

From: [Loftus Hana](#)
To: [North East Cambridge AAP](#)
Subject: FW: FeCRA Response to the NEC Consultation
Date: 06 October 2020 18:32:50

See email thread below, the email at the very bottom should be registered as the consultation response from FeCRA.

From: Wendy Blythe [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 October 2020 18:27
To: Loftus Hana [REDACTED]
Cc: FeCRA Committee <committee@fecra.org.uk>; Frainer Paul [REDACTED] Matthew Paterson [REDACTED] Julian Sykes [REDACTED] Kelly Stephen [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: FeCRA Response to the NEC Consultation

Dear Hana,
Thank you. Yes, please. It would be great if this could be registered as FeCRA's consultation response. The prompt response from Stephen was noted and appreciated too!

Best wishes,
Wendy

Sent from my iPhone

On 6 Oct 2020, at 18:15, Loftus Hana [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Wendy,

With regard to your email below, would you like this to have this registered as FeCRA's consultation response, or have you submitted a response separately either online or to nec@greatercambridgeplanning.org?

We've had over 3000 responses so we haven't sifted through them all yet to know if there are others there from FeCRA – sorry.

If you could confirm if you wish these comments to be registered (and therefore, in due course, published) as a consultation response, that would be very helpful,

Hana

From: Kelly Stephen [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 October 2020 17:00
To: Wendy Blythe [REDACTED]
Cc: FeCRA Committee <committee@fecra.org.uk>; Frainer Paul [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Matthew Paterson
[REDACTED] Loftus Hana
[REDACTED]; Julian Sykes
[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: FeCRA Response to the NEC Consultation

Dear Wendy,

Thank you for your email and comments. We will of course carefully review the response of FeCra and the responses from others as we consider how to proceed with this project. At this stage therefore, and ahead of analysis of all of the other feedback that we have received, it would be wrong for me to comment on the specific judgements that you make other than to thank you for your time reviewing and considering the proposals and for sharing your views.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Kelly

From: Wendy Blythe [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 October 2020 15:56
To: Kelly Stephen [REDACTED]
Cc: FeCRA Committee <committee@fecra.org.uk>
Subject: FeCRA Response to the NEC Consultation

To Stephen Kelly, Joint Director of Planning & Econ Development, copied to Lewis Herbert, Daniel Zeichner, Tim Bick and the FeCRA Committee

Dear Stephen,

Re: North East Cambridge Area Action Plan

Consultation closing 5th October 2020

I write as Chair of the Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations, on behalf of the FeCRA Committee

You will, I know, have received responses to the consultation both from individual residents and from Residents' Associations. We endorse all the views expressed by Residents' Associations, including, for example, those expressed by Milton Road Residents' Association, one of the groups of residents who will be most severely and directly impacted by what is proposed. We were also struck by the comments made by [REDACTED]

My purpose in writing is to ensure that you are aware that we have registered a strong groundswell of opinion from residents that the overwhelming answer to every one of the ten questions in the Consultation is 'No'.

This proposal has become less and less attractive and persuasive as it has evolved, and the time has arrived for fundamental re-thinking of all parameters.

There is grave doubt that what is currently proposed will be of any benefit to Cambridge, its residents, present and future, or provide any positive contribution towards solving the many concerns to which we are all fully alert.

The building heights and massing are entirely inappropriate, and the building standards for the residential buildings fall far below Passivhaus or Sustainable Building Level 6. Water conservation standards proposed are far too weak.

In this regard, as in many others, the model should be the standards already set by Eddington.

The amount of dedicated green space is far too low, facilities are inadequate, and the proposed contribution to increasing biodiversity is totally inadequate.

Whatever the undoubted merits of seeking to increase the availability of affordable housing, the price to be paid with this poor proposal is simply too high. Not least, the development will greatly exacerbate the housing crisis by drawing in twice as many people to the 20,000 new jobs as are being housed. We also have something like a new town with no social housing at all.

We are very concerned that the consultation has not been fully and appropriately publicised, that the leaflet distribution was partial and flawed, and we have grave doubts that even now there is an appropriately widespread and full engagement with the important questions that arise.

There are fundamental failures of programme management already. There is no risk analysis in the plan so there is no recognition that some outcomes depend on things which are highly problematic and with no way of recovering from failure.

For instance, gridlock on Milton Road can only be avoided if two thirds of the potential car trips are entirely "*discouraged*". This depends on measures which are unproven, and partly dependent on the whims of developers and property owners. If reducing traffic in Cambridge is this easy why it has not happened already? There is not space to consider the critical dependence on a transport strategy which is in complete disarray.

"We want North East Cambridge to be an inclusive, walkable, low-carbon new city district with a lively mix of homes, workplaces, services and social spaces, fully integrated with surrounding neighbourhoods."

The problem with this is it does not say what its objectives are in terms of housing and jobs, for who, and how this benefits different stakeholders. The current residents may or may not be included in this. It seems building is an end in itself.

Yours sincerely,

Wendy Blythe,

Chair FeCRA, 

www.fecra.org.uk

www.facebook.com/CambridgeRAs

www.twitter.com/fecra2

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived