

| CHAPTER 12: PROMOTING AND DELIVERING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE  |   |
|--|---|
| QUESTION NO.   | SUMMARY OF REPS   |
| <b>QUESTION 97: Planning for sustainable travel</b>  |   |
| <p>Should the Local Plan include the principles regarding sustainable travel outlined in Issue 97 and are there any additional issues that should be included?</p> <p>Support:85<br/>Object: 2<br/>Comment: 26</p> <p><b>Questionnaire Responses:</b></p> <p><u>Question 8:</u><br/>647 respondents, 267 of which were Comberton petition (all Comberton responses mentioned retention and improvement of public transport). About 75% of all responses referred to transport issues.</p> <p><u>Question 9</u><br/>675 respondents, 267 of which were Comberton petition (all Comberton responses mentioned providing good public transport, cycle tracks). About 60% of all responses referred to transport issues.</p> <p><u>Question 10</u><br/>525 respondents, 267 of which were Comberton petition (all Comberton responses mentioned impact of traffic congestion on residents). About 60% of all responses referred to transport issues (50% of which are Comberton petition).</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is definitely not enough transport provision between villages.</li> <li>• Bus services are atrocious. Odd to require transport systems when being cut or withdrawn. No point building homes for people who cannot get to Cambridge by public transport. Already people marooned in villages. Must be affordable. If there was excellent, sensibly priced public transport, more people would use it.</li> <li>• Developments should be expected to address the transport issues they generate, including traffic congestion, and meet the demands sustainably. View supported by <b>Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council</b>. Developers must invest in cycle paths and bus routes. Requires commitment to those settlements located in close proximity to transport links - Guided Bus (Longstanton). Principle 2 most importance - highway and access improvements will directly benefit existing and new local communities, residents and businesses. Key in obtaining support of communities for development proposals. Priority early delivery of sustainable modes to desirable destinations. Develop major uses in accessible (by sustainable modes) locations. Developments should not be located in areas that increase travel demands.</li> <li>• Where there are cycle paths, they are great, but cyclists don't use them. Accord higher priority to cycling, including priority over cars, especially at junctions. More routes needed, not just in/out Cambridge but between villages. Build more long distance commuter cycle routes, segregated from major roads. Consider links to existing cycle routes, improvement of routes, and the affect of increased traffic (motor or cycle) on existing cycle routes. Grit routes.</li> <li>• <b>Cambourne Parish Council</b> - All provisions for sustainable travel should link up with existing road and cycleways. Important to have a comprehensive sustainable travel network linked to surrounding employment and transport hubs.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridge City Council</b> support inclusion of principles of sustainable travel, particularly greater connectivity of cycling and walking networks.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> – Need greater emphasis on reducing need to travel by car where</li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>possible. Work together on Transport Strategy. Existing rights of way network should be protected and enhanced. Where new cycle routes are required, adequate lighting should be provided. Significant developments should provide links to wider rights of way network. Take account of statutory Rights of Way Improvement Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum</b> support reference to wider RoW network - important resource; recommend a general presumption against development that affects a RoW without the provision of adequate / acceptable alternative. RoW network should be enhanced. Support off-road cycling and walking routes that link villages with 'hubs' providing a greater range of facilities as well as market towns and Cambridge.</li> <li>• Bassingbourn does not have a good bus service – could be improved by providing additional bus services. Cycling to Royston is a dangerous route - need for dedicated cycle route.</li> <li>• <b>Comberton Parish Council</b> - appeal to Government for funding to reduce congestion from through-traffic on A14. Local residents / developers should not have to pay.</li> <li>• District poses unique problem for transport planners. Movement of people cannot readily be served by public transport system. Principles should go some way to alleviate the problem. Issues of access to Cambridge and a few other centres of employment are probably the crucial point that needs addressing.</li> <li>• <b>Cottenham Village Design Group</b> support creation of coordinated transport networks such that access to employment and retail areas is as easy as it can be.</li> <li>• <b>Dry Drayton Parish Council</b> - impact of developments on surrounding countryside and villages must be mitigated, and provide sustainable access to countryside. Include provision / funding for cycle paths to networks in towns and villages.</li> <li>• <b>Fowlmere, Over, Papworth Everard, Steeple Morden, Swavesey Parish Councils</b> support approach.</li> <li>• <b>Foxton Parish Council</b> – Include all principles. Give thought to how major roads around Cambridge need improving to deal with new developments.</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn Parish Council</b> – Give priority to improvement and expansion of strategic cycling network, including maintenance and safety - improve off-road provision whenever possible. Consider subsidising bus travel to some villages to provide real choice.</li> </ul> |
|--|--|

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be adequately resourced. Cycling between villages often dangerous - fast traffic on narrow roads. Off-road cycleways should connect local communities. Major challenge is buses - too few and do not integrate with trains - considerable increase in financial support must be a priority in rural areas.</li> <li>• <b>Gamlingay Parish Council</b> - Provision of new local links between villages and larger service centres/transport hubs should be a priority especially for more isolated settlements with limited public transport. Investment in cycleways would promote linking villages as groups to service centres.</li> <li>• <b>Great Abington Parish Council</b> - Travel on A1307 is major issue. Developments in Haverhill impact - need for cooperation with planners over border to ensure impact of development fully considered.</li> <li>• <b>Hauxton Parish Council</b> – principles need to be backed with funding.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – SA - likely to contribute positively to sustainability issues. Welcome the policy proposals. Requirements should include promotion of non-vehicular access to strategic GI and wider countryside.