

Summary of Issues and Options 2012 comments on Broad Locations in the Green Belt

Figure a. Map of broad locations



**Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council
Issue and Options Consultation on Broad Locations in the Green Belt**

Question / options no.	SUMMARY OF REPS
<p>1. Land to the North and South of Barton Road (including land in both districts)</p> <p>City: Support: 4 Object: 91</p> <p>SCDC: Support:5 Object: 53 Comment: 6</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The release of sensitive Green Belt land around Cambridge is not unprecedented e.g. North West Cambridge; • Suitable site for residential development with employment, shops, schools, services and open space provision (including a wildlife reserve and country park); • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge area including for affordable housing, such need has been exacerbated by the lack of development at Cambridge East; • Close to West Cambridge, housing development here would complement its employment floorspace; • The location would encourage sustainable modes of transport; • Low density, well landscaped, sensitive and high quality development acceptable. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • Substantial Green Belt release has only recently been sanctioned so further release should not be contemplated. There should be a settling in period of at least 10 years to allow for the impact of current developments on the edge of Cambridge to be assessed; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • The land is in a highly sensitive area of the Green Belt, which is important to the setting of the city and adjacent conservation area and forms an important approach to the city. Forms a vital part of the Quarter to Six Quadrant; • Forms part of the wider setting of the historic core of Cambridge and the large number of highly graded listed buildings within the core; • The site contains the remnants of the West Field and almost certainly contains archaeological remains dating at least as far back as the Roman occupation. New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge; • Would destroy the last remaining vista of the historic core and the last remaining stretch of road into Cambridge not subject to urban sprawl; • The area is important for wildlife, including

	<p>threatened species;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area should not be designated for housing but for playing fields and recreation; • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful • Part of setting for Grantchester Meadows and Coton Country Park • Loss of a green lung for Cambridge which is easy to access on foot; • Loss of recreation facilities contrary to NPPF; • Would bring development closer to necklace villages; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity, Barton Road already heavily congested; • Development would make it harder to commute into Cambridge by car along Barton Road • Would bring more traffic through Grantchester • Impact on local services and facilities; • Land close to Bin Brook is subject to flooding and development could increase flood risk downstream; • Noise and air quality concerns close to M11; • Inadequate water supply to support development; • Site rejected in the past and nothing has changed to reduce the importance of the area; • Inadequate local infrastructure including schools. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The QTSC should be preserved & enhanced; • A limited area may be possible to develop if well landscaped.
<p>2. Playing Fields off Grantchester Road, Newnham (includes land in both districts)</p> <p>City: Support: 1 Object: 69</p> <p>SCDC: Support:2 Object: 47 Comment: 4</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge; • Low density, well landscaped, sensitive and high quality development acceptable. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • Substantial Green Belt release has only recently been sanctioned so further release should not be contemplated. There should be a settling in period of at least 10 years to allow for the impact of current developments on the edge of Cambridge to be assessed; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages) • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the

	<p>character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is in a highly sensitive area of the Green Belt, which is important to the setting of the city and adjacent conservation area and forms an important approach to the city. Forms a vital part of the Quarter to Six Quadrant; • Would bring development closer to Grantchester • Harmful to tourism; • Impact on Grantchester Meadows; • Would lead to the loss of a green finger running into the centre of Cambridge; • Impact on local services and amenities; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity, Grantchester Road inadequate; • Would bring more traffic through Grantchester; • Could lead to the loss of the allotments, which represent an important facility for the community; • Would destroy the village feel of Newnham; • Would lead to unacceptable levels of traffic on Barton Road and Fen Causeway which are already heavily congested; • Development would make it harder to commute into Cambridge by car along Barton Road; • Flood risk to rugby club land, development could exacerbate flooding to neighbouring properties; • Inadequate water supply to support development; • Could increase flood risk downstream; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity; • Loss of playing fields should be resisted and is contrary to the NPPF; • The area is important for wildlife, including threatened species. The site forms an important wildlife corridor linking to the Backs and Grantchester Meadows; • Development of this site has been rejected in the past, and the reasons for this remain unchanged. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The QTSC should be preserved & enhanced; • Perhaps a small development away from the River would be acceptable.
<p>3. Land West of Trumpington Road (includes land in Cambridge only)</p> <p>City: Support: 1 Object: 64</p> <p>SCDC: Support:3</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge; • Well landscaped, sensitive and high quality development acceptable if away from river. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • The area forms a sensitive part of the Green Belt and should remain as such. It plays a very important part in the overall setting of the city and

