

Appendix 3

CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS **NORTHERN FRINGE EAST AREA ACTION PLAN – ISSUES AND OPTIONS** **REPORT)**

The comments in this response are those of Cambridgeshire County Council Officers and are subject to comment and endorsement by the Council's Economy & Environment Committee in March 2015.

Question 1: Do you support or object to this vision for CNFE? Do you have any comments? SUPPORT

The vision states that *'the development will ensure the continued presence of the strategic aggregates railheads that will facilitate the wider growth of Greater Cambridge'*. CNFE is the only location in the Cambridge area which has strategic railheads, and these are essential to the growth of the area as they are the means through which mineral which cannot be found locally i.e. hard rock, is brought into the area. The alternative would be to bring large quantities of hard rock by road which would not be sustainable. The Lafarge Tarmac railhead will also play an essential role in bringing in hard rock for the improvement of the A14, over the three year build period.

The intent to retain these railheads is therefore strongly supported and is consistent with the County Council's policy in the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011) and Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012) which identifies the Lafarge Tarmac railhead as a Transport Zone and designates a Transport Safeguarding Areas around it, placing within it a presumption against any development which could prejudice its use for the transport of mineral and / or waste.

The vision box also states that the development will ensure 'existing and new waste management facilities can be safeguarded / delivered (including Household Recycling Centre and inert waste recycling facility)'. This is welcomed and is in line with the County Council's policy in the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011) and Site Specific Proposals Plan (2012) which identifies an area of search for a Household Recycling Centre and a permanent inert waste recycling facility, alongside other new waste technologies where appropriate. As pointed out above, so long as the vision takes account of the relevant safeguarding areas and allocations set out within the Minerals and Waste Development Plan, and ensures that development is appropriate that will not prejudice the minerals and waste, plus related transport uses, it should be seen to be policy compliant.

Support from economic development perspective.

The vision would benefit from the inclusion of "health" as a concept.

Question 2: Do you support or object to these objectives and how would you improve them? SUPPORT

The overarching objectives are supported. Considering these against the option scenarios it is apparent that the mix of land uses is wide ranging, comprising existing and new uses such as the Water Recycling Centre and housing. Some of these uses would not normally be located next to each other, with this in mind it is suggested that Proposed Objective 2 be slightly amended to incorporate the objective that these mixed uses be provided in such a way that they are located in a compatible way:

‘Proposed Objective 2: Provide a mix of land uses in locations where they are compatible, and at densities that make best use of this highly sustainable location and regeneration opportunities’

In addition to the suggested change to proposed Objective 2, we would also point out that there is not currently reference to the minimising of waste in line with the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012). We would therefore recommend that this be built into proposed Objective 8 as follows, or a separate Objective set up to cover this issue:

‘Encourage a low carbon lifestyle; the minimisation of waste both during construction and occupational phases of development; and addressing climate change’

Support from economic development perspective.

The objectives should include an object to secure “good health” through development.

Question 3: Do you support or object to the current area identified for the AAP? SUPPORT

The ‘physical and visual envelope’ in point (iv) makes reference to the ‘*screening landscape alongside the A14 to the north*’ and the ‘*highway environment along Milton Road to the west*’ both of which are supported as they show the level of screening already in place in parts of the CNFE AAP area currently identified. This existing screening should be taken into account for any waste application that should come forward on the Anglian Water site.

Support from economic development perspective.

The relationship to the Traveller and Gypsy site should be explored in order to protect the site and associated access.

Question 4: Do you support or object to the extension of the CNFE AAP to include Option A – The Cambridge Science Park? OBJECT

If redevelopment guidance for the Science Park is thought necessary, a separate AAP should be prepared at the appropriate time as currently it is only Phase 1 of the Science Park that has potential for redevelopment. The two areas are different in their nature with the Science Park being virtually wholly for employment uses (primarily high-tech and R&D) whilst a mix of uses is proposed for CNFE. In addition, the Science Park's status and image as a significant brand in itself should warrant its own AAP rather than being part of another AAP for an area which has yet to create an identity for itself. If a combined AAP is undertaken for both the Science Park and

CNFE, it could also hamper implementation of the CNFE proposals as developer interest is likely to be more focused on the Science Park, given its status.

**Question 5: Do you support or object to the extension of the CNFE AAP to include Option B – The additional triangular area south of Chesterton Sidings?
SUPPORT**

The inclusion of this land is supported; provided that it maintains or improves access to the new rail station and / or assists local pedestrian and cycle access.

**Question 6: This area is planned to change significantly over coming years. What do you think would be a good name for this part of Cambridge?
COMMENT**

This is subject to Member considerations and their views will be reported back.

Question 7a: Do you support or object to naming the proposed new railway station, Cambridge Science Park Station? COMMENT

As question 6 although the Science Park was the UK's first science park and has world-wide recognition. None of the other suggestions come close in terms of recognition for those who are not local.

Question 7b: Do you support or object to naming the proposed new railway station, Chesterton Interchange Station?

No comment.

Question 7c: Do you support or object to naming the proposed new railway station, Cambridge North Station?

No comment.

Question 7d: Do you support or object to naming the proposed new railway station, Cambridge Fen Station?

No comment.

Question 7e: Do you have any other suggestions for a name for the proposed new railway station?

See response to Question 6.

Question 8: Do you have any comments on the Site Context and Constraints, and what other issues and constraints should be taken into account in the preparation of the Area Action Plan?

Figure 4 shows an indicative Household Recycling Centre location at the boundary with the A14 alongside an area for an inert waste recycling facility. Whilst we welcome the inclusion of this facility, and more importantly the footnote that states that 'the

Household Recycling Centre could also be located on B2, B8 and sui-generis land in the vicinity of Cowley Road', we are concerned that at present the new entrance to serve this facility is in very close proximity to the Jane Coston Bridge and also crosses protected verge land. Such issues, alongside permeability into the site by pedestrians and cyclists, still need careful consideration.

The County Council is currently reviewing the strategic waste service provision of Household Recycling Centres. At present the allocation for a Household Recycling Centre, allocated through the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan, is intended to provide essential waste infrastructure which will be needed when the time limited Household Recycling Centre at Milton closes. This will be the only facility in the Cambridge area and must continue to be taken into account in future development scenarios.

We welcome the acknowledgement to the role of Anglian Water's Water Recycling Centre and the odour issues that need to be taken into account. We also welcome the acknowledgement to noise issues in relation to the A14 and the mineral and waste operations, all of which need to be taken into account when planning compatible uses in the future that do not prejudice the existing and planned operations.

Paragraph 6.14 discusses landscaping and enhancement for high quality development. However, reference to existing screening landscape on the site also needs to be taken into account, particularly alongside the boundary with the A14. Furthermore, existing waste uses also need to be considered in the context of landscaping, so this should be acknowledged within the issues and constraints going forward. In particular when the heights of buildings are being considered the consideration of views onto such activities also need careful consideration and should be acknowledged at this early stage.

- 6.7 – The need to provide leisure/community opportunities for the Nuffield Road area is supported as this area is a deprived area and these services/facilities can help improve health and social cohesion.
- 6.8 – The aim for modal shift welcomed but this needs to be an evidenced based figure of 24% i.e. the number of Cambridgeshire people who work less than a set distance from work who travel by car, also what are the current background levels.

The County Council supports the redevelopment of the area. With the new station, busway and proximity to the A14 and A10, the site is probably better linked than any other on the Cambridge fringe. The station will markedly improve accessibility into the area and could divert many longer trips onto rail, particularly on the Ely, Royston and Saffron Walden corridors. There is an excellent opportunity through the AAP to make sure that the local transport network from the station makes these trips as easy as possible for those going to the Science Park, Regional College, or to the other major employment sites in the area. At the same time, new employment in the area will have the opportunity to take advantage of the excellent transport links, particularly by rail, guided bus, walking and cycling. It is also fair to say that

early development around the station would also improve the attractiveness of rail and bus trips into the whole area.

However, there is a need for a very careful consideration of how this growth can fit into the local transport network, and a particular focus on what level of growth might be possible to manage, given the constraints of that network. Some very high levels of new jobs are under discussion. Even at the lowest level, the number of new jobs is equivalent to around three new Cambridge Science Parks. If the transport network and peoples travel patterns remain as now, we do not need to model to know that the local road network will not cope with this.

The City Deal transport programme has obvious potential to help address this issue. Several work packages are likely to provide new sustainable transport capacity in the area:

- Milton Road bus corridor
- A10 north corridor transport package – rail, Busway, pedestrian / cycle networks, A10 improvements
- Eastern Orbital public transport – Science Park to Cambridge Biomedical Campus.

Work to further develop the Milton Road corridor is likely to commence shortly (subject to Member consideration). Work on the other two packages has yet to be programmed. However it will not be possible to complete the work in time to meet the timescales envisaged for the AAP. The level of growth under consideration in the area is likely to require a more radical approach to transport in the area and potentially in the wider city than is currently under consideration.

To put this into context, at the levels of growth under consideration, even very low mode shares of car use similar to those that are targeted in the CB1 development around Cambridge Station will cause very severe problems on the local road network. The Highways Agency has not accounted for growth at the levels under consideration in its planning of the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon scheme. There is often a commercial imperative to produce development in areas with similar levels of parking to that historically seen. In this case, that would be wholly counterproductive, as the road network would not have the capacity to get people to these parking spaces. Growth at the levels under consideration will demand a wider consideration of how the current and new employment uses operate in transport terms, and quite possibly, how the wider city, fringes and employment catchment operate.

Question 9: Do you support or object to the Development Principles (A to P)? Please add any comments or suggestions. SUPPORT

Development Principle G is supported, the continued operation of the Water Recycling Centre and the strategic railheads are essential for the growth and well being of the Greater Cambridge area.

Development Principle L seeks to deliver *‘enhanced connections for pedestrians, cyclists, buses, prioritise these modes to encourage a modal shift’*. However, care needs to be taken to how this can be delivered alongside existing and planned mineral and waste activity to avoid a potential conflict situation.

An additional development principle should be added which includes the need to ensure that essential services / infrastructure is retained and / or provided. This may be infrastructure which is essential to support the development proposed in the CNFE, or the wider Cambridge area e.g. a new Household Recycling Centre.

Support objective 1, but amend option B to read ***“By creating a sustainable, cohesive and inclusive area by ensuring there is appropriate support, improving access to jobs, homes, open space, leisure facilities and other services within the development and to the wider community”***.

This is supported but would benefit from “health” added to address any deprivation in the area of Chesterton.

Question 10: Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 1? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their inter-relationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly the case for those that propose higher levels of development which might require significant transport intervention to ensure that transport impacts are not severe. This applies to both the local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway) and also the strategic road (i.e.: Highways Agency) and rail (i.e.: Network Rail) networks. This will need to be reflected in viability work.

The retention of the strategic aggregate railhead is supported.

The inclusion of an indicative location for the new Household Recycling Centre and inert recycling facility is also supported, together with the caveat that gives the flexibility for this to be located on alternative B2, B8 or sui generis land in the vicinity of Cowley Road.

It is noted that the Veolia Waste Transfer Station site would be redeveloped. This site is safeguarded through the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan, but scope exists for this use to be accommodated on other land proposed for B2, B8 and sui generis uses.

The retention of the existing inert waste recycling centre, within the curtilage of the Water Recycling Centre is supported. This existing facility is time limited but lies within

an allocated Area of Search for a permanent site for such a use (allocated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan).

The provision made for the temporary storage of aggregates for the improvement of the A14 is supported. A temporary facility in this location (with time restricted access directly on to the A14) will assist in the efficient movement of mineral for the scheme.

All new development which falls within the Safeguarding Area for the Water Recycling Centre (designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan) will in due course need to comply with Policy CS31 Waste Water Treatment Works Safeguarding Areas (WWTW SA) of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). The proposed uses must demonstrate that they would not prejudice the continued operation of the water treatment works i.e. by an odour assessment report. It would be prudent to bear this requirement in mind now when new uses which would normally be occupied by people are being proposed, particularly if the juxtaposition of certain uses would give rise to future amenity issues which could pose issues / constraints to the future operation of this essential infrastructure. Under Option 1 all the proposed uses except for those in the new station area and in the Nuffield Road area fall within the WWTW SA. Option 1 places those which are likely to be less sensitive i.e. B2, B8 and Sui Generis, immediately adjacent the Water Recycling Centre, and those which are likely to be more sensitive i.e. B1 uses further away. This approach is supported, although consideration to heights of buildings, views and the use of any external landscaped areas being capable of being used for the purpose designed will still be required.