</li> <li>• <b>Pampisford Parish Council</b> - provision should be made for easy movement on foot or bike. Car movements should be restricted whenever possible, but allowance for cars when heavy loads are needed, and also for visitors.</li> <li>• <b>Rambler’s Association</b> – Support reference to Rights of Way network - important network is enhanced with new development. Support off-road cycling and walking routes that link villages with 'hubs' as well as market towns / Cambridge.</li> <li>• <b>Rampton Parish Council</b> - Agree, but location affects how well certain policies are implemented, and poor implementation often occurs where the need is high but the economic drivers are low.</li> <li>• <b>Suffolk County Council</b> - would welcome a reference to improving safety and reducing congestion on A1307 and other routes important to the sub-region, in line with Suffolk and Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plans.</li> <li>• Discourage car use.</li> <li>• Promote school buses.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Haslingfield Parish Council</b> – Support principles but two additional issues. (1) must oblige developers to fund transport infrastructure. (2) must pressure central government to support rural areas - funding for public transport.</li> <li>• Sustainable transport just an empty phrase.</li> </ul> |
|--|--|

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>Realistically, most people will drive to work and other facilities for the foreseeable future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must be rigorously applied for all new developments.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bourn Parish Council</b> - policy will need to be very clearly defined - especially (1) - "significant" and "appropriate" will be need to be formalized.</li> <li>• Assessments of traffic impact should be based on existing patterns of travel - these take account of variety of factors such as journey time, cost, frequency and convenience rather than relying on the mere presence of a transport link.</li> <li>• Broader issue of cross county boundary development (e.g. Haverhill) needs to be recognised. Developers should mitigate the effects even when occurs in a different planning authority's area. Clear processes need to be developed to formalise this requirement.</li> <li>• <b>Conservators of River Cam</b> - Towpath between Clayhithe Bridge and Baits Bite Lock has been upgraded in perpetuity. County Council has no management plan. Conservators need financial assistance to maintain. Suggest improved connectivities are mentioned in the Plan, i.e. enhancing river crossings.</li> <li>• <b>Croydon Parish Council</b> - Development will give rise to travel demands - developers are unlikely to address. Routes need to be improved for any increase in use before the development inhabited. Sustainable travel unviable in rural areas.</li> <li>• Cars will be "sustainable" in 10-20 years - largely ignored – will result in negative economic impact.</li> <li>• Provision of P&amp;R station south of Harston would mitigate traffic along A10 through Harston - trying to get a bypass for several years.</li> <li>• Increases in traffic congestion could be problem if modelling is insufficient to provide appropriate capacity before building commences.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – should address need to protect and enhance designated rights of way to comply with paragraph 75 of the NPPF.</li> <li>• <b>Oakington Parish Council</b> - All major routes should demonstrate nil detriment - including cycle routes, pedestrian routes and 'b' roads.</li> <li>• Loss of facilities in villages making residents dependant on transport.</li> <li>• Extra traffic and people in Caldecote would be bad.</li> <li>• People that want to use the bus should be able to if they are prepared to pay the market rate - no subsidy. Houses must have driveways and garages - no homes (should be built) where people that want to drive cannot securely keep a</li> </ul> |
|--|--|

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>car.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National cycle network route 11 is currently interrupted between Waterbeach Bannold Road and the end of White Fen driveway - surely within SCDC's power to fix.</li> <li>• <b>St Edmundsbury Borough Council</b> - consider that removing upper limit of size of development in settlements does not provide certainty and ability to plan for long term delivery of services and infrastructure - size should be determined locally having regard to implications on infrastructure provision, the environment and the wider area.</li> <li>• Key part of NPPF. No objection so long as where opportunities for improvement are not reasonable, schemes are not refused solely on that basis.</li> <li>• Encourage food shops around transport hubs like stations, guided bus stops and park and ride.</li> <li>• Build rapid transit from Waterbeach to Cambourne via Cambridge similar to guided busway or other tram or train system.</li> <li>• Increase the Trumpington and Babraham Road Park and ride car parks.</li> <li>• Develop local train stations from villages into town and main station, consider a metro.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>QUESTION 98: Transport Assessments and Travel Plans</b></p>  |  |
| <p>A. Should the Local Plan continue to require 'major developments' to produce a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, as well as smaller developments with particular transport implications?</p> <p>Support:57<br/>Object: 0<br/>Comment: 4</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact of any development should be taken into account and meet the demands sustainably. Also view of <b>Croydon and Fulbourn Parish Councils</b>. Given the constraints on the network, even small developments may have significant impact – also consider very localised impacts.</li> <li>• Developments should not be located in areas that increase travel demands. Assessments of impact should be based on existing patterns of travel.</li> <li>• <b>Bassingbourn-cum- Kneesworth, Bourn, Cambourne, Comberton, Cottenham, Foxton, Great Abington, Haslingfield, Litlington, Little Abington, Papworth Everard, Rampton, Steeple Morden, Swavesey, and Weston Colville Parish Councils</b> and <b>Cambridgeshire County Council, Conservators of River Cam</b> support approach.</li> <li>• <b>Caldecote Parish Council</b> - impact of development on transport networks could be widespread - should assess impact on existing settlements and capacity of roads.</li> <li>• Current thresholds should be retained.</li> <li>• Doubt ability of Travel Plan to influence behaviour. Needs monitoring (annually?) and enforcing to ensure being adhered to or adjusted, particularly if ownership or tenants change.</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport Assessment is likely to be a critical factor in determining whether development is allowed - essential examined carefully to check they are realistic.</li> <li>• <b>Hauxton Parish Council</b> - Travel plans only mean something if there is money to make public transport work – need shuttle buses from villages to transport hubs (e.g. P&amp;R).</li> <li>• Should include commuting routes to major employment centres and shops.</li> <li>• <b>Travel for Work Partnership</b> (late rep) - Consider cumulative impacts of smaller developments and utilising area wide Travel Plans. Require monitoring and enforcement.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to define ‘particular transport implications’.</li> <li>• Cars are too numerous because there are not enough decent alternatives for people who live out of town - once you are out of Cambridge there are few options but to drive to work.</li> <li>• More speed limits and traffic calming in villages.</li> </ul>  |
