners

A merit of the realignment proposal claimed by the Landowners is that it would improve the City edge by aligning the CBC boundary with the Worts Causeway development on the other side of Babraham Road. *But why is a straight line city edge thought to be a benefit worth paying for by increasing the area taken out of the Green Belt at Very High Harm? Many city edges including some of the most beautiful are not straight edged.* Frankly, we suspect that the Landowners' dominant motive here is not improving the City edge but rather increasing the area of developable land to their own financial benefit. That the County Council which owns the land concerned, is cash strapped is neither here nor there in terms of the Draft Local Plan, and is not relevant to removing land from the Green Belt causing Very High Harm.

Landowners' claim to be creating a more defensible edge to the City – should we believe it?

In support of their wish to increase the area of developable land to be taken out of the Green Belt, the Landowners also state that by –

“Creating a more defensible edge between the City and the Green Belt through a strong and co-ordinated landscape edge would be more robust and better able to defend pressure for further unplanned release of Green Belt land in the long term.”
[Page 15/35]

That this may appear to be a refreshingly novel approach by the CBC Landowners *should not lead us to take the statement at face value.* On a number of occasions in the directly relevant past we have asked CBC representatives to confirm that if it was agreed to further extend the CBC by the 19.43 hectares of Green Belt land then being proposed, that would be an end to it. *No such assurance has ever been forthcoming.* For example, when raised in the erstwhile CBC Local Liaison Group in 2022 in the context of discussion of the CBC's Proposed Spatial Framework, no such assurance was given.

EXTRACT from the Community Organizations' Submission to GCSP for inclusion together with the submissions made by the CBC:

“11. There is no guarantee that if the possible extension was removed from the Green Belt that would be an end to it. Our fear, based on experience, is that the CBC will be back for more. *The 77.15 hectares of CBC Phases 1 to 3 have already been taken out of the Green Belt - now deemed in its reduced form to be even more important in maintaining the separation of Cambridge from its necklace of villages that is so vital to Cambridge's “special character” and “quality of life”.*

12 The 8.94 hectares of Phase 3 were only recently taken out of the Green Belt despite our objections, yet Vision 2050 asserts, “This is insufficient to meet existing demand much less to accommodate further growth in the city” – a telling phrase in

juxtaposition with “CBC... has the opportunity to integrate its current form into a more balanced peri-urban quarter”.

13. In this context it is not a sufficient argument nor of any comfort to be told, as we are, that a need for more land beyond the possible further extension is not foreseen at present but may be necessary and cannot be ruled out.

12. Indeed, if Knight Frank’s estimates are taken at face value, it is inevitable that after the “phase 4” land had been consumed, the CBC would be back for more development land at even greater Very High Harm to our ever diminishing Green Belt.”

[“Where we do not and do agree with CBC – summary” - Where will it end?, pages 4 &5] [Trumpington Residents’ Association & Great Shelford Parish Council, December 2022]

GCSP and the two councils are asked to take explicit account of our great concern at the open-ended position the CBC has taken on this crucial matter - by, we propose, making it abundantly clear that if a further extension of the CBC into the Green Belt were to be agreed in the 2025-2045 Greater Cambridge Local Plan, it would be conditional on a CBC Landowners’ contractual commitment to make no further bids in the future for yet more land to be taken out of our precious and diminishing Green Belt. Unless the Landowners agree to that condition, the proposed Phase 4 addition to the CBC should not be agreed.

There is an alternative to what is proposed in the Draft Local Plan

This is to agree the additional 22 hectares in the location proposed, and to offset this with a 3 hectare restoration to the Green Belt from the Phase 3 allocation of 8.94 hectares. This would be used *to provide much needed additional protection to the fragile Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve which is perilously close to the Phase 3 boundary. **Were the GCSP / two councils to be minded to approve inclusion of the proposed 22 hectares CBC expansion in the Local Plan, we recommend this alternative.***

Well-being and social inclusion: New Homes

Policy S/JH and its supporting evidence *are deficient* when stating

“Development will meet the objectively assessed needs in Greater Cambridge over the period 2024-2045 for: ...