For the options listed on pages 33-41 the positive and negative aspects of each topic and options presented are supported. There needs to be a balance to ensure uplift to Chesterton, enough local facilities/employment to support new housing without detriment to new or existing residents – the redevelopment should present opportunities to reduce the sources of concern – odour, noise etc. as much as possible, and enhancing opportunities for active travel.

Question 11: Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 2? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their inter-relationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly the case for those that propose higher levels of development which might require significant transport intervention to ensure that transport impacts are not severe. This applies to both the local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway) and also the strategic road (i.e.: Highways Agency) and rail (i.e.: Network Rail) networks. This will need to be reflected in viability work.

The retention of the strategic aggregate railhead is supported.

The inclusion of an indicative location for the new Household Recycling Centre and inert recycling facility is also supported, together with the caveat that gives the flexibility for this to be located on alternative B2, B8 or sui generis land in the vicinity of Cowley Road.

It is noted that the Veolia Waste Transfer Station site would be redeveloped. This site is safeguarded through the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan, but scope exists for this use to be accommodated on other land proposed for B2, B8 and sui generis uses.

The retention of the existing inert waste recycling centre, within the curtilage of the Water Recycling Centre is supported. This existing facility is time limited but lies within an allocated Area of Search for a permanent site for such a use (allocated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan).

The provision made for the temporary storage of aggregates for the improvement of the A14 is supported. A temporary facility in this location (with time restricted access directly on to the A14) will assist in the efficient movement of mineral for the scheme.

The provision of new heavy goods vehicle access is supported as this will enable traffic movements associated with the railheads, waste management and other B2, B8 and sui generis uses to be separate from Cowley Road which will be subject to additional use by station and other users.

All new development which falls within the Safeguarding Area for the Water Recycling Centre (designated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan) will in due course need to comply with Policy CS31 Waste Water Treatment Works Safeguarding Areas (WWTW SA) of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). The proposed uses must demonstrate that they would not prejudice the continued operation of the water treatment works i.e. by an odour assessment report. It would be prudent to bear this requirement in mind now when new uses which would normally be occupied by people are being proposed, particularly if the juxtaposition of certain uses would give rise to future amenity issues which could pose issues / constraints to the future operation of this essential infrastructure. Option 2 places those which are likely to be less sensitive i.e. B2, B8 and Sui Generis, immediately adjacent the Water Recycling Centre, and those which are likely to be more sensitive i.e. B1 uses further away. This approach is supported, although consideration to heights of buildings, views and the use of any external landscaped areas being capable of being used for the purpose designed will still be required.

Support a focus on Option 2 but with the aim of moving to Option 3 if reconfiguration of the WRC is technically, financially (viability) and operationally deliverable within a realistic timescale. Given the uncertainty around the WRC reconfiguration Option 2 provides the best route for regenerating a substantial part of the area in the short/medium term including a residential element and local centre. The preference would be however to change Nuffield Road to residential. With Option 3 there still remains the issue of the proximity of proposed office/R&D uses to part of the adjacent railhead.

Question 12: Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 3? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their inter-relationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly the case for those that propose higher levels of development which might require significant transport intervention to ensure that transport impacts are not severe. This applies to both the local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway) and also the strategic road (i.e.: Highways Agency) and rail (i.e.: Network Rail) networks

The retention of the strategic aggregate railhead is supported. It's relocation onto land which is currently on the eastern side of the Water Recycling Centre would be consistent with the allocation for a new Transport Zone made by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan.

The inclusion of an indicative location for the new Household Recycling Centre and inert recycling facility is also supported, together with the caveat that gives the flexibility for this to be located on alternative B2, B8 or sui generis land in the vicinity of Cowley Road.

It is noted that the Veolia Waste Transfer Station site would be redeveloped. This site is safeguarded through the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan, but scope exists for this use to be accommodated on other land proposed for B2, B8 and sui generis uses.

The existing inert waste recycling centre, within the curtilage of the Water Recycling Centre would be displaced under this Option. This existing facility is time limited but lies within an allocated Area of Search for a permanent site for such a use (allocated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan). There may also be an opportunity for it to be accommodated within the proposed new areas for B2, B8 and Sui Generis uses.

The provision made for the temporary storage of aggregates for the improvement of the A14 is supported. A temporary facility in this location (with time restricted access directly on to the A14) will assist in the efficient movement of mineral for the scheme.

The provision of new heavy goods vehicle access and the new north-south route is supported; this will enable traffic movements associated with the railheads, waste management and other B2, B8 and sui generis uses to be separate from Cowley Road which will be subject to additional use by station and other users.

Option 3 is dependant upon the development of a new enclosed Water Recycling Centre, on a substantial smaller footprint than that existing. As Anglian Water has no operational need to make such a change and their shareholders will not bear the costs of doing so, for this to take place a viable financial arrangement would need to be in place, potentially involving other land owners/developers in the wider CNFE.

The Employment Options Study (October 2014) sets out the results of the high level financial appraisal of the 4 development options. In the case the Option 3 (Higher Development) the appraisal demonstrates that the development will deliver a deficit value of -£1,089,497/gross acre (-£59,922,363). Despite an allowance already being made for acquisition costs this clearly does generate sufficient value across the whole of the AAP area to incentivise the landowner/s to bring the site forward under this option. A range of sensitivity tests were applied to consider variations to Option 3, e.g. increasing sales values, share of residential floorspace or storey heights. Neither of these variants improved the deficit. On this basis it is likely that significant public subsidy and/or reduction in policy requirements will be necessary to bring the viability to a position where development under this option could be considered.

Further information is also required with regard to the odour contours of the enclosed Water Recycling Centre; even with enclosure there will still be inlet works which is a main source of odour. This information will inform and enable us to understand what uses are suitable in close and intermediate proximity to the new works.

