

| CHAPTER 3: THE CURRENT DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY               |  |
|---|--|
| QUESTION NO.  | SUMMARY OF REPS  |
| QUESTION / PARAGRAPH                                      |  |
| Paragraph 3.1<br><br>Support:1<br>Object: 4<br>Comment: 1 | <b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fenland District Council</b> - welcomes the recognition that Cambridge has a high demand for housing.</li> </ul> <b>OBJECTIONS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge should not develop as a shopping centre or as a dormitory for London.</li> <li>• Rapid growth is not a measure of success.</li> <li>• More growth will bring more congestion.</li> <li>• Growth will not bring prosperity for most residents.</li> </ul> <b>COMMENTS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth is inevitable and welcome but should be more broadly based.</li> </ul> |
| Paragraph 3.2<br><br>Support:0<br>Object: 2<br>Comment: 2 | <b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Councils must plan for substantial growth to be compliant with Government policy.</li> <li>• Constrain growth at Cambridge and in the County to benefit other areas of the country that need it more.</li> </ul> <b>COMMENTS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The phrase 'high-quality' is meaningless and must be defined each time it is used.</li> <li>• Release more land from the Green belt in South Cambridgeshire to allow the economy to grow.</li> </ul>  |
| Paragraph 3.3<br><br>Support:1<br>Object: 1<br>Comment: 1 | <b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the business parks most of which are well designed.</li> </ul> <b>OBJECTIONS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New homes are needed close to the business parks to comply with the NPPF.</li> </ul> <b>COMMENTS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be a greater Cambridge political authority.</li> </ul>  |
| Paragraph 3.4<br><br>Support:0<br>Object: 2<br>Comment: 0 | <b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Councils must not revert to a dispersal strategy. If they do their plans will be unsound with regard to NPPF paragraph 37.</li> <li>• The Councils must stick to a Cambridge focussed strategy.</li> </ul> <b>COMMENTS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>  |
| Paragraph 3.6<br><br>Support:2<br>Object: 0<br>Comment: 0 | <b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>East Cambs District Council</b> - Welcome recognition of the development sequence set out in paragraph 3.6 of the Part 1 document (e.g. within Cambridge, on the edge of Cambridge, at Northstowe, and in the market towns and better</li> </ul>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>served villages in South Cambridgeshire), and agree with the Inspectors conclusions that it remains the most sustainable strategy for the two District to 2016 and beyond (as set out in paragraph 6.9).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fenland District Council</b> - Agree with the 'sequential approach' identified at 3.6, namely that development be located within Cambridge, then edge of Cambridge, then Northstowe, then better served market towns.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b><br/><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> |
| <p>Paragraph 3.8</p> <p>Support:0<br/>Object: 3<br/>Comment: 0</p>  | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b><br/><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The figures in the Housing Supply Table are out of date.</li> <li>• The strategy should concentrate on sites where infrastructure already exists to speed up delivery.</li> <li>• Northstowe should be included in the table.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>  |
| <p>Paragraph 3.9</p> <p>Support:0<br/>Object: 2<br/>Comment: 0</p>  | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b><br/><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 2003 strategy was developed in more positive economic times and must not dictate current strategy development.</li> <li>• More land must be allocated for housing to address housing needs and make up for the loss of Cambridge East.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>   |
| <p>Paragraph 3.10</p> <p>Support:0<br/>Object: 3<br/>Comment: 0</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b><br/><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A further review of the Green Belt is necessary to identify more capacity to address affordability and climate change issues.</li> <li>• A lower growth percentage is better than the higher percentage planned for in the past.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>   |
| <p>Paragraph 3.11</p> <p>Support:0<br/>Object: 3<br/>Comment: 0</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b><br/><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The figures in the Housing Supply Table are out of date.</li> <li>• The housing supply figures include sites which are unlikely to be delivered.</li> <li>• Cambridge should plan for dense development in and one the edge of the city supported by infrastructure and public transport. A dispersal strategy is contrary to NPPF principles.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>   |
| <p>Paragraph 3.12</p> <p>Support:0<br/>Object: 1<br/>Comment: 0</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b><br/><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To reduce car commuting improve public transport and cycling facilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>   |
| <p>Paragraph 3.14</p>   | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>Support:1<br/>Object: 2<br/>Comment: 1</p>                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CDS actually identifies congestion issues with all growth strategies. Hence future growth should aim to make best use of existing infrastructure in places close to jobs such as on the south-western side of Cambridge.</li> <li>• A Cambridge centred growth strategy allows simpler transport solutions. Emphasis must be placed on rail and cycle solutions.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Cambridge Green Belt must go to allow economic growth, and new housing and transport. Lack of a transport strategy in the plan is a major weakness.</li> </ul> |
| <p>Paragraph 3.15</p> <p>Support:0<br/>Object: 2<br/>Comment: 2</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CDS advocated a Cambridge first strategy. To do otherwise would make the Local plans unsound with regard to the NPPF paragraph 37.</li> <li>• Further Cambridge growth is not sustainable. Move jobs and housing to the market towns. Housing growth in Cambridge serves London commuters not Cambridge workers.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CDS methodology and findings were not agreed by all stakeholders</li> <li>• The plan must not constrain market choices and the market wants to build at Cambridge.</li> </ul>   |
| <p>Paragraph 3.16</p> <p>Support:0<br/>Object: 2<br/>Comment: 0</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• References to a "rolling forward of the current development strategy" are incorrect, the actual regional housing targets were much higher (950 per year and not 700 per year).</li> <li>• The Council plans must emphasise housing growth over job growth in Cambridge to correct the current imbalance between the two which leads to commuting across the Green Belt.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>   |
| <p>Paragraph 3.17</p> <p>Support:1<br/>Object: 3<br/>Comment: 1</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree this is a key issue.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The case for a Cambridge focussed growth strategy has not changed. A dispersal strategy would be contrary to the NPPF paragraph 37.</li> <li>• There is no justification for a Green Belt review. The emphasis should be on one or more new settlements.</li> <li>• Growth beyond that already planned for will be harmful to the success of Cambridge as a high-tech innovation centre as its small size allows better interaction and more trust. Disperse low tech growth away from Cambridge.</li> </ul>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A unitary Greater Cambridge Authority is needed.</li> </ul>  |
| <p>Paragraph 3.18</p> <p>Support: 1<br/>Object: 1<br/>Comment: 0</p> | <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support need for reviews.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The case for a Cambridge focussed growth strategy has not changed. A dispersal strategy would be contrary to the NPPF paragraph 37.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> |