A minimum of 48,195 new homes meeting the needs for the total population *including for affordable housing ...* [Our emphasis]

So called “affordable” housing at 80% of market rents is way out of reach for large numbers of people in our community because market rents are so high in Greater Cambridge due to

the high growth in jobs which draws in people who can afford them at the cost of residents who cannot. *This is in direct conflict with the Draft Local Plan's -*

"... strategic priority for our wellbeing and social inclusion policies

6.2 Strategic Priority: Help improve equality of access and opportunities for people in Greater Cambridge to lead healthier and happier lives, ensuring that everyone benefits from the development of new homes and jobs."

[Page 483]

And is, therefore, unacceptable.

Therefore, we propose the following amendment:

"A minimum of 48,195 new homes meeting the needs of the total population of which at least 20 per cent must be social at a maximum of 60 per cent of market rents and a further 20 per cent affordable at a maximum of 80 per cent of market rents."

Unless this or a similar amendment is adopted, the Draft Local Plan's strategic priority for wellbeing and social inclusion of "ensuring that everyone benefits from the development of new homes and jobs" *will not be achieved.* [Pages 24-25 of the Draft Local Plan]

The Draft Local Plan states correctly that:

"Many residents of Greater Cambridge benefit from the economic success of the area through high employment rates and high average pay rates and disposable incomes ... accompanied by a high quality of life and very high levels of health and well-being. However, there are also significant numbers of people (who) continue to experience poverty in Greater Cambridge alongside many residents who face challenges due to a high cost of living and lack of affordable housing." [Page 25]

Spot on. But where's the beef in the Draft Local Plan to help put this right? It is not to be found in its provisions for the crucial component of this situation, viz. truly affordable housing. As a result, it is at risk of being only so much hot air. ***Hence the amendment we propose.*** Yes, the Draft Local Plan does state –

"We require a high proportion of new homes to be Affordable Housing, provided at a cost below market rates to meet the needs of those who cannot afford to buy or rent at market prices." [Homes, page 25]

But, and it is a big but, nowhere is the actual level of rents specified in terms of percentages of market rents, and crucially, the substantial need for Social Rents is not mentioned at all. This is not good enough to secure the vital wellbeing and social inclusion strategic priority. Indeed, it is likely to fail - because market rents in and around Cambridge are unusually high nationally, and "significant numbers of people continue to experience poverty in Greater

Cambridge alongside many residents who face challenges due to a high cost of living and lack of affordable housing.” [Page 25]

This may help to explain why despite our rate of growth, disposable incomes in Cambridge have declined since 2013 in contrast with some other towns and cities in England. [The Guardian, Tom Knowles, 26.01.2026, based on a Centre for Cities report, “Cities Outlook 2026”. See also Paul Brackley, Cambridge Independent, 28.01.2026, page 7] Our Draft Local Plan is deficient in not addressing this adequately and needs to be improved accordingly.

Our proposed amendment is informed by our lived experience in Trumpington where specified social and affordable housing requirements in the “Southern Fringe” new developments have produced real social benefit.

ENDS

Prepared by [REDACTED]

For Trumpington Residents’ Association

29 January 2026

Authorized Users of the CBC's Private Roads

The Traffic Regulation Order authorizes the following persons to use the CBC's private roads:

Hospital patients, patients' visitors, hospital staff, people who work elsewhere on the Campus, visitors to organizations/employers/companies located on the Campus, emergency service vehicles including ambulances, cyclists, local public service vehicles, statutory undertakers - e.g. utility company vehicles, universal service providers such as Royal Mail, construction activities on the CBC

No other road user is authorized to use the CBC's private roads - which are not part of the public highway.

The Campus's private roads designated in the Prohibition of Driving section of the Traffic Regulation Order are: Robinson Way, Puddicombe Way, Dame Mary Archer Way, Francis Crick Avenue, and Adrian Way - plus an unnamed connecting road (continuation of Puddicombe Way)

SOURCE: Cambridgeshire County Council. The City of Cambridge Area G (Consolidation) Order 1993 (Amendment No. 37) Order 2015, Section 31 Prohibition of Driving Order.