Although Option 3 sees the redevelopment and enclosure of the Water Recycling centre, the intent of safeguarding the facility remains (as enshrined in the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy). In due course all new development will still need to comply with Policy CS31 Waste Water Treatment Works Safeguarding Areas (WWTW SA) of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2011). The proposed uses must demonstrate that they would not prejudice the continued operation of the water treatment works i.e. by an odour assessment report. It would be prudent to bear this requirement in mind now when new uses which would normally be occupied by people are being proposed, particularly if the juxtaposition of certain uses would give rise to future amenity issues which could pose issues / constraints to the future operation of this essential infrastructure. Option 3 places those uses which are likely to be less sensitive i.e. B2, B8 and Sui Generis, immediately adjacent the reconfigured Water Recycling Centre, and those which are likely to be more sensitive i.e. B1 uses further away. This approach is supported, although consideration to heights of buildings, views and the use of any external landscaped areas being capable of being used for the purpose designed will still be required.

The redevelopment of the Station car park following provision of a new multi-storey car park is noted. The new multi-storey car park lies in South Cambridgeshire, and if the County Council were not the developer a planning application for this use would need to be submitted to South Cambridgeshire District Council as it will not be a County Council development.

Question 13: Do you support or object to the proposals for the CNFE area as included in option 4? Please provide comments on what you like or dislike about this option.

All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their inter-relationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly the case for those that propose higher levels of development which might require

significant transport intervention to ensure that transport impacts are not severe. This applies to both the local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway) and also the strategic road (ie: Highways Agency) and rail (ie: Network Rail) networks

The retention of the strategic aggregate railhead is supported. It's relocation onto land which is currently on the eastern side of the Water Recycling Centre would be consistent with the allocation for a new Transport Zone made by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan.

The inclusion of an indicative location for the new Household Recycling Centre and inert recycling facility is also supported, together with the caveat that gives the flexibility for this to be located on alternative B2, B8 or sui generis land in the vicinity of Cowley Road.

It is noted that the Veolia Waste Transfer Station site would be redeveloped. This site is safeguarded through the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan, but scope exists for this use to be accommodated on other land proposed for B2, B8 and sui generis uses.

The existing inert waste recycling centre within the curtilage of the Water Recycling Centre would be displaced under this Option. This existing facility is time limited but lies within an allocated Area of Search for a permanent site for such a use (allocated by the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan). There may also be an opportunity for it to be accommodated within the proposed new areas for B2, B8 and Sui Generis uses.

The provision made for the temporary storage of aggregates for the improvement of the A14 is supported. A temporary facility in this location (with time restricted access directly on to the A14) will assist in the efficient movement of mineral for the scheme.

The provision of new heavy goods vehicle access and the new north-south route is supported; this will enable traffic movements associated with the railheads, waste management and other B2, B8 and sui generis uses to be separate from Cowley Road which will be subject to additional use by station and other users.

Option 4 is dependant upon the relocation of the Water Recycling Centre. As Anglian Water has no operational need to make such a change and their shareholders will not bear the costs of doing so, for this to take place a viable financial arrangement would need to be in place, potentially involving other land owners/developers in the wider CNFE.

The Employment Options Study (October 2014) sets out the results of the high level financial appraisal of the 4 development options. In the case the Option 4 (Maximum Development) the appraisal demonstrates that the development will deliver a surplus, after acquisition costs, of £354,660/gross acre (£21,988,933). Whilst this option generates a surplus this is less than 10% of the gross development value and consequently the viability could be considered marginal. A range of sensitivity tests were applied to consider variations to Option 4, e.g. increasing sales values, share of residential floor space or storey heights. Only the "Values up 10%" variant made positive impact on viability.

The relocation of the Water Recycling Centre has been considered in the past, if it is to be demonstrated at Examination that this Option is feasible evidence needs to be presented to show that a site(s) which meets Policy CS17 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy is deliverable in principle. It is suggested that this could be pursued through a bespoke study which considers potential sites against the criteria of the Policy and other relevant constraints.

The redevelopment of the Station car park following provision of a new multi-storey car park is noted. The new multi-storey car park lies in South Cambridgeshire, and if the County Council were not the developer a planning application for this use would need to be submitted to South Cambridgeshire District Council as it will not be a County Council development.

Question 14: Are there alternative redevelopment options you think we should have considered? For example, do you think the redevelopment options should include more residential development, and if so to what extent?

The inclusion of more residential development within the Options needs to be carefully considered given the presence of the Water Recycling Centre (Options 1-3), strategic aggregates railheads (Options 1-4) and waste uses (Options 1-4). Residential development is particularly sensitive to development like the Water Recycling Centre and amenity issues may arise e.g. associated with odour. Similarly residential development close to the strategic railheads and waste uses may also give rise to amenity issues such as noise and dust. For these reasons these facilities, and other existing and proposed waste management uses, have consultation / safeguarding areas around them designated through the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan. These Areas all seek to prevent essential existing and planned facilities being prejudiced by incompatible development. If additional residential development is proposed it should be located away from these uses, and the evidence base should demonstrate that existing and allocated waste management / aggregate facilities will not be prejudiced, otherwise proposals will not be deliverable.

Question 15: Do you support or object to the proposed approach for place and building design, and why? SUPPORT

Consideration needs to be given to the type of use and the context of the site when setting out the requirements for place and building design, this will be particularly important for waste uses that could be adjacent to the A14 where existing screening and the surrounding uses should be taken into account.

Question 16: Do you support or object to the proposed approach on densities, and why?

Support from an economic development perspective

Question 17: Do you support or object to the proposed approach on tall buildings and skyline, and why?

Any proposals will need to take into account the requirements placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport (referral for 15m and above in this area). In addition to this consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional / unnecessary screening and landscaping.

Support from an economic development perspective.

Question 18a: Do you support or object to the proposed Option A on building heights, and why?

Any proposals will need to take into account the requirements placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport (referral for 15m and above in this area). In addition to this consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional / unnecessary screening and landscaping.

Support an approach which continues the scale and form of development of the Cambridge Business Park perhaps allowing the opportunity to create a single taller landmark building around the new station (subject to the above).

Question 18b: Do you support or object to the proposed Option B on building heights, and why?

Any proposals will need to take into account the restrictions placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport, which includes height of buildings. In addition to this consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional / unnecessary screening and landscaping.