<p>Object: 43 Comment: 3</p>	<p>its rural edge is a vital characteristic of Cambridge that should be protected;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); and have a negative impact on the Southacre Conservation Area; • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge; • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful; • Would impinge on a Green Corridor and add to urban sprawl; • Site assessed previously and rejected, nothing has changed since then to alter that conclusion; • Impact on Grantchester Meadows, important green lung for residents and visitors; • Part of the setting to Grantchester, and Grantchester Meadows; • Loss of playing fields should be resisted and is contrary to the NPPF; • Loss of green separation between Cambridge and Trumpington; • The site forms an important part of the river valley wildlife corridor. The area is important for wildlife, including threatened species; • Development would lead to the loss of high quality agricultural land; • Additional road junctions required by development would damage appearance of tree lined approach to City; • The trees along Trumpington Road form part of a Woodland Wildlife Site; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity, Trumpington Road could not cope with the additional traffic generated by the development; • Inadequate water supply to support development; • Could increase flood risk downstream. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The QTSC should be preserved & enhanced
<p>4. Land West of Hauxton Road (includes land in both districts)</p> <p>City: Support: 4 Object: 41</p> <p>SCDC: Support:7 Object: 50</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are exceptional circumstances; • Would be a sustainable development with 10.49 Ha of outdoor sports pitches, 8.65 hectare extension to Trumpington Meadows Country park a community stadium with a capacity of c8,000, indoor sports provision; • Logical extension to City without compromising neighbouring necklace villages. M11 forms a natural Southern boundary;

Comment: 4

- Could help meet development needs of Cambridge;
 - Land already compromised by development;
 - Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable;
 - Good access;
 - Minimal landscape impact.
- OBJECTIONS:**
- No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development;
 - No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages);
 - New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge;
 - Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful;
 - Development would conflict with the aim of having a "quality edge" on the southern approach to Cambridge;
 - Loss of landscaped foreground to the new city edge;
 - Highly visible site on rising ground;
 - Coalescence with Hauxton / Harston;
 - Development would adversely impact on the setting of the adjacent new country park, including Byrons Pool and the river;
 - Community Stadium not appropriate in this sensitive gateway location;
 - Involves loss of open space needed to form a positive southern boundary to the city, and buffer Trumpington Meadows from the motorway;
 - Would erode the amenity value of the Trumpington Meadows country park;
 - Inadequate water supply to support development;
 - Could increase flood risk downstream;
 - Would worsen traffic and make it harder to commute to work;
 - Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity;
 - Noise and air quality concerns close to M11;
 - Noise from the stadium,
 - Impact on local services and amenities including schools (Primary school at Trumpington Meadows incapable of extension);
 - New retail should be in city centre;
 - Allow new development to be completed and settled before more is contemplated.
- COMMENTS:**
- Minor development acceptable;
 - Broad Location 4 should include the WWTW at

