

QTSQ PUBLIC CONSULTATION EXERCISE

No.	Author	Response	Amendment to Consultation Draft <i>(page refs are to the page numbers in the consultation draft, the version with no cover sheet)</i>
1	Sara Hennesy 5 Stulp Field Road Grantchester Cambs. CB3 9NL	Congratulations on a clear, balanced, common sense and informative (though lengthy!) document. I agree completely with the points and suggestions made.	None
2	Terry Childerley	I would like to think that if the general consensus of opinion, after the public meeting agrees with the consultation draft, then I believe there should be a petition circulated. I believe that the current government will do their utmost to push as many housing projects through, regardless of local opinion. Therefore I think that any ammunition to support the local cause would be beneficial. Evidence that cannot be refuted. I am also concerned about any conflict of interest concerning parish councillors, or their families offering land for sale for housing, in relation to the local development framework.	None
3	Michael Foster	An impressive and enlightening draft. Thank you for all the hours and energy that went into it. I hope it will receive the recognition and credit due, and these rural lungs will be kept healthy.	None
4	Dr R Anthony Cox, 4, College Farm Court, High Street, Barton, Cambridgeshire, CB23 7A	I wish to record how much impressed I was with the arguments presented in the 'Quarter-to-six-Quartile' plan proposed by the four villages (Barton, Coton, Grantchester and Trumpington) for development to the south-west of the City of Cambridge. Since moving to the Cambridge area 16 years ago to an academic post, and with a long held interest in the environment and the natural world, I have felt that the landscape, countryside stewardship and community access in this particular area represent the very best of the traditions of our lowland English countryside. I believe that it is in the best interests of everyone living in or near Cambridge, of just visiting Cambridge, that the character of this area remains for the benefit of future generations. These points are well articulated in the QTSQ paper and I give it my full support.	None
5	Andrew Roberts (Trumpington Residents' Association)	Many thanks for the vision document which we've received, very impressive	None
6	Margaret and Malcolm Flook 3 Roman Hill	We agree with Barton Parish Council's vision for the area	None
7	HILARY CACCHIO	I have received and read the QTSQ consultation draft and broadly agree with your vision and offer you my support	None
8	Sian Reid (Cambridge City Councillor, Newnham Ward)	It is a really nice idea to bring Newnham in on this exercise	None
9	(Dr) Robert Hunt.	As a resident of Coton (5 Sadlers Close) I am writing to express my support for the consultation draft distributed with the latest issue of the Coton Community News. It has evidently been written with a great deal of care, thought and intelligence, and must have taken a great deal of time. It makes its points clearly and forcefully (though perhaps the analogy with National Parks on page 48 was drawing a comparison too far!). Thank you for your efforts	None
10	Sir David Harrison	Thank you for sending me a copy of 'A joint vision' which it is good to have.	None

		I have no additional points to make on behalf of the Gough Way Residents' Association, of which I am Chairman. It is however particularly useful to have a copy (in Appendix 4) of the High Court Judgement re Barton Road 2008. This Residents' Association has consistently and strongly opposed further development to the north and south of the Barton Road between the City limit and the M11	
11	Keith and Ruth Barnes 33 Kings Grove Barton Cambridge CB23 7AZ	Thank you for our copy of the consultation draft re QTSQ. We think it is a comprehensive and informative document which has clearly taken some considerable time to prepare. We would completely agree with the ethos and sentiment expressed, and fully support the aims and objectives contained within the consultation draft. We hope the document receives the consideration it deserves as part of the planning process, for the future benefit of all concerned. Thank you again	None
12	Rosemary Hand	Thank you for all the work you have done on our behalf.	None
13	J Magill 2 Hines Close Barton	In light of the work you have done on the Quarter-to-Six Quadrant Document I would like to thank you for the hard work you have done and would like to express my full support.	None
14	Stuart Gibbs	I just wanted to give you some of my views for the area, I live in Little Eversden and frequent the villages talked about i.e. Grantchester and Barton. I really don't want to see this area become any more developed, I believe its fine the way it is and to put in any more large developments would spoil the area's natural beauty which we are very fortunate to have around here.	None