Question 18c: Do you support or object to the proposed Option C on building heights, and why?

Any proposals will need to take into account the requirements placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport (referral for 15m and above in this area). In addition to this consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional / unnecessary screening and landscaping.

Question 18d: Do you have other comments on building heights?

Any proposals will need to take into account the requirements placed upon development by the Safeguarding Zone for Cambridge Airport (referral for 15m and above in this area). In addition to this consideration needs to be given to the views from taller buildings across existing and proposed mineral and waste development to avoid the need for additional / unnecessary screening and landscaping.

Question 19: Do you support or object to the proposed approach and measures to integrate the area with the surrounding communities, and why? SUPPORT

When looking to integrate the area with surrounding communities, the integration of existing uses should also be considered, which includes minerals and waste uses.

Amend text as below

BALANCED AND INTEGRATED COMMUNITIES – EFFECTIVE INTEGRATION WITH THE WIDER AREA: PROPOSED APPROACH:

The CNFE development should be comprehensive in its own right, but to be truly successful measures should be taken to ensure it is also effectively integrated with the wider communities.

This should include measures to achieve:

- ***Integration with the wider area;***
- ***Welcoming entrances to the area;***
- ***Convenient access to new facilities in the development;***
- ***Improved signage;***
- ***Accessible local services and facilities, through new facilities or improvements to nearby facilities;***
- ***Access to appropriate support to ensure the development of cohesive community***
- ***Informal and formal social spaces that support the needs of workers and residents.***

The proposals on integration with the wider community are supported in order to build a successful, healthy and vibrant community.

Question 20: Do you support or object to the proposed approach for employment uses, and why? SUPPORT

Support the intention to provide a range of unit types and sizes, hybrid buildings and laboratory space

The potential of the CNFE to support the cluster of high technology and R&D development is noted. However, it is also one of the very few locations in the Cambridge area which accommodates B2, B8 and sui generis uses which support and provide essential infrastructure for the Cambridge area. This role is reflected in the Options and should not be diminished.

There needs to be greater reference to middle level jobs not just a focus on high skill jobs as it currently reads. This proposed policy seems to focus on high skills jobs, which as of 2013, made up 70% of the jobs in Cambridge – more focus should be made to the middle level jobs which are desperately needed in Cambridge so people can get out of low skill low paid employment. As it stands this policy does not support the development principle as detailed in chapter 7: ***‘Deliver additional flexible employment space to cater for a***

range of business types and sizes, and supporting a wide range of jobs for local income, skills and age groups'

Question 21: Do you support or object to the proposed approach on shared social space, and why?

Support but the viability of such leisure/social facilities may depend on which option/mix of options is selected and the pace of re-development.

The concept of shared space is to be encouraged. The new community including businesses should be consulted on what type of shared space they would like.

Question 22a: Do you support or object to the proposed Option A on change of use from office to residential or other purposes, and why?

Change of use from employment to residential use in a mixed use area could potentially give rise to issues if the property to be changed is in an area where amenity issues may subsequently arise. Removal of prior notification rights is therefore supported.

The employment land should be protected as employment uses. There can be conflicts with some business uses and residential and therefore the master plan will have considered this, allowing change of use may have the effect of pepper potting residential dwellings within established employment areas potentially leading to social isolation.

Question 22b: Do you support or object to the proposed Option B on change of use from office to residential or other purposes, and why? SUPPORT

Change of use from employment to residential use in a mixed use area could potentially give rise to issues if the property to be changed is in an area where amenity issues may subsequently arise. Removal of prior notification rights is therefore supported.

Support in order to protect new employment development from conversion to residential.

Question 22c: Do you have any other comments on change of use from office to residential or other purposes?

No comment.

Question 23a: Do you support or object to the proposed Option A for Cambridge Science Park, and why?

No comment.

Question 23b: Do you support or object to the proposed Option B for Cambridge Science Park, and why? SUPPORT

Support in order to protect the Cambridge Science Park from possible conversions and retain its essential character and attractiveness.

Question 23c: Do you have any other comments on Cambridge Science Park?

No comment.

Question 24a: Do you support or object to the proposed Option A on change of use from industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road, and why?

No comment.

Question 24b: Do you support or object to the proposed Option B on change of use from industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road, and why?

No comment.

Question 24c: Do you support or object to the proposed Option C on change of use from industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road, and why? SUPPORT

Support this option in order to provide a better environment for residents in the Nuffield road area.

Question 24d: Do you have any other comments on change of use from industrial to other purposes at Nuffield Road?

No comment.

Question 25: Do you support or object to the proposed approach on wider employment benefits, and why? Please add any other suggestions you have for policies and proposals that could be promoted through the AAP to support local jobs for local people and reduce barriers to employment in the wider area. SUPPORT

Support proposed approach, however, should include reference to apprenticeships to ensure opportunities for all avenues into work and skills development.

Support the aspiration to provide training and employment opportunities for local people if it can realistically be delivered.

The policies regarding local employment are supported, access to employment is a key wider determinant of health and local employment should be encouraged to cater for local residential development.

Question 26a: Do you support or object to the proposed Option A on hotel and conference facilities, and why?

No comment.

Question 26b: Do you support or object to the proposed Option B on hotel and conference facilities, and why?

If a hotel is provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Support either option B or C but may depend on whether development of a hotel at the entrance to the Science Park goes ahead. Any provision allocation in the AAP needs to be kept flexible if no demand materialises.

Question 26c: Do you support or object to the proposed Option C on hotel and conference facilities, and why?

If a hotel is provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Question 26d: Do you have any other comments on hotel and conference facilities?

If a hotel is provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Question 27: Do you support or object to the proposed approach on housing mix, and why? Please add any other suggestions you have for the types and sizes of houses that should be included within the CNFE area. SUPPORT

If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.

The need to ensure a balanced housing mix is supported. A mix of house types and tenures can help community cohesion and help maintain a healthy development.

Question 28: Do you support or object to the proposed use of Cambridge City Council's affordable housing requirements for the whole of the CNFE area, and why?

If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Affordable housing requirements should be subject to viability and development will need to mitigate a range of services such as education and transport.