| <p>B. Should an alternative threshold be used, if so what, and why?</p> <p>Support:2<br/>Object: 4<br/>Comment: 6</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 dwellings unlikely to have large impact (exception will require a TA). Requires too much information for small schemes, overburdening developer and Council dealing with application. More reasonable to rise thresholds.</li> <li>• All developments should include a Travel Plan – all cumulates – to particular bottlenecks at bad road junctions, or push a community over a threshold where a regular bus service is justified.</li> <li>• All developments as traffic into and out of Cambridge is already at ridiculous levels.</li> <li>• Suggest that thresholds for residential and commercial developments should double.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cottenham, Great Abington, Litlington, Little Abington, Steeple Morden, and Weston Colville Parish Councils</b> support the existing threshold.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Haslingfield Parish Council</b> - should be additional requirements on larger developments, where the need for public transport improvements, etc. - should be integral to the justification for the concerned planning applications.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>QUESTION 99: How car parking is provided within residential developments</b></p>                                |   |
| <p>A. What approach should the Local Plan take towards residential car parking standards?</p>                         | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum standards should not preclude design-led approach.</li> </ul>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>i. Maximum parking standards – an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling up to a maximum of 2 spaces per 3 or more bedrooms in poorly accessible areas.</p> <p>Support:6<br/>Object: 1<br/>Comment: 1</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most realistic option.</li> <li>• Enough if there is good public transport e.g. at Northstowe and Waterbeach.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too restrictive. View supported by <b>Comberton Parish Council</b>.</li> <li>• <b>Histon and Impington Parish Council</b> - Current policy is having negative impacts, but no impact on car usage. Impacting on workers working from home and service workers / tradesmen who need parking for light vans.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Foxton Parish Council</b> - Need flexible approach for villages depending on public transport available but generally with more parking spaces as usually at least 2 people need a car.</li> </ul>   |
| <p>A. What approach should the Local Plan take towards residential car parking standards?</p> <p>ii. Maximum parking standards – an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling for developments on the edge of Cambridge, but increased to an average of 2 spaces per dwelling across the remainder of the district, with an average of 2.5 spaces per 3 or more bedrooms in poorly accessible areas.</p> <p>Support:16<br/>Object: 1<br/>Comment: 4</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bourn, Cambourne, Cottenham, Great Abington, Little Abington, Over, and Weston Colville Parish Councils</b> support this approach.</li> <li>• <b>Hauxton, Pampisford, Swavesey and Waterbeach Parish Councils</b> - must be enough parking for residents and visitors in communities where public transport is not adequate, to stop car unsightly parking clogging up rural residential roads. Unrealistic to expect householders to rely on public transport, cycling or walking.</li> <li>• Provision currently too low - results in dangerous parking putting pedestrians and other road users at risk.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too restrictive. View supported by <b>Comberton Parish Council</b>.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy must be worked through together with the design guidelines for specification of room sizes, street widths and design etc.</li> <li>• <b>Caldecote Parish Council</b> - If inadequate off road parking is supplied, road width and design must take into consideration cars will be parked on the streets (safety).</li> <li>• <b>Haslingfield Parish Council</b> - should be a desirable target standard rather than maximum because of failures to provide adequate and realistic levels of public transport that can attract users away from their cars and motorbikes.</li> </ul> |
| <p>A. What approach should the Local Plan take towards residential car parking standards?</p> <p>iii. Remove all car parking standards and adopt a design-led approach to</p>  | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rural areas need cars and we should learn to live with the car. Areas of restricted parking become blighted by dangerously parked cars on streets.</li> <li>• <b>Caxton, Oakington and Westwick, Papworth Everard, and Steeple Morden Parish Council</b> support approach. <b>Litlington Parish Council</b> - not less than parameters in option ii.</li> </ul>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>car parking provision in new developments.</p> <p>Support:19<br/>Object: 2<br/>Comment: 3</p>                                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Comberton Parish Council</b> - Could be excellent and encourage innovation but developers could use it to reduce costs. Could be trialled and reviewed after 5 years.</li> <li>• The other two options have caused conflict in the past with planners accused of a lack of realism.</li> <li>• <b>Fen Ditton Parish Council</b> – needs to become site specific.</li> <li>• Subject to having the resources to implement it. This would promote a detailed analysis of local requirements and future flexibility.</li> <li>• Provision would need to reflect not only the demand at the time of development, but be sustainable longer-term.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would be a disaster.</li> <li>• Would lead to additional burden for every scheme to justify approach, uncertainty, and possibly reason for refusal.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Gamlingay Parish Council</b> - guidance should be dependent on site characteristics and proximity to public transport nodes.</li> </ul>  |