15	Vicky Smith	I have read the consultation document all the way through, sitting in the sun in the back garden, and very good it is too - well written, clearly set out and easy to understand. The argument progresses well and I am almost convinced..... but not entirely. My problem is - just how rural are we really, or are we deluding ourselves? In reality, the motorway and other major roads cut the villages off from Cambridge and from each other, and Grantchester from its agricultural hinterland. They form a massive barrier, both physical and psychological, and cast a dark shadow over the whole of the area in question. In our back garden, the noise from the motorway is intrusive and constant, day and night. It blights our use of the garden all year round, but especially in the summer, when we would like nothing better than to enjoy the "peace and holy quiet" of Grantchester. But it just ain't so at this end of the village. And walks into the fields behind are similarly affected - as one gets closer to the M11, conversation has to stop. Rambles along the footpaths into Barton are spoilt by the sight and sound of traffic - lorries thundering by are not in my view, indicative of a rural idyll and ruin an otherwise delightful area. So just how pleasant can a rural park here be? Isn't the domination of the M11 and other roads too impossible to ignore? A walk in Coton Countryside Reserve, in the shadow of the motorway, is not actually the delightful prospect that people might be expecting. The report mentions that the noise problem would be addressed. I would be interested to hear from you as to what noise amelioration measures there are that might help the problem. Covering the motorway over seems the best solution, but hardly one that I expect would be doable! I also wondered whether you could tell me if the M11 had been resurfaced with a less noise-reducing surface than it had before, for I believe the noise has become louder in the last few years since the resurfacing took place. Or is this due to larger lorries / greater volumes of traffic	None
16	Helen and Tom Mannion Owners of 1 Hines Close, Barton	We would like to add our support to the Quarter to Six Quadrant and the plans you have outlined.	None
17	Michael Monk	We in the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Branch of CPRE congratulate Barton, Coton, Grantchester and Madingley Parish	None

	Chairman, Cambridgeshire & Peterborough CPRE (Campaign for Protection of Rural England)	Councils on the enormous amount of work which has gone into producing "The Quarter to Six Quadrant" document. We applaud the way in which the document shows how their area has a special landscape quality and provides a vision as to how it should be treated in the future. As such, the area is worthy of special landscape protection and enhancement in the forthcoming revised South Cambridgeshire District wide local plan. CPRE would see such policies being directed to landscape and amenity issues in the QTSQ area and therefore would be additional to those afforded by the Cambridge Green Belt policy, which covers a much wider area. We would very much like to be kept informed of progress.	
18	Dr Helen Eccles, Wimpole	I support the vision of the QTSQ.	None
19	Michael Carrick	I have read the consultation document and appendices. I found the history of the site and the previous decisions made very informative. I think it has been clearly recognised in the past how unique and special that this rural hinterland is and that this environment should be protected. I am very aware of the pressures and demands to provide facilities for housing and economic activity and acknowledge that this part of Cambridge may look appealing. I do though feel strongly that the approach that the local parish and district councils are proposing appears to me to be entirely sensible. I am in favour of environmental stewardship, enhancing access, encouraging usage but opposing any large scale development which sadly would destroy all that makes this unique.	None
	John Boocock	Congratulations on the QTSQ Consultation Draft. The Vision section 7 is particularly helpful. I have no adverse comments. I learned recently that the SOWETO area of Johannesburg in South Africa is short for South West Township. I guess SOWECAM for South West Cambridge is no clearer than QTSQ, though easier to say! Perhaps QTSQ will end up as QTS, pronounced 'cutes': cute idea?	None
20	Pat Magill	I thank you for all the hard work you have put in to consultation draft of the Quarter-To-Six Quadrant document. I wish to express my full support.	None
21	Pat Magill	I have already emailed my broad agreement with the document, but would like to point out an omission in the Food and Drink section (page 32): The Burwash Manor Tearooms in Barton should also feature.	Add reference p30
22	Christine Jennings	A few comments on the proposed pamphlet A Joint Vision for Cambridge's quarter-to-six Quadrant. 1 In its draft form this is far too long. It is so repetitive and rambling that it could be dismissed as unreadable. 2 There are a few lapses that need severe editing: -- I am uneasy about the introductory panel on p.6, which seems a little pretentious. - Delete apostrophe from 'It's' in penultimate paragraph. - p.13 penultimate line, surely necessity rather than 'necessary'? - Surely the lighting of contours on the map has been from the N.W. side, rather than the east? - p.27 about Grantchester Meadows and farmland. Lacies Farm was just one of the earlier farms: a greater acreage was managed by Manor Farm, owned by King's from its acquisition of the 'Lordship'. - p.32 The Blue Ball offers drink but no food. - p.34 Typo: 'form' instead of 'from'. - p.39 Rupert Brooke: please don't say 'Grantchester and the poet R B are of course synonymous with each other'. This is a cliché which seems to have become fashionable, but totally misunderstands the meaning of the word 'synonymous'. They do not mean the same thing. As you say earlier, the poet's name is associated with the village. 3 I am all for making a strong case for conserving the rural character of the QTSQ. But please don't try to sell the area as too much of a tourist attraction! Most of it is not all that attractive, and a place like Grantchester really can't take more traffic. Let people discover its charms for themselves, in the traditional way.	Delete apostrophe p9 Typo corrected (page 11) Change p14 Add reference p25 Change p37