Question 29a: Do you support or object to the proposed Option A on private rented accommodation, and why? SUPPORT

If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Support, allow the market to deliver private rented accommodation rather than encourage it given the uncertain implications.

Question 29b: Do you support or object to the proposed Option B on private rented accommodation, and why?

If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Question 29c: If you have any other comments on private rented accommodation please add them here.

If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads, and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Question 30a: Do you support or object to the proposed Option A on student housing, and why? SUPPORT

If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Support especially as the need for student accommodation in the area has yet to be made.

Question 30b: Do you support or object to the proposed Option B on student housing, and why?

If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Question 30c: Do you support or object to the proposed Option C on student housing, and why?

If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Question 30d: Do you support or object to the proposed Option D on student housing, and why?

If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Question 30e: If you have any other comments on student housing please add them here.

If housing (of any type) is to be provided it should be in a location where amenity issues from the Water Recycling Centre, aggregate railheads and existing and planned waste uses will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Question 31: Do you support or object to the proposed approach on provision of services and facilities, and why? Please also add any other suggestions for provision of services and facilities.

The proposed approach to the delivery of supporting services is supported in principle. However, the location of facilities must have regard to other development existing or proposed in the locality, so that potential amenity issues arising for example from proximity to the Water Recycling Centre, waste management uses, and the railheads are avoided and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Supportive of this policy, especially regarding co-location of services for community, retail and leisure uses.

The proposal on services and facilities are supported. Community facilities should be provided early in the development of the residential component of the development. Services and facilities should include community development.

Question 32: Do you support or object to the proposed approach for the new local centre, and why?

The proposed new local centre in Options 2-4 is supported in principle. However, it is noted that it is proposed that this include a residential element and other elements which will be used by people, and in Option 2 the local centre appears to lie partially within the odour zone which is not suitable for such a use. The location of the local centre must have regard to other development existing or proposed in the locality, so that potential amenity issues arising for example from proximity to the Water Recycling Centre, waste management uses, and the railheads are avoided and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Question 33: Do you support or object to the proposed approach on open space standards, and why?

The approach to the provision of open space is supported in principle. However, regard needs to be paid to amenity issues which may arise from other uses in the CNFE area, such as the Water Recycling Centre, waste management uses and railheads which could give rise to dust, noise and odour. Open space needs to be located in a position where such matters will not arise and / or can be satisfactorily mitigated; otherwise the areas will not be capable of being used and enjoyed for the purpose designed.

The policy to require open space is supported, as the action plan area is located in both Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire the local plan with the greater requirement for open space should be followed to ensure enough provision is made.

Access to open space is a key wider determinant of health.

Question 34: Do you support or object to the proposed key transport and movement principles, and why? Please add any other suggestions you have for key transport and movement principles to improve and promote sustainable travel in the area.

See response to question 8.

All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their inter-relationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly the case for those that propose higher levels of development which might require significant transport intervention to ensure that transport impacts are not severe. This applies to both the local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway) and also the strategic road (i.e.: Highways Agency) and rail (i.e.: Network Rail) networks.

The CNFE is a mixed use area with a variety of uses existing and proposed through the AAP. There will be a wide variety of modes of transport ranging from pedestrian and cyclist to heavy commercial vehicles (HCVs) accessing the B2, B8 and Sui Generis areas. It is important to have some degree of separation between HCVs and other users. This is in part encompassed by the objective relating to safety, but the need to separate and avoid conflict between the less compatible transport modes such as HCVs and pedestrian / cyclists could be made more explicit in the transport and movement principles.

The approach on transport is broadly supported particularly the approach on walking and cycling.

Question 35a: Do you support or object to the proposed Option A on modal share target, and why?

All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their inter-relationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly the case for those that propose higher levels of development which might require

significant transport intervention to ensure that transport impacts are not severe. This applies to both the local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway) and also the strategic road (i.e.: Highways Agency) and rail (i.e.: Network Rail) networks.

Question 35b: Do you support or object to the proposed Option B on modal share target, and why?

All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their inter-relationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly the case for those that propose higher levels of development which might require significant transport intervention to ensure that transport impacts are not severe. This applies to both the local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway) and also the strategic road (i.e.: Highways Agency) and rail (i.e.: Network Rail) networks.

Question 35c: Do you support or object to the proposed Option C on modal share target, and why?

All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their inter-relationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly the case for those that propose higher levels of development which might require significant transport intervention to ensure that transport impacts are not severe. This applies to both the local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway) and also the strategic road (i.e.: Highways Agency) and rail (i.e.: Network Rail) networks.

Question 35d: Do you have any other comments on modal share target?

All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their inter-relationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly the case for those that propose higher levels of development which might require significant transport intervention to ensure that transport impacts are not severe. This applies to both the local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway) and also the strategic road (i.e.: Highways Agency) and rail (i.e.: Network Rail) networks.

Question 36a: Do you support or object to the proposed Option A for Cowley Road, and why? NOT SUPPORTED

The CNFE is a mixed use area with a variety of uses existing and proposed through the AAP. There will be an increasing number of users and a wide variety of modes of transport using this area, ranging from pedestrian and cyclists going to the offices and the station, to HCVs accessing the B2, B8 and Sui Generis areas. The redevelopment of the area through the AAP provides an opportunity to improve conditions across all modes for accessing the area. This includes improved separation between HCVs and other users, not least to ensure the safety of those moving in and through the area,

given the significant levels of demand likely to be generated by the AAP proposals, but also to minimise the impact of such traffic on other land uses through the minimisation of noise and vibration of vehicles. There may also be occasion for example where the coated roadstone plant located at the Lafarge Tarmac railhead needs to be active out of hours i.e. when providing material for road repair and resurfacing schemes being undertaken at night, a dedicated HCV access would enable safe access and reduce the potential for amenity issues to arise.

Question 36b: Do you support or object to the proposed Option B for Cowley Road, and why?

Option B is supported above Option A, but less than Option C. There will be an increasing number of users and a wide variety of modes of transport using this area, ranging from pedestrian and cyclists going to the offices and the station, to HCVs accessing the B2, B8 and Sui Generis areas. It is important to have separation between HCVs and other users, not least to ensure the safety of those moving in and through the area, but also to minimise the impact of such traffic on other land uses through the minimisation of noise and vibration of vehicles. There may also be occasion for example where the coated roadstone plant located at the Lafarge Tarmac railhead needs to be active out of hours i.e. when providing material for road repair and resurfacing schemes being undertaken at night, a dedicated HCV access would enable safe access and reduce the potential for amenity issues to arise.