	<p>Bayer Cropscience;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The QTSC should be preserved & enhanced.
<p>5. Land South of Addenbrooke's Road (includes land in both districts)</p> <p>City: Support: 7 Object: 30</p> <p>SCDC: Support:9 Object: 43 Comment: 5</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Logical extension to City without compromising neighbouring necklace villages. M11 forms a natural Southern boundary; Would provide a employment-led, mixed-use neighbourhood in a sustainable location with 45 hectares of office/research and employment development (science park), 1,250 market, affordable and key worker dwellings, local shops and community facilities, a primary school, public open space, strategic landscaping, highways and other supporting infrastructure; Could help meet development needs of Cambridge; Would assist the delivery of high levels of employment growth in Cambridge; Sustainable location high in development sequence established by 2003 Structure Plan; Good transport network nearby; Site is available and can be delivered in plan period; Land already compromised by development, would not harm Green Belt purposes; Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable; Would allow for enhancement of nearby habitats and increased access to the countryside; Yes, provided views maintained and clear separation between development and Great Shelford; Potential for major growth which has little impact on character / townscape and landscape setting of city. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); Allow new development to be completed and settled before more is contemplated, area is already overdeveloped; Planning inspectors have ruled Addenbrooke's Road is a sensible Green Belt boundary; New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge; Would compromise planned Green Belt edge on Glebe Road; Development south of Glebe Road rejected in earlier plans and nothing has changed since then;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would lead to ribbon development; • Would lead to coalescence with Great Shelford; • Harmful impact on views of Cambridge from the Gogs; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity; • Inadequate local school places, services and facilities; • Would worsen traffic and slow ambulances going to Addenbrooke's Hospital; • Noise and air quality concerns close to M11; • Loss of amenity, open spaces and land for walking; • Could increase flood risk downstream. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not as intrusive as other options • Minor development on non-elevated land would be acceptable • Not too bad, plenty of new housing going on nearby and decent roads • The southern limit of this site would need to be defined with care. If extended too far to the south it could swamp Great Shelford. • This is the better of the options, as it continues on from existing developments. However, it could cause congestion and the transport infrastructure would need to be improved to cope
<p>6. Land South of Addenbrooke's Road between Babraham Road and Shelford Road (includes land in both districts)</p> <p>City: Support: 4 Object: 35</p> <p>SCDC: Support:6 Object: 37 Comment: 3</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical extension to City without compromising neighbouring necklace villages; • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge including affordable homes; • Would deliver new infrastructure to help serve existing uses; • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable; • Yes, provided views maintained and clear separation between development and Great Shelford. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge; • Would lead to coalescence with Great Shelford; • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful; • No development south of the Addenbrooke's

	<p>Access Road which is a clear Green belt boundary;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undermine the new planned edge for the city; • Would create an isolated new community; • Used for recreation, important to preserve the unspoiled view of White Hill; • Harmful to views from the Gogs and Wandlebury; • Development should not encroach upon Nine Wells and to the land on either side of Granhams Road, which has landscape value; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity; • Would worsen traffic and slow ambulances going to Addenbrooke's Hospital; • Could constrain long term growth of the Biomedical Campus; • Would lead to ribbon development distant from existing communities; • Inadequate local school places, services and facilities; • Inadequate local school places, services and facilities; • Damage to biodiversity and Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not as intrusive as other options; • Minor development on non-elevated land would be acceptable; • Area between Shelford Road and Babraham Road is of high value landscape. Some small areas to the rear of Shelford Road could be developed with a tree belt edge continuing the boundary of the Clay Farm 'green wedge'.
<p>7. Land between Babraham Road and Fulbourn Road (includes land in both districts)</p> <p>City: Support: 5 Object: 38</p> <p>SCDC: Support:6 Object: 69 Comment: 3</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical extension to City without compromising neighbouring necklace villages; • Could help meet housing and employment development needs of Cambridge; • Deliverable in plan period; • Could provide for up to 4,000 new homes in a sustainable location close to the jobs at the Addenbrooke's Hospital, Marshalls and ARM; • Would allow for expansion of Peterhouse Technology Park; • Can provide significant open space and recreation areas; • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable; • Already compromised; • Could minimise the starkness of Addenbrooke's; • Low lying land development would have less impact. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green

	<p>Belt development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful; • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge; • Very important to the special character and setting of Cambridge as elevated with important views; • Majority of land is elevated with important views - development could not easily be screened from other vantage points; • Worts' Causeway and minor road over hill towards Fulbourn provide a well-used route for leisure access to countryside and development along this corridor would have a significant negative impact; • Harmful to setting and character of Fulbourn; • Contrary to the conclusions of earlier Green Belt studies and to those of the Inspector when considering proposals for housing at Netherhall Farm in 2006; • Important for amenity and recreation; • Impact on tranquillity of the countryside; • Impact on traffic; • Harmful to views from the Gogs and Wandlebury and of high landscape value; • Damage to biodiversity and Nature Reserves. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The part of the area either side of Worts' Causeway which is on level ground would seem to be the most unobtrusive of all the sites. • Minor development on non-elevated land would be acceptable if the done with sensitivity to preserve the best of the landscape.
<p>8. Land East of Gazelle Way (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only)</p> <p>City: Support: 7 Object: 15</p> <p>SCDC: Support: 7 Object: 64 Comment: 6</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable; • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge; • Little impact on character / townscape and landscape setting of city subject to landscape and woodland buffers; • Strong possibility provided a clear (green) corridor retained for Teversham village; • Would not involve views of the historic city; • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green