23	Polly Voss 1 Hines Close, Barton	Thank you for producing such an excellent document. We think it is very important to safe guard this area as a very special rural pocket. It is so unusual to find an area so green, so close to a city. It should be thought of as a National Park for the next generation.	Add this sentence on page 32
24	Roger Sewell	I am a resident of Newnham. I have read and completely agree with the objections to residential etc development either side of Barton Rd indicated in QTSQmaindocument.pdf downloaded on 3rd April 2012 from http://qtsq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/QTSQmaindocument.pdf . This part of Cambridge's green belt is one of the major reasons why Cambridge is "special" and attractive to live in both for students, academic members of the university, and other city residents. This region is by far the closest countryside and walking area available to students for reflection and quiet socialising, and for most it is essentially the only such area. Further, I am personally acquainted with individuals living in houses already built in these areas who have been flooded several times and (when I last discussed this with them) were unable to get insurance against flooding. Moreover, we continue to fail to learn from history if we permit residential and industrial development of this part of the country to permanently spoil its natural beauty in the same way as has previously happened in e.g. the Manchester/Yorkshire conurbations in previous centuries. Mankind is all too good at the destruction of the natural environment, and all too backward in returning it to its previous natural state once local economic fortunes decline as a result of that destruction.	Add this sentence on page 32
25	Ann Silver	Page 11 The penultimate line talks of a 'vital necessary for the University'. Please correct to 'necessity' - we don't want a public loo there.	Typo corrected (page 11)
26	Peter Landshoff	A quick comment about your excellent document on http://qtsq.org.uk/ : it is true that houses in Gough Way and beyond were flooded in 1978 but, in spite of prevention measures that were put in place after that, it happened again in 2001.	Insert a reference to this on page 17
27	Dr Bridget Sutton Chair of Governors Coton Primary School	Further to our report at the Coton Parish Meeting this evening I can confirm that Coton School is at net capacity with current intakes currently greatly exceeding the PAN and that there is no scope within the current buildings to accept any intake arising from new building in Coton. Further, development adjacent to the school site would need to take account of the location of the swimming pool and the school access points. Any increase in traffic arising either from construction vehicles or from new residents would cause great concern to the school.	Insert a reference to this on pages 19 & 49 ('community') Insert reference in 'Vision' p49
28	The Elmes Family, Coton	Many thanks for all the work you have put in so far. We are strongly in support of the 'lungs of Cambridge' vision. As a twice daily dog walker and runner, I am very appreciative of the footpaths surrounding Coton but am frustrated that there are almost no circular routes linking Coton (and Cambridge) with the other three villages. Madingley in particular seems mostly out of bounds. There are also no safe cycle routes between villages. If we are truly to offer the whole area as recreational facility for the city, we must provide this extension and not leave the burden on Coton and its Countryside Reserve, and Grantchester Meadows.	Reinforce the references to cycling, circular paths, links on page 48 "access"
29	Chris Pyle 30 High Street Madingley	Many thanks for the draft version of the QTSQ booklet which was delivered recently. It is an impressive statement of the value of the southern and western area of the rural fringe or urban shadow of Cambridge. I only have two very small comments on possible additions, although I realise that you have no shortage of material, and I will not be offended if you do not include them! Firstly, it could be mentioned (p27 or in the access section around p36) that the new Madingley 800 Wood contains a network of footpaths that are open to the public during daylight hours. Secondly, it could perhaps be made even clearer that there are excellent cycle paths from Cambridge into the area, separated from the traffic, along the Coton footpath and alongside Madingley Road and Barton Road (p.34). Many thanks again. It is an excellent document offering a coherent and attractive vision for this sector of Cambridge	Add reference p 25 & 36 Add reference p 32
30	John and Rachel Howland Jackson	Thank you for sending us a copy of the Consultation Draft dated 20th March 2012 and our appreciation to all drafters for an excellent piece of work. We should start by saying that we are completely supportive of the purpose of the document and	