Question 36c: Do you support or object to the proposed Option C for Cowley Road, and why?

Option C is supported above Option A and Option B. The CNFE is a mixed use area with a variety of uses existing and proposed through the AAP. There will be an increasing number of users and a wide variety of modes of transport using this area, ranging from pedestrian and cyclists going to the offices and the station, to HCVs accessing the B2, B8 and Sui Generis areas. It is important to have separation between HCVs and other users, not least to ensure the safety of those moving in and through the area, but also to minimise the impact of such traffic on other land uses through the minimisation of noise and vibration of vehicles. There may also be occasion for example where the coated roadstone plant located at the Lafarge Tarmac railhead needs to be active out of hours i.e. when providing material for road repair and resurfacing schemes being undertaken at night, a dedicated HCV access would enable safe access and reduce the potential for amenity issues to arise. Option C provides a separate access for HCVs and a dedicated access north of Cowley road for the industrial, mineral and waste management activities. This will facilitate even better access to the industrial areas and still maintain separation between less compatible forms of traffic and uses.

Question 36d: Do you have other suggestions for what else could be done to improve vehicular access to the area whilst mitigating the impact of traffic?

All options will require more detailed transport assessment work to understand the transport implications, across all modes, of the proposals including their inter-relationship with emerging proposals under development by the County Council as part of the City Deal programme. Although this is true of all options, this is particularly

the case for those that propose higher levels of development which might require significant transport intervention to ensure that transport impacts are not severe. This applies to both the local networks (walk, cycle, bus, and highway) and also the strategic road (i.e.: Highways Agency) and rail (ie: Network Rail) networks.

Question 37a: Do you support or object to the proposed Option A for parking at the proposed new rail/bus transport interchange, and why?

The County Council would wish to consider the form of car parking provision at a later date when further details are known. It is important to note, however, that car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation and careful consideration will need to be given to balancing operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, and thus ensuring that any residual impacts on the highway network are not severe

Question 37b: Do you support or object to the proposed Option B for parking at the proposed new rail/bus transport interchange, and why?

The County Council would wish to consider the form of car parking provision at a later date when further details are known. It is important to note, however, that car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation and careful consideration will need to be given to balancing operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, and thus ensuring that any residual impacts on the highway network are not severe

Question 37c: Do you have other comments on parking at the proposed new rail/bus transport interchange?

The County Council would wish to consider the form of car parking provision at a later date when further details are known. It is important to note, however, that car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation and careful consideration will need to be given to balancing operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, and thus ensuring that any residual impacts on the highway network are not severe

Question 38a: Do you support or object to the proposed Option A for car parking standards, and why?

As noted above, car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation and careful consideration will need to be given to balancing operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, and thus ensuring that any residual impacts on the highway network are not severe. The County Council therefore considers that more detailed consideration of parking numbers, and the approach to parking provision, will be required including inter-alia detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, the potential for shared use

of parking across different land uses, and impacts of vehicular traffic on the highway networks

Question 38b: Do you support or object to the proposed Option B for car parking standards, and why?

As noted above, car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation and careful consideration will need to be given to balancing operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, and thus ensuring that any residual impacts on the highway network are not severe. The County Council therefore considers that more detailed consideration of parking numbers, and the approach to parking provision, will be required including inter-alia detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, the potential for shared use of parking across different land uses, and impacts of vehicular traffic on the highway networks

Question 38c: Do you support or object to the proposed Option C for car parking standards, and why?

As noted above, car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation and careful consideration will need to be given to balancing operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, and thus ensuring that any residual impacts on the highway network are not severe. The County Council therefore considers that more detailed consideration of parking numbers, and the approach to parking provision, will be required including inter-alia detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, the potential for shared use of parking across different land uses, and impacts of vehicular traffic on the highway networks

Question 38d: Do you have other comments on car parking standards?

As noted above, car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation and careful consideration will need to be given to balancing operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, and thus ensuring that any residual impacts on the highway network are not severe. The County Council therefore considers that more detailed consideration of parking numbers, and the approach to parking provision, will be required including inter-alia detailed assessment of non-car trip patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, the potential for shared use of parking across different land uses, and impacts of vehicular traffic on the highway networks

Question 39a: Do you support or object to the proposed Option A for cycle parking standards, and why?

As noted above, car parking provision has a strong relationship to traffic generation and careful consideration will need to be given to balancing operational needs of the site, with encouraging high levels of access by non-car means and supporting sustainable transport access to the site, and thus ensuring that any residual impacts on the highway network are not severe. The County Council therefore considers that more detailed consideration of parking numbers, and the approach to parking provision, will be required including inter-alia detailed assessment of non-car trip

patterns, mode split targets, the relationship to standards, the potential for shared use of parking across different land uses, and impacts of vehicular traffic on the highway networks

Question 39b: Do you support or object to the proposed Option B for cycle parking standards, and why?

The ability to park a cycle in a safe, secure, and convenient location is a key aspect of encouraging and supporting travel by bike. The County Council considers that cycle parking provision at least in line with standards will be required. However, further more detailed analysis will be needed on cycle mode share and targets to determine an appropriate level that seeks to maximise cycle access to the area. This is likely to confirm a level of provision in excess of standards given the high levels of non-car mode split likely to be required but as noted this will require further, more detailed, analysis.

Increased cycle parking is in line with increasing modal share to walking and Cycling, and Active Transport is a key wider determinant of health.

Question 39c: Do you support or object to the proposed Option C for cycle parking standards, and why?

The ability to park a cycle in a safe, secure, and convenient location is a key aspect of encouraging and supporting travel by bike. The County Council considers that cycle parking provision at least in line with standards will be required. However, further more detailed analysis will be needed on cycle mode share and targets to determine an appropriate level that seeks to maximise cycle access to the area. This is likely to confirm a level of provision in excess of standards given the high levels of non-car mode split likely to be required but as noted this will require further, more detailed, analysis.