	<p>Belt development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful; • Loss of countryside, adverse impact on concept of a compact city; • Loss of rolling agricultural land with good views of Cambridge; • Would reduce the separation of Fulbourn from Cambridge which is already compromised by the Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospital sites, and Tesco, making retention of open land to the north more important; • Developing this land would turn Teversham into a suburb of Cambridge and destroy the character of the village; • Impacts of road network, local roads already congested; • Inadequate public transport to support development. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to comment without knowing potential dwelling numbers; • Minimal impact on the setting of the city and good transport links. This would indicate Broad Location 8 as the least worst of the options; • Development would lead to merger with Fulbourn which should be avoided, however Teversham could be expanded north and eastwards considerably: there is little landscape value in that area.
<p>9. Land at Fen Ditton (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only)</p> <p>City: Support: 4 Object: 22</p> <p>SCDC: Support: 9 Object: 43 Comment: 6</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable location to provide much needed homes and/or employment for the Cambridge area; • Could provide a foot/cycle bridge over the river Cam to link to the Science Park and the new rail station; • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge including affordable housing; • Development would retain a strategic green edge along A14, thereby preserving openness of immediate area and wider landscaped setting of Cambridge; • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable; • Little impact on character / townscape and landscape setting of city subject to landscape and woodland buffers.

	<p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • Fen Ditton is a historic settlement, most of which has been designated a Conservation Area. Additional housing development of any size in this area would subsume Fen Ditton into the city; • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in (other) Green Belt villages would be less harmful; • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of maintaining rural setting of Fen Ditton; • Importance of Green Belt has been examined through South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Development Framework and through various planning applications, which have dismissed development as inappropriate. • Negative impact on East Cambridge road network, which is one of the most congested in the city; • Existing public transport links are minimal (2 buses a day) and unable to support an enlarged settlement travelling for employment; • The infrastructure could not support any further development. • Would lead to urban sprawl, Cambridge could accommodate more by building taller; • Inadequate roads and other transport links; • Would lead to congestion, existing traffic bottleneck at the bottom of Ditton Lane at peak times, and bus services are likely to be reduced in near future; • Unsustainable location, the only bus is about to be withdrawn, there is no village shop, the sewage system is overburdened and inadequate, and the B1047 already carries a heavy vehicular load; • Commons on the river corridor are essential open space for the city; • Noise from the A14; • Open and rural nature of land between Chesterton and Fen Ditton is highly prized and has been identified by local and city people as essential open space. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to comment without knowing potential dwelling numbers; • Development might be possible if Fen Ditton village can be adequately protected and significant
--	--

	<p>improvements are made to the transport system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There must be a 'buffer zone' between development and the edge of the River to preserve rural character of the Green Corridor.
<p>10. Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only)</p> <p>City: Support: 8 Object: 14</p> <p>SCDC: Support:7 Object: 32 Comment: 5</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable location for housing and employment development including strategic open space, transport, noise and air quality issues can be mitigated; • Best of the 10 Broad Locations, least effect on the landscape; • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge; • This land is not easily accessed for recreation and too close to the A14 to be really worth keeping as Green Belt; • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable; • Little impact on character / townscape and landscape setting of city subject to landscape and woodland buffers. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • This land forms a buffer between the village of Girton and the City, without it Girton could be subsumed as a suburb to the city; • Development would have negative impacts on Girton; • Close to A14 so will not be a pleasant place to live; • Flood risk downstream, site could be used for a reservoir to serve the North-West developments • NIAB and NIAB2 have failed to provide strategic green infrastructure and allocation of this area for development would only compound the short-sighted decisions of the Councils regarding this area; • Loss of green corridor for wildlife. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to comment without knowing potential dwelling numbers; • This should be kept mostly as open space with some low density development;