	<p>The Old Farmhouse 9, Comberton Road Barton CB23 7BA</p>	<p>your vision of QTSQ as a rural quadrant which should be preserved as such in any multi-year plan or local development framework for the future. One or two specific comments -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We are not sure how high level the consultation draft is supposed to be. It comes across as non-specific in attacking any particular development plans and reads very much as a vision statement, as it is probably meant to. However in October 2011 District Councillor Burkitt circulated a Development Update referring to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and the Call for Sites with a map of potential development sites in Barton, Coton, Haslingfield and Barton Road, none of which are cited in the Joint Vision. Our question is how this Development Update and the longer term Vision relate to each other and whether some objection should be made to these possible developments. 2. The QTSQ portrayed as the rural lungs of Cambridge bringing fresh air and countryside right in to the centre of the city is an attractive analogy. Our fear is that anyone with a contrary agenda might portray it as an ideal infill so that an enlarged Cambridge forms a perfect circle with fresh air and countryside around the entire circumference. The Green Belt and easy access from the city arguments are therefore of paramount importance. 3. Are there any grounds for attempting to make the QTSQ a National Park ? 4. Although probably not of great relevance we did not quite understand the extent of the King's Covenant and whether it relates only to Granchester Meadows or to all King's properties (which seems too restrictive). The point of raising this question is to ensure clarity so that any opponent cannot pick holes in the Vision argument by alighting on potentially misleading minor detail. 5. We would strongly support the possibility which is mentioned as an aside that there could be further noise abatement initiatives along the M11. <p>Once again many thanks for your efforts to date</p>	<p>Add reference to "Incompatability" under "preserve" page 50</p> <p>Clarify page 38</p> <p>Reinforce page 49</p>
31	Amanda Fuller	<p>I am writing in support of your excellent vision for the four villages. I have lived in Coton for 2 and a half years and I love it. It's a wonderful village with an amazing community. I think the strength of the community is evidenced by the fundraising that has happened for the new village hall, by the way we helped to win the BT Race to Infinity and by the fact that very few people move out! The village school is excellent with many parents helping out. As well as the community I enjoy the fact that I can walk out of my house and be in the middle of fields in minutes, yet I can also cycle into the middle of Cambridge. I also know that Coton's proximity to Cambridge is enjoyed by Cambridge residents and on a summer evening you will find many people walking down the cycle path to eat at the Plough. I would also venture to hold up Coton as a forward-thinking community witnessed by the success of the recent bulk purchase scheme for solar photovoltaic panels. I think there are now over 50 homes in the village which have this technology installed which in my view is something to be proud of! Large-scale development would threaten the fantastic community that exists in Coton. I believe that village growth has to be slower and more organic if a proper community is to survive. I overheard another Coton resident commenting that they used to live in Teversham. When Teversham expanded massively, the village community feel was lost. I also believe that Coton does not have the infrastructure to cope with many more houses. The bulk of the village is located down a no-through road with most of the houses past the school. The road is narrow and unsuitable for a much higher volume of traffic at peak times. Although all modern developments say that they will encourage sustainable transport by providing bike sheds, the reality is that most people still get in their car. The cycle ride into Cambridge is easy and enjoyable but a lot of people will still get in their car so more houses, means more people and more cars. On leaving Coton, the Madingley Road into Cambridge is often at a standstill in the morning, sometimes tailed back to the A428 roundabout so I would not like to see more cars joining this traffic jam from Coton. Consideration has to be given to the view of current residents when planning a large-scale expansion of a village. It may be called NIMBYism but I chose Coton because it was a fairly small village and I want it to remain that way. On speaking to</p>	<p>Add reference p50</p>

		<p>other people in the village I have not come across anyone who would welcome 150 new houses being built here. The only major negative to living in Coton is the noise from the M11. The traffic is at field height between junctions 12 and 13 so some form of acoustic barrier is definitely needed here, and possibly something from junction 11 right up to 14. The only other improvement I can really think of is to improve the provision for cyclists between the four villages. Cycle paths between each of the villages and Cambridge are excellent but the routes between the villages are not ideal. Coton to Madingley is fine because of the low traffic volume. Coton to Grantchester can be a bit daunting, particularly crossing the motorway slip road at junction 12 and then the A603 roundabout. Also the roads themselves are narrow and windy with high hedges which can mean cars find themselves up on cyclists very suddenly. I hope that your vision for the future of the four villages is well received by SCDC</p>	<p>Add reference p49</p> <p>Reinforce p48 "access"</p>