| <p>B. Are there any alternative policies or approaches you think should be included?</p> <p>Support:1<br/>Object: 0<br/>Comment:16</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Return to minimum parking standards - inappropriate to continue a policy primarily designed for urban areas, well served by public transport. View supported by <b>Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council</b>. <b>Croydon Parish Council</b> suggests a minimum of 2 spaces.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - consider impact of more older people driving and whilst not 'disabled' might have restricted mobility and consequently may require wider spaces.</li> <li>• Inclusion of a target, removing 'maximum', and flexibility for variations based on local circumstances, would be appropriate. Provision in line with the standard should not be questioned.</li> <li>• Design developments to facilitate easier short trips by walking or cycling than the car.</li> <li>• Ensure that future housing is spaced correctly to allow enough parking.</li> <li>• Provide parking within curtilage to avoid on-street parking, with associated safety issues. Naïve to try to restrict car use with lack of parking.</li> <li>• Needs to be considered with Issue 100.</li> <li>• <b>Haslingfield Parish Council</b> - Forcing people to use public transport by limiting parking does not work. Public transport needs to appear attractive</li> </ul> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>and reliable to get used. Alternative policies need to be considered in this light.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Over Parish Council</b> – include visitor parking.</li> <li>• Quicker adoption of roads so inappropriate parking can be prevented and road safety improved. Provision should separate pedestrian and road traffic. Too many spaces in Cambourne are misused with pavements blocked and parking on junctions.</li> <li>• <b>Travel for Work Partnership</b> (late rep) - Car clubs: Research on car clubs shows that ownership is much reduced when car clubs are available.</li> <li>• Council should avoid being overly prescriptive - will preclude innovative design, impede new solutions being found and implemented and result in extensive negotiations at planning application stage. Element of discretion and ability to deal with site specific circumstances must be built into Policy.</li> <li>• Needs to be considered in relation to the quality of public transport.</li> </ul>   |
| <p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>Support:1<br/>Object: 3<br/>Comment:10</p>                | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many cars does 1.5 spaces equate to?</li> <li>• Control of car ownership by restricting parking can only be achieved by strict enforcement, which Police seem unwilling to do - huge number of cars illegally parked on footways and verges.</li> <li>• Where parking is on premises, no more than 2 spaces per house. Communal parking bays for houses/flats should have allowance for visitors. Total will depend on size of the houses/flats.</li> <li>• In rural areas the number of cars is normally the same as number of adults living in the house. Not going to change, even with good public transport.</li> <li>• Parking away from house may mean the owner is unable to charge an electric car – numbers likely to increase in 10-20 years. Needs to be addressed at planning stage.</li> <li>• <b>Histon and Impington Parish Council</b> - encourage developments close to guideway route with less parking than developments more than 1.5km from guideway stops.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>QUESTION 100:</b><br/><b>Allocation of car parking within residential developments</b></p> |   |
| <p>A. What approach should the Local Plan take to the allocation of car</p>                      | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>parking in residential developments?</p> <p>i. The Local Plan should maximise the efficiency of car parking provision by not allocating any residential car parking to individual properties.</p> <p>Support:1<br/>Object: 6<br/>Comment:1</p>                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will not work in practice - people will park where convenient - people want to park in front of their houses. Garages and parking spaces separated from properties tend not to be well used and risk creating 'urban wastelands'. Will lead to displeasure with development designs. Only appropriate in denser developments.</li> <li>• <b>Rampton, Steeple Morden and Waterbeach Parish Councils</b> - all parking should be within curtilage rather than communal or on street.</li> <li>• Develops potential for overspill or commuter parking and for introduction of parking fees such as "resident parking permits".</li> <li>• More dangerous having to walk any distance, with children and bags, particularly if you have to cross the road.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Litlington Parish Council</b> – should be left to design of individual developments but with minimum standards.</li> </ul>   |
| <p>A. What approach should the Local Plan take to the allocation of car parking in residential developments?</p> <p>ii. The Local Plan should only allocate a proportion of the car parking spaces to individual properties.</p> <p>Support:10<br/>Object: 1<br/>Comment: 2</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bourn, Cambourne, Comberton and Swavesey Parish Councils</b> support approach.</li> <li>• Anything else will likely result in unwanted friction between neighbours as car ownership increases.</li> <li>• Works in Switzerland - informal network ensuring allocated spaces are used, not necessarily by the residents of the dwelling owning the allocation.</li> <li>• At least one space provided per dwelling. Many people would be loath to leave vehicles in communal parking bays, possibly out of sight.</li> <li>• <b>Swavesey Parish Council</b> - In rural communities, driveway parking should be allocated with a minimum allocation of 2 spaces per property.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locate so entire front garden does not become a car park. Prevent front gardens being turned into paved parking spaces, losing the potential for planting and increasing water run-off problems.</li> </ul> |
| <p>A. What approach should the Local Plan take to the allocation of car parking in residential developments?</p> <p>iii. The Local Plan should not address the allocation of car parking spaces, and it should be left to the design of individual developments.</p>            | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - design-led approach in addition to a minimum garage size.</li> <li>• <b>Cottenham, Little Abington, Oakington and Westwick, Papworth Everard, Steeple Morden and Weston Colville Parish Councils</b> support.</li> <li>• Developers and Planners need to agree a suitable provision for each development.</li> <li>• <b>Great Abington Parish Council</b> - at least one car space plus parking for visitors as minimum.</li> <li>• <b>Foxton Parish Council</b> - design of parking places should depend on the development.</li> </ul>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Support: 18<br/>Object: 1<br/>Comment: 0</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Haslingfield Parish Council</b> - allows different approaches for different target groups.</li> <li>• <b>Histon and Impington Parish Council</b> - this will be highly dependent on location; access to public transport; provision for working at home et al.</li> <li>• Gives the flexibility for innovative design, ideas, and provision based on need, demand. Most likely to provide what is needed.</li> <li>• <b>Rampton Parish Council</b> - aim for higher on-site parking in more rural areas where car ownership is a necessity and land prices are less.</li> <li>• Attention should be given to ensuring any on street parking/visitor spaces are well integrated.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer will have no vested interest in serving needs of community as purely profit-motivated.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>  |
