

For office use only
Agent number:
Representor number:
Representation number:



Draft North East Cambridge Area Action Plan Consultation 2020

Response Form

How to use this form

If you are able to, please comment online at www.greatercambridgeplanning.org/nec. You can comment on part or all of the Draft Area Action Plan online, and your response can be analysed more quickly and efficiently if you do so.

If you wish to comment using this form, please note we will transcribe all your responses into our online consultation system, and they will be published as part of our consultation feedback.

There are three parts to this form. Please fill in the form electronically or in black ink.

All comments must be received by **5pm on Monday 5 October 2020**. Thank you for taking the time to respond to this consultation.

Part A – Your details

- We ask for your name and postal address because the Councils must comply with national regulations for plan-making. We also ask for contact details but it is optional for you to give these. Please be aware that if you do not provide contact details and 'opt-in' to future notifications, we will not be able to notify you of the future stages of the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan.
- Your name will be published alongside your representations on our website, but your email address, address and phone numbers will not.

Part B - Response to the ten big questions

- This section asks you to answer ten important questions about the Area Action Plan. You can answer some or all.
- Each question has a multiple choice answer and the opportunity to add further comments.

Part C – Comments on specific policies and supporting documents

- You can comment on specific policies in the draft Area Action Plan, and on the draft Sustainability Appraisal, draft Habitats Regulations Assessment and draft Policies Map.
- Please copy this part of the form as many times as you require. You should complete a separate response for each policy or supporting document you wish to comment on.

If you need any further information or assistance in completing this form please contact the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Policy Team on: 01954 713183 or

nec@greatercambridgeplanning.org

Part A – Your Details

Please note that we cannot formally register your comments without your name and postal address, because the Councils must comply with national regulations for plan-making.

We also ask for contact details but it is optional for you to give these.

If you do not provide contact details and 'opt-in', we will not be able to notify you of the future stages of the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan.

Name:	<i>Curling</i>	Agent's name: (if applicable)
Name of organisation: (if applicable)		Name of Agent's organisation: (if applicable)
Address:	██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████	Agent's Address:
Postcode:	██████████	Postcode:
Email (optional):		Email (optional):
Telephone (optional):		Telephone (optional):

Signature:	Date: <i>2 Oct 2020</i>
If you are submitting the form electronically, no signature is required.	

Data Protection

We will treat your data in accordance with our [Privacy Notice](#). Information will be used by South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council solely in relation to the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan. Please note that all responses will be available for public inspection and cannot be treated as confidential. Comments, including your name, are published on our website, but we do not publish your address or contact details. **By submitting this response form you are agreeing to these conditions.**

The Councils are not allowed to automatically notify you of future consultations unless you 'opt-in'.

Do you wish to be kept informed about future planning consultations run by the Greater Cambridge Planning Service on behalf of Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council?

Please tick: Yes No

Part B – Response to the ten big questions

1. What do you think about our vision for North East Cambridge?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Further comments Qu 1:

Completely flawed from beginning to end. Massive overdevelopment on inappropriate rural-based site location: none of lessons of critical issues of quality-of-life post COVID 19 (C19) pandemic lockdowns etc. have been considered in ANY way.

Totally inappropriate dense development for outskirts of rural/greenbelt based Cambridge. This site is NOT central London with likes of high-rise poor quality housing dense developments & Canary Wharf-style office blocks.

Major dilution of original vision & concepts – clearly greedy Developers looking to make massive monies from dense, multistorey very high apartment blocks & office complexes. Exactly what C19 lockdowns showed as NEVER required/will never be wanted ever again.

2. Are we creating the right walking and cycling connections to the surrounding areas?

- Yes, completely
- Mostly yes
- Neutral
- Mostly not
- Not at all

Further comments Qu 2:

People don't use methods of walk/cycle/unreliable public transport - all history tells you that. And C19 shows all public transport stops in a pandemic.

Massive effects of extra traffic in all local roads, & car parking madness on the site. All 'planning words' on 'discouraging car usage': always turn out to be unenforceable as well as inappropriate to modern ways of day-to-day living.

No consideration given massive CURRENT gridlocks with routes across Cambridge - clearly very inadequate now.

Where do you plan to put roads for everyone's (high density housing) home delivery van access?? They can't come on a bike/walking.

Total lack of any detailed strategic thought in such a proposed plan. Clearly all driven by greedy Developers looking to make massive monies from dense building initiatives, leading to major overwhelmed transport systems - but long after the Developer's diggers have upped and left.

3. Are the new 'centres' in the right place and do they include the right mix of activity?

- Yes, completely
- Mostly yes
- Neutral
- Mostly not
- Not at all

Further comments Qu 3:

Science Park shows office block monoculture and thus total lack of overall mix.

Post C19 pandemic situation, offices and dense housing near to them are now NEVER going to required again.

Total lack of control over Brookgate developments - no coordination with NES AAP.

Local planning officers (UFOs: Unelected Planning Officers) racing ahead (to feed greedy Developers?) without any consideration to open & fair consultation with locals/City affected, & consideration of multiple ramifications to longer-term life quality in the Cambridge area.

Dwellings are increasingly multi-story apartment blocks, with massive dilution of original Visions & Concepts.

4. Do we have the right balance between new jobs and new homes?

- Yes, completely
- Mostly yes
- Neutral
- Mostly not
- Not at all

Further comments Qu 4:

Clearly all driven by greedy Developers wanting to 'degrade' all green lung areas in Cambridge with horrid, dense, high-rise & poor quality housing.