32	Jonathan Graffy	<p>I'm sending some comments on the qtsq consultation. I thought I'd send them to you informally, but I can respond to the formal email address.</p> <p>Before I read it, I wondered whether the document might be able to make an economic case - for keeping Cambridge as a great place to live, work, study and reflect creatively - essential for the culture of innovation in the city. Its an argument that might be worth making.</p> <p>Also I wondered whether the pressure for housing development might be acknowledged, but then assert that development should not destroy the character of the city and surrounding area.</p> <p>I understand why you want to use the brand QTSQ, although I wonder whether it would be worth using the phrase "Cambridge's Green Quadrant" sometimes in the document. It would be easier to understand in media uses. If things were at an earlier stage, I might have argued for the Green Quadrant brand - you can think about it.</p> <p>p5, I realise we are seeing a draft, but it was oddly complacent to release something saying that all the parish councillors had approved this in May.</p> <p>Maps: There are lots of maps, but it would help to have one good one for reference, which facilities could be marked on. (Small ones can be used in some places, but it would unite the document to link back to one main map.)</p> <p>I think the summary for section 1.0 could usefully include the reason for preserving the quadrant, by adding "This green area is one of the things which gives Cambridge its unique character as a place to live, work and study".</p> <p>p22 - the art exhibition is every year.</p> <p>p29 - this had some repetition eg Madingley Cemetary and Madingley Hall. It would be better to find a way to integrate the four "important sites" elsewhere.</p> <p>Things which are missing are: Village cricket. The model engineers.</p> <p>I think it might make good politics to drop the Trinity Foot and South Herts Beagles on page 30. References to Hunting remind me of the way the hunting lobby hijacked the Countryside Alliance protests. Referring to the hunt runs the risk of inviting a negative response from those who feel strongly about hunting.</p> <p>I thought the references to cycling were weak. If the purpose is really to preserve and enhance the use of the area then this should be given more emphasis.</p> <p>On page 51, I wonder about dropping the reference to rising bollards. I think this goes against the claim to be open and inviting others in. It may or may not be a good idea, but it would impact significantly on local residents as well as others passing through. It presses a "NIMBY" button.</p> <p>Hope this is helpful.</p>	<p>Reinforce p 45</p> <p>Reinforce p 45</p> <p>State perhaps hold subsequent competition for alternative name, p48</p> <p>p47: state that a priority is a better map Add page 6</p> <p>Correct p20</p> <p>Add p31</p> <p>Reinforce page 48</p> <p>P49: delete reference</p>
33	Stuart Hawkins	<p>Thank you for the copy of the QTSQ Consultation Draft. The document is extremely well organised and presented, and its central argument is very clearly articulated. I found it an interesting read in its own right, in terms of learning some new things about the area that I'd not previously known. The document is obviously the product of a lot of hard work and thorough research. I'd like to thank all those involved for their efforts on my behalf and the other residents of the four villages.</p>	

		<p>I fully subscribe to the vision presented. One of the reasons I moved to Madingley (19 years ago) was precisely for the quality of life afforded by being able to live in a (largely) unspoilt village and area of countryside, whilst still easily benefitting from the facilities of Cambridge. I have treasured the protection that the green belt and other local policy and development frameworks have provided and it would be a very real shame to lose this -- not only for the residents of the villages themselves, but also the residents of Cambridge and visitors from further afield.</p> <p>I had a couple of minor comments on the document:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I'm not so sure about the name adopted for the area: the "Quarter to Six Quadrant". I think my main issue is that it is not immediately clear what this is referring to and so will always have to be explained, as it is in the document, each time it is introduced to a new audience. Because of this, I'm not sure it offers any advantages over alternative, potentially more descriptive or 'guessable' (albeit more 'boring') names such as the "South West Quadrant". This is probably academic, as I suspect it's probably too late to change things now? 2. The document presents its argument extremely well and clearly. But all the way through reading it I had in the back of my mind that there was an element of NIMBYism, or certainly a risk of being accused of such. That is, the message coming across is essentially "we strongly support growth and prosperity, etc., etc. but not here". I would expect other parish councils representing their respective 'quadrants' around Cambridge to be able to put forward equally strong visions for their areas and equally strong (albeit different) arguments as to why they should be excused growth. Ultimately, QTSC can only do what you have done, which is to present a clearly articulated and factually based vision. But I'm just wondering if you expect the NIMBY argument to crop up, and whether you have any thoughts about how to counter it? <p>With my pedant's hat squarely on, I also spotted a few minor errors in the draft document:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On page 30 the paragraph relating to Cambridge University contains a list of colleges. Uniquely, Queen's college is actually Queens' college because it was founded by two different queens (it was founded and then subsequently re-founded). This is one of those facts that's completely unguessable to the uninitiated, but the errant apostrophe sticks out like a sore thumb once you know! 2. On page 32, in the first sentence "Food and drink are available from no less than eight pubs", 'less' should really be 'fewer' (one of my pet bits of pedantry!). 3. On page 53, under the third bullet point the Residents Associated of Old