| <p>B. Are there any alternative policies or approaches you think should be included?</p> <p>Support:3<br/>Object: 0<br/>Comment: 8</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All residences should have garage space, or easy access to charging points.</li> <li>• <b>Hauxton Parish Council</b> - Parking should be adequate for family vehicles, people who need extra space for mobility etc.</li> </ul>   |
| <p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>Support: 0<br/>Object: 1<br/>Comment: 7</p>   | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road widths in new developments are too narrow and yet on-street parking takes place anyway and causes problems for other road users, pedestrians and particularly for children.</li> <li>• <b>Croydon Parish Council</b> - Provision of communal parking areas does not mean people will use them. If allocation left to developers, there would be minimum provision to maximise profit. Allocated spaces unused by one occupant may well be used by the next occupant.</li> <li>• What about underground parking allocation?</li> <li>• Avoid being overly prescriptive - preclude innovative design, impede new solutions and result in extensive negotiations at planning application stage. Need element of discretion and ability to deal with site specific circumstances.</li> <li>• <b>Caldecote Parish Council</b> - Given car ownership per household is increasing, dwellings should have appropriate parking. If unallocated, adequate on road parking should be provided with</li> </ul> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | wide enough roads and good visibility to ensure safety.   |
| <b>QUESTION 101:<br/>Residential Garages</b>   |   |
| <p>What approach should the Local Plan take to residential garages?</p> <p>i. Specify minimum size dimensions for garages to count towards parking standards, to ensure they are large enough to easily accommodate modern cars, cycles and other storage needs.</p> <p>Support: 42<br/>Object: 0<br/>Comment: 2</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bourn, Caxton, Cottenham, Foxton, Gamlingay, Great Abington, Haslingfield, Hauxton, Histon and Impington, Litlington, Little Abington, Oakington and Westwick, Over, Pampisford, Papworth Everard, Rampton, Swavesey, Waterbeach and Weston Colville Parish Councils</b> supports approach.</li> <li>• Do not allow developers to build any more estates where people are forced to park on narrow roads as garages are not big enough.</li> <li>• Garages should be large enough for family vehicles and for the driver to get in/out, whatever their level of mobility/size.</li> <li>• <b>Caldecote Parish Council</b> - in conjunction with issues 99 &amp;100 ensuring adequate and safe parking is allocated for each dwelling.</li> <li>• <b>Cambourne Parish Council</b> - If cycle storage is shared with car parking the garage should be enlarged to suit both.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridge City Council</b> supports, but consideration should also be given to double garages. Learn from difficulties experienced in the provision of car parking in urban extensions.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - design-led approach to parking in addition to a minimum garage size with agreed dimensions.</li> <li>• Without, there is a risk that developers will cut the provision of this most useful space.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not specify bigger garages for ever larger cars - current fad for 4x4s will not last as fuel prices rise and more people take CO2 emission seriously.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most new garages are so small that although a car can be driven into one, it is impossible to open the door and get out! Should be a minimum standard specified somewhere (planning regulations?) based on being able to open the door and get out of an average sized family car, when in the garage.</li> </ul> |
| <p>What approach should the Local Plan take to residential garages?</p> <p>ii. Not address the issue of residential garage sizes.</p>  | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fen Ditton Parish Council</b> support approach.</li> <li>• Overkill for such detail</li> <li>• <b>Steeple Morden Parish Council</b> - Garage size should be demand driven and not mandated - could increase cost of already expensive housing stock without guarantees this space will actually be used for car parking.</li> </ul>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Support: 7<br/>Object: 1<br/>Comment: 0</p>  | <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>  |
| <p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>Support: 0<br/>Object: 1<br/>Comment: 3</p>  | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid being overly prescriptive - preclude innovative design, impede new solutions and result in extensive negotiations at planning application stage. Need element of discretion and an ability to deal with site specific circumstances.</li> <li>• Policy to restrict conversion of domestic garages to additional rooms should be considered.</li> <li>• Provision of other storage options (e.g. sheds) could release garages for car use, at lower cost.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>QUESTION 102: Car Parking Standards for Other Types of Developments</b></p>   |  |