(N.B. including aspects surrounding proposed move of Anglian Water's Water Treatment - not required as it has a recent upgrade: see Opposition to that Planning Application. Clear that benefits will be to Developers, not Residents or any preservation of local Green Space/Green lung/Green Belt preservation: views, environmental aspects etc.).

Planners clearly have not learnt the clear lessons of the C19 pandemic & lockdowns etc. on the critical health of the nation - especially for significant push-back on ANY dense Housing/Development areas.

No consideration to long-term massive changes to working/living practices shown during C19 lockdown.

20,000 new jobs means 40,000 more people. Housing for 18,000 noted. Maths just doesn't add up.

Clearly illustrates total lack to detailed thought of this Planning's Proposal from beginning to end.

5. Are we are planning for the right community facilities?

- Yes, completely
- Mostly yes
- Neutral
- Mostly not
- Not at all

Further comments Qu 5:

What's proposed shows thinking is based on housing the size of Ely but with facilities of Swavesey: madness !

Covers lack in all areas of key community facilities to serve such a dense housing area/community - availability of GPs & healthcare services; lack of schools planned - all ages; no swimming pool; no cultural centre; no new sports pitches; no facilities for the disabled/elderly; no new allotments; no major venue included; independent shops concept has been lost; green space by river is vague; no recognition that Milton Country Park is already at capacity etc.

Clearly all driven by greedy Developers looking to make massive monies, leaving the local 'mess' behind, long after the Developer's diggers have upped and left.

Will lead to major degradation (of already very stretched facilities) on rest of Cambridge, as well as massive increases in local travel etc. - gridlocks are ALREADY a major issue.

Where do you plan to put roads for everyone's (high density housing) home delivery van access?? They can't come on a bike/walking.

6. Do you think that our approach to distributing building heights and densities is appropriate for the location?

- Yes, completely
- Mostly yes
- Neutral
- Mostly not
- Not at all

Further comments Qu 6:

Cambridge is a beautiful low density, low building height city with wonderful Green Space/Green Lung/Greenbelt areas that MUST be preserved.

High rise building developments 3 to 4 times taller than Eddington etc. will be unavoidable to the achieve the Developer's aim of 8,000 dwellings in the available land area (maths by the Developer's Proposal's/Concept Designs don't look at 3D volumes with ANY noted Height metric - we all wonder why !!).

Impact of 'layering' (effect on views/vistas/skyline from all surrounding locations) shows major impacts & severe degradation on the rural landscape of this North Eastern environs of Cambridge.

All Building Heights & Densities are definitely NOT appropriate to any Cambridge location. Clearly all driven by greedy Developers looking to make massive monies, leaving the local 'mess' behind, long after the Developer's diggers have upped and left.

7. Are we planning for the right mix of public open spaces?

- Yes, completely
- Mostly yes
- Neutral
- Mostly not
- Not at all

Further comments Qu 7:

*Clearly shows this is not enough, being too linear with too much reliance on existing.
None of the massive issues of the past seen with Orchard Park have been learnt - clearly all driven by greedy Developers looking to make massive monies from very dense building initiatives, leading to major overwhelmed local systems, but long after the Developer's diggers have upped and left.
Car barns have disappeared - to give larger density of housing & even less public open space on the site.
Plan includes no new allotments; no new sports pitches; no facilities for the disabled/elderly; independent shops concept has been lost; Green Space by River Cam is very vague; no recognition that Milton Country Park already at capacity etc.*

8. Are we doing enough to improve biodiversity in and around North East Cambridge?

- Yes, completely
- Mostly yes
- Neutral
- Mostly not
- Not at all

Further comments Qu 8:

*Plan is completely flawed and clearly only driven by greedy Developers looking to make massive monies from very dense building initiatives, leading to major degradation of green lungs/green spaces.
Plan degrades, not maintains (even less so IMPROVES) Biodiversity.
Biodiversity doubling is a regional target - 10% target is woefully low.
Look at Eddington.*

Specific & clear examples of major Biodiversity degradation include: no new allotments; no new sports pitches; Green Space by River Cam is very vague; no recognition that Milton Country Park already at capacity etc.

9. Are we doing enough to discourage car travel into this area?

- Yes, completely
 Mostly yes
 Neutral
 Mostly not
 Not at all

Further comments on Qu 9:

Also see Qu2 response above.

Any public transport offering is more of the same (history shows that it all fails) - not any proposed transformal step change to learn from the lessons of the past.

Any cycling provision is mostly squeezing more into existing 'network'.

People don't use methods of walk/cycle/unreliable public transport especially in bad weather - all history tells you that.

Massive effects of extra traffic in all local roads, & car parking madness on the site. All 'planning words' on 'discouraging car usage': always turn out to be unenforceable as well as inappropriate to modern ways of day-to-day living: school run, shift working by both parents etc. Where do you plan to put roads for everyone's (high density housing) home delivery van access?? They can't come on a bike/walking.

10. Are we maximising the role that development at North East Cambridge has to play in responding to the climate crisis?

- Yes, completely
 Mostly yes
 Neutral
 Mostly not
 Not at all

Further comments Qu 10:

All aspects on provisions to conserve/make best use of Planet's resources is very weak.

Water/Energy generation (all types: solar, heat pumps etc.) & local energy storage/Driving the Electric revolution – infrastructure requirements etc.

Includes Water conservation aspects; not Passivhaus plans; Sustainable Homes Level 6 - or 5?

No transformal step change to learn from the lessons of the past: Goldsmith Street Norwich and Eddington as models.

Completed response forms must be received **by 5pm on Monday 5 October 2020**. These can be sent to us either by:

Email: nec@greatercambridgeplanning.org or post, to:

Greater Cambridge Shared Planning
Cambridge City Council
PO Box 700
Cambridge CB1 0JH