Question 39d: Do you have other comments on cycle parking standards?

The ability to park a cycle in a safe, secure, and convenient location is a key aspect of encouraging and supporting travel by bike. The County Council considers that cycle parking provision at least in line with standards will be required. However, further more detailed analysis will be needed on cycle mode share and targets to determine an appropriate level that seeks to maximise cycle access to the area. This is likely to confirm a level of provision in excess of standards given the high levels of non-car mode split likely to be required but as noted this will require further, more detailed, analysis.

Question 40: What further provision should be made to improve the cycle and pedestrian environment in the Cambridge Northern Fringe East area, and are there any other pedestrian and cycleway linkages that are important and you wish to be included in the plan?

Any considerations for further provision of cycle and pedestrian access in CNFE should take account of both the existing and planned mineral and waste activities in the area and the importance of separation between HCVs and other users.

Question 41a: Do you support or object to the proposed Option A for Cowley Road, and why?

We would be content to rely on Local Plan policies related to climate change and sustainable design and construction.

Question 41b: Do you support or object to the proposed Option B for Cowley Road, and why?

At present the proposal to develop a bespoke sustainable design and construction policy for CNFE through Option B seeks a minimum BREEAM standard of 'excellent' for all 'new non-residential development' under point (a). As 'new non-residential development' would include future mineral and waste applications, where operations can be designed without the need for a building, we would question whether a minimum standard of BREEAM excellent is relevant in these circumstances? As such we would recommend that point (a) is reworded to make reference to non-residential built development in the form of offices and industrial units etc. which excludes mineral and waste uses. In the case of mineral and waste applications it would be better to seek a high environmental application which will deliver the standards required without using BREEAM which is not considered appropriate. This is already sought through adopted policy in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (particularly Policies CS22 Climate Change and CS24 Design of Sustainable Minerals and Waste Management Facilities) and the two adopted Waste Management Design Guides (The Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities 2011, and the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide 2012).

Question 41c: Do you have other policy option suggestion for sustainable design and construction and flood risk?

No comment.

Question 42: Do you support or object to the proposed approach on renewable and low carbon energy generation, and why? If you have other policy option suggestions for renewable and low carbon energy generation please add your suggestions.

The requirement for new waste management processing facilities to carry out a feasibility study for the potential for anaerobic digestion is onerous and inappropriate. The waste management uses proposed for this area through the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan are a Household Recycling Centre (dealing with bulky household waste items) and a permanent inert waste recycling facility; neither of these facilities would be treating organic municipal waste. As part of the Waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI) contract with AmeyCespa arrangements are already in place for the treatment of municipal organic waste until 2036, which means that this aspiration is unlikely to be deliverable. In order for an anaerobic digestion facility to be viable a significant quantity of organic waste would be required, a municipal waste contract is likely to be needed to give surety of supply before other sources of waste are secured. Such a facility would also give rise to additional HCV movements and potentially amenity issues, depending on access arrangements and the location of the facility. The only suitable location for anaerobic

digestion would appear to be the Water Recycling Centre where sludge treatment works, involving the importation of sludge from elsewhere, is already in place.

Question 43: Do you support or object to the proposed approach on Health Impact Assessments, and why? SUPPORT

This approach is supported for residential and office / industrial built development; However, it would be prudent to require a Full Health Impact Assessment for all residential development given the mixed use of the area, especially if residential development is located in proximity to the Water Recycling Centre and / or aggregates railheads and other uses which have the potential to give rise to amenity issues.

In the case of future minerals and waste development on CNFE, where activities may largely be conducted outside of a building and are considered compatible with the existing surrounding minerals and waste uses, this should be acknowledged within the proposed approach. It is therefore recommended that the proposed approach is strengthened in relation to residential development and remains as identified for office type built development, with an acknowledgement that minerals and waste uses are excluded from this requirement.

The requirement of requiring a health impact assessment is supported. The concept of requiring a Health Impact Assessment accords with the South Cambridgeshire local plan (current and proposed) and with the Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Strategy with requires: *“Ensure that housing, land use planning and development strategies for new and existing communities consider the health and wellbeing impacts for residents in the short and long term.”*

Question 44: Are there alternative policy approaches or policy options you think we should have considered?

No comment.

Question 45: Are there any other policy areas that need to be specifically addressed in the Area Action Plan rather than relying on the Local Plans?

No comment.

Question 46: Do you support or object to the Councils’ views on Infrastructure, and why?

We would recommend that ‘waste infrastructure’ is added to this section. The inclusion of waste would be consistent with the approach set out within the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD (2012) which highlights the importance of designing in waste infrastructure at the outset to support a sustainable community. This would involve all elements of waste infrastructure and storage requirements for housing and businesses, right up to the Household Recycling Centre provision.

Furthermore, although Para 10.5 states that infrastructure provision will be funded through a number of sources, we are still concerned that the viability of some of the options is still unclear, which questions the delivery of some of the proposals. This needs to be clarified going forward.

Question 47a: Do you support or object to the proposed Option A on phasing and delivery approach, and why?

Option A is realistic as it accepts that development will come forward in the different areas of the CNFE at different times. This is particularly the case if Options 3 or 4 were pursued, both of which foresee major changes to the Water Recycling Centre. These options are dependent upon a viable financial arrangement being in place, and may take a considerable time to deliver.

Question 47b: Do you support or object to the proposed Option B on phasing and delivery approach, and why?

Option B may be difficult to deliver given that a developer of the early phases may not be aware of issues and constraints in areas they do not propose to develop, and therefore it may not be appropriate to propose detailed master planning proposals for other areas of the CNFE. In particular the reduction in size and enclosure of the Water Recycling Centre in Option 3 could take different forms and be located in different ways on the site depending on the constraints placed on the redevelopment by the inlet works and other technical aspects of the development.

Question 48: Do you have any comments on Plan Monitoring?

No comments.

Question 49: Do you have any other comments about the CNFE area and/or Area Action Plan? If you wish to make suggestions, please provide your comments.

Viability calculations will need to factor in the very real transport challenges as well as those associated with redesigned/relocated water recycling works.

The comments in this response are those of Cambridgeshire County Council Officers and are subject to comment and endorsement by the Council's Economy & Environment Committee in March 2015.