| <p>Should the Local Plan carry forward maximum parking standards for non-residential developments included in the existing plan?</p> <p>Support: 19<br/>Object: 4<br/>Comment: 13</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bourn, Cambourne, Cottenham, Fen Ditton, Great Abington, Litlington, Little Abington, Over, Papworth Everard, Rampton and Weston Colville Parish Councils</b> supports approach.</li> <li>• Sharing parking areas should be encouraged, especially between adjacent retailers. Present generous provision arises from reluctance of people to walk more than a short distance to cars. What about pick up points?</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid being overly prescriptive - preclude innovative design, impede new solutions and result in extensive negotiations at planning application stage. Need element of discretion and an ability to deal with site specific circumstances.</li> <li>• Preserve scarce land resources, supermarkets should not be allowed vast surface car parks when restricted for other users. Prefer underground or multi-storey car parks for large retail/commercial developments.</li> <li>• Should be specific to South Cambridgeshire – bring forward new standards that take local circumstances into account.</li> <li>• Risks getting out of date quite quickly not to mention appearing to sail against the stream.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking standards should ensure provision is adequate and does not result in overflow parking on neighbouring roads.</li> <li>• <b>Croydon Parish Council</b> - need some control</li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>over cars and where they park to avoid gridlock. Might be better to assess each case in order to obtain the best results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of maximum car parking spaces as a means of restricting car use needs to be applied with care especially as bus subsidies are being removed.</li> <li>• <b>Oakington and Westwick Parish Council</b> - major re-think is necessary. E.g. parking at SCDC very quickly became full until redundancies took place. Not an ideal way to provide more parking.</li> <li>• <b>Swavesey Parish Council</b> - should reflect the location of the development and be sufficient to avoid problems of on-street parking.</li> <li>• <b>Travel for Work Partnership (late rep)</b> – Important tool to 'encourage' sustainable transport. Apply area-wide Travel Plans, including car park management to allow equity. Effective Travel Plan will ensure 'carrots' of incentives and facilities encourage as much sustainable travel as possible as well as the 'stick' of reduced car parking.</li> <li>• If carry forward current maximum car parking standards, policy should allow for the application of issues in NPPF (para 39).</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>QUESTION 103: Cycle Parking Standards</b></p>  |  |
| <p>A. What approach should the Local Plan take towards cycle parking standards?</p> <p>i. Retain the current minimum cycle parking standards for different types of development.</p> <p>Support: 3<br/>Object: 0<br/>Comment: 2</p>  | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the principle but the level of provision should be proportionate. One space per bedroom is far too much and leads to over provision.</li> </ul>   |
| <p>A. What approach should the Local Plan take towards cycle parking standards?</p> <p>ii. Continue to set minimum cycle parking standards for different types of development, but develop new higher levels of provision.</p> <p>Support: 22<br/>Object: 1<br/>Comment: 3</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bourn, Cambourne, Comberton, Croydon, Great Abington, Haslingfield, Hauxton, Over and Rampton Parish Councils</b> support approach.</li> <li>• Including standards should not preclude design-led approach.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridge City Council</b> - high quality provision of appropriate levels is important in ensuring the success of new developments. Be as proactive as possible in seeking new provision on both new developments and throughout the District.</li> <li>• Essential given importance of cycling to Cambridge area.</li> <li>• Standards need to be much higher to reflect</li> </ul>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>probable number of occupants of the dwelling (taking account of double rooms) and the fact many regular commuters have more than one cycle. Important all members of family can own and securely store cycles. Design of parking is also important.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All measures need to be adopted that might lead to an increase in cycle ownership and security if the number of miles cycled overall is to increase.</li> <li>• Support a combination of design-led and minimum standards for cycle parking. Use of 'visitor parking' sheffield stands for secure locking, as part of residential/street infrastructure encourages local cycle trips.</li> <li>• Must be covered and secure.</li> <li>• Standard should be 1 space per bedroom, undercover and lockable – e.g. garage / shed.</li> <li>• <b>Travel for Work Partnership</b> (late rep) - more needed, especially with Olympic legacy. Insist on minimum standards of style, type, covered and location. Shower/locker and drying room provision to encourage cycling, walking running to work. Travel plans need to be implemented, monitored and enforced to ensure this provision is taken up.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the principle but the level of provision should be proportionate. One space per bedroom is far too much and leads to over provision.</li> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> |
| <p>A. What approach should the Local Plan take towards cycle parking standards?</p> <p>iii. Remove cycle parking standards, but include a policy requiring cycle parking provision, adopting a design-led approach.</p> <p>Support: 11<br/>Object: 2<br/>Comment: 0</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cottenham, Litlington, Little Abington, Papworth Everard, Steeple Morden and Weston Colville Parish Councils</b> support.</li> <li>• Encourages planners to follow current trends.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum levels should continue to be applied.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Genome Campus has exemplar campus-wide Travel Plan actively promoting cycling. Not always appropriate for individual developments to provide separate spaces (requested relaxation of standards). Approach should retain commitment to provision, but design-led approach to location and numbers more appropriate.</li> </ul>   |
| <p>B. Are there any alternative policies or approaches you think should be included?</p> <p>Support: 0<br/>Object: 0<br/>Comment: 3</p>   | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Caldecote Parish Council</b> - Secure cycle space should also be considered at bus stops, given some stops are some distance from housing.</li> </ul>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycle parking standards should be reviewed and updated to reflect local circumstances.</li> <li>• Target should be given with allowance for under and over provision based on individual circumstances. Would allow variation in provision, but provides more clarity for developers.</li> </ul>   |
| <p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>Support: 0<br/>Object: 1<br/>Comment: 4</p>  | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoting cycling is commendable - note that cycling can be seasonal and many cyclists own and use cars - cannot be relied upon for modal shift.</li> <li>• Avoid being overly prescriptive - preclude innovative design, impede new solutions and result in extensive negotiations at planning application stage. Need element of discretion and an ability to deal with site specific circumstances.</li> <li>• It is astonishing that current standards are for 1.5 cars per dwelling but only 1 bike!</li> <li>• It is not clear why this is necessary.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>QUESTION 104: Rail Freight Interchanges</b>  |   |
| <p>A. Should the Local Plan continue to protect rail freight interchange sites?</p> <p>Support: 31<br/>Object: 0<br/>Comment: 2</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bourn, Comberton, Cottenham, Croydon, Fen Ditton, Great Abington, Haslingfield, Litlington, Little Abington, Over, Rampton and Weston Colville Parish Councils</b> support.</li> <li>• Freight should be on railways. Anything that helps modal shift and helps to keep heavy lorries off the roads should be promoted, to improve safety and cut emissions.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England (late rep)</b> - only include those sites where it can be demonstrated that there will be no adverse effects on the natural environment.</li> <li>• <b>Suffolk County Council</b> - Welcome further co-operation to ensure this provision is coordinated across Cambridge sub-region and beyond to reflect the national significance of freight distribution and the role of the Port of Felixstowe.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there any rail freight interchange sites in the district? I cannot see they can contribute to reducing the amount of freight movement on the district's roads, given the pattern of development.</li> </ul> |
| <p>B. Are there any alternative policies or approaches you think should be included?</p>  | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Support: 0<br/>Object: 0<br/>Comment: 4</p>  | <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Comberton Parish Council</b> - Efforts should be made to encourage transit freight to use rail and not cause congestion on road infrastructure.</li> <li>• <b>Haslingfield Parish Council</b> - work with others to encourage freight transfer from road to rail.</li> <li>• A freight equivalent of "park and ride" should be considered.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>QUESTION 105: Aviation Related Development</b></p>  |  |
| <p>A. Should the Local Plan continue to include a criteria-based policy for assessing and mitigating the impact of aviation related development proposals?</p> <p>Support:25<br/>Object: 0<br/>Comment: 9</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambourne, Fen Ditton, Great Abington, Hauxton, Litlington, Little Abington, Over, Rampton, Steeple Morden and Weston Colville Parish Councils</b> support.</li> <li>• Light aircraft and helicopter flying should as far as possible be restricted. Noise nuisance to large numbers of people near the flight path far outweighs the benefit to the fliers.</li> <li>• <b>Haslingfield Parish Council</b> - Contribution of aviation operations to the prosperity of Cambridge area should be accepted and not obstructed.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England (late rep)</b> - welcome a policy to ensure aviation development at Cambridge Airport is only permitted where it will not have a significant adverse effect on natural environment.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Croydon Parish Council</b> - criteria for new airfields should be much stricter. Should consider not just current land use but also current sky use. Already lots of aviation activity.</li> <li>• Oppose any expansion in use of Cambridge airport. Been no consultation with local communities re recent new routes. Lots of affected houses around the airport.</li> </ul> |
| <p>B. Are there any alternative policies or approaches you think should be included?</p> <p>Support: 0<br/>Object: 0<br/>Comment: 3</p>   | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Marshalls of Cambridge</b> - Government advice in Circulars 1/2003 and 1/2010. Offer clear and relevant advice dealing with public safety and safeguarding flying operations of airports. Policy should be included to meet those requirements.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>QUESTION 106: Cambridge Airport – Aviation Development</b></p>  |  |
| <p>A. Should the Local Plan continue to include a policy that would only permit aviation</p>  | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambourne, Fen Ditton, Great Abington, Litlington, Little Abington, Over, Rampton and</b></li> </ul>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>development at Cambridge Airport where it would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and residential amenity?</p> <p>Support:25<br/>Object: 5<br/>Comment: 7</p> | <p><b>Steeple Morden Parish Councils</b> support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Required to maintain the character and limit noise pollution.</li> <li>• Importance in underpinning the economic vitality of South Cambs and Cambridge City should also be a consideration.</li> <li>• Links strongly to major site selection criteria.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridge City Council</b> – Both Councils are consulting on options and will continue to work together to develop appropriate policies.</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn Parish Council</b> - Being within the flying zone, Fulbourn is over flown regularly and suffers noise pollution from ground engine running. Wish policy to protect character and amenity of village.</li> <li>• Everything should be done to mitigate noise nuisance and potential danger from light aircraft and helicopters. For large aircraft the costs and benefits are completely different and such flights are unproblematic.</li> </ul> <p>•</p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commercial and employment potential of Cambridge Airport ought not to be jeopardised. Planes come from all over bringing jobs and money which Cambridge continues to need.</li> <li>• <b>Marshalls of Cambridge</b> - A policy supportive of employment and aviation will help enhance the economic growth of Cambridge area.</li> <li>• Airport should be developed for housing.</li> <li>• <b>Weston Colville Parish Council</b> disagree.</li> <li>• Too restrictive and any adverse effect on the environment and residential amenity should be balanced against economic and wider benefits</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I suppose it is not within the council's powers to limit further aviation development at Cambridge Airport to encourage Marshalls to re-locate?</li> <li>• <b>Croydon Parish Council</b> - Surely further development would impact on the environment and local amenity? But it does seem sensible to keep aviation activity on a site that is regulated.</li> <li>• <b>Haslingfield Parish Council</b> - Aviation development at the airport should not be opposed purely on environmental and amenity grounds.</li> <li>• Marshalls is important business in Cambridge and one of largest employers. Essential to be supported. While environmental and residential concerns must be taken into account, and safety paramount, further development to support business should be sympathetically considered.</li> </ul> |
| <p>B. Are there any alternative policies or approaches you think should be included?</p>  | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Support: 0<br/>Object: 0<br/>Comment: 2</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>COMMENTS:</b></li> <li>• <b>Marshalls of Cambridge</b> - Government advice in Circulars 1/2003 and 1/2010. Offer clear and relevant advice dealing with public safety and safeguarding flying operations of airports. Policy should be included to meet those requirements.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>QUESTION 107: Provision of Infrastructure and Services</b></p>  |  |
| <p>A. Should the Local Plan include a policy to require development to provide appropriate infrastructure?</p> <p>Support: 76<br/>Object: 0<br/>Comment: 13</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New development is key to delivery of new and improved infrastructure but should not burden villages – ensure adequate provision for transport - including effective and integrated public transport, effective road network, cycleways, footpaths, traffic calming and other safety measures, P&amp;R, waste, high speed broadband (min 20Mbps) and ensure mitigate impact on countryside and villages.</li> <li>• Consider cross boundary issues – developers should still contribute if impacts are across border.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridge City Council</b> - Need to assess viability with range of requirements and infrastructure plans likely to impact on the cost of development. Collaboration and consistency of approach with Cambridge City Council important, particular with cross-boundary delivery.</li> <li>• Timely and sustained (i.e. years) provision of infrastructure is important – in place before development. No more major development until delivered infrastructure for currently planned development.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - important to include a policy to ensure development provides appropriate infrastructure. Strongly support the Infrastructure Delivery Study (commissioned in partnership with Cambridge City Council).</li> <li>• <b>Conservators of the River Cam</b> - Yes, and include projects along River Cam, e.g. habitat, amenity improvements, picnic sites.</li> <li>• Section 106 agreements provided useful facilities in past. Whatever form this obligation takes in future, e.g. CIL, the principle is very sound.</li> <li>• Economy impacted by limitations of A14 and A428 – will impact on levels of job creation (&amp; impact of Northstowe on A14 yet to be felt).</li> <li>• Parish Councils should be consulted more closely on these issues, and should be listened to. Must ensure service providers demonstrate there is sufficient capacity, verified by parish councils.</li> <li>• Vital that appropriate infrastructure is provided to support development. For far too long Cambridgeshire in general, and South</li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>Cambridgeshire in particular, has suffered from a serious infrastructure deficit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need funding to make cycling into Cambridge safer, so could contribute into a central fund to do this. Otherwise, providing cycle paths by developments may be rather pointless.</li> <li>• Ensure housing costs are not unreasonably impacted. Building sustainable dwellings with larger spaces will cost more but produce a clear benefit for purchasers. Some infrastructure add value, others could be considered an expense for general benefit of locality - needs to go easy.</li> <li>• Road infrastructure insufficient – M11 and A14 and public transport (trains) poor, overcrowded at peak times and very expensive. Development will make this worse.</li> <li>• <b>Wildlife Trust</b> - must develop a CIL and include strategic green infrastructure as one of the key components eligible for funding.</li> <li>• The nature, scale and phasing of infrastructure or funding should be related to the form of development and potential impact. Also to secure future upkeep or maintenance.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stated that impacts on health cannot be assessed until proposals firmed up – existing services overstretched.</li> <li>• Need to campaign for national investment in transport infrastructure before additional growth.</li> <li>• Additional residential allocations should be made in Longstanton to deliver new infrastructure and support the existing facilities.</li> <li>• Caldecote needs better transport, and our waste management is at its limit.</li> <li>• Consequence of growth, rising pressure to correct serious infrastructure deficit - 1. Trunk roads that serve national economy; 2. Roads around city; 3 Dedicated cycle paths / super highways; 4 Accessible land and water for leisure and nature; 5. Essential services. Danger invest too little and/or too late in provision and maintenance of critical infrastructure.</li> <li>• Major upgrades needed to M11, A14 and A1307 before development to avoid gridlock.</li> <li>• <b>Greater Cambridgeshire &amp; Peterborough Partnership</b> - provide realistic and deliverable strategy, identify key infrastructure constraints and highlight how constraints will be overcome. Needs to be robust - set out delivery challenges and interventions necessary to support growth and for use as a lobbying tool to secure funding.</li> <li>• Focus is on physical infrastructure - i.e. roads,</li> </ul> |
|--|--|

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>schools, health centres, open space etc. No reference to key support infrastructure. Should be considering modern building techniques (to reach economic and sustainability targets).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure in Caldecote (electricity / internet / water) already poor - do not need more development.</li> <li>• <b>Middle Level Commissioners</b> – Contributions and attenuation features required for drainage / flood prevention. Problems arise on piecemeal developments / with several developers – need a masterplan to consider what required.</li> <li>• Additional demands for school places, hospital beds and other social infrastructure should be highlighted. Political parties want greater funding from the private sector.</li> <li>• <b>Suffolk County Council</b> - Some pupils likely to attend schools in Suffolk. Development proposals near Suffolk border should include consideration of demand for school places upon Suffolk schools - contributions may be required.</li> <li>• Build a new road (dual A-road) from Huntingdon across to Newmarket and leave the A14 above except for new junction at Bar Hill.</li> </ul> |
| <p>B. Are there any alternative policies or approaches you think should be included?</p> <p>Support: 1<br/>Object: 0<br/>Comment: 5</p> | <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central Government should properly recognise the contribution Cambridge and Cambridgeshire make towards the national economy and provide proper funding to meet the ever increasing demands for infrastructure and public services.</li> <li>• <b>Little Gransden Parish Council</b> - Extend P&amp;R to the proposed new towns such as Bourn Airfield and Cambourne to compensate reduction in bus services.</li> <li>• Already a severe shortage of funding for infrastructure and huge developments would exacerbate. Period of consolidation is required.</li> </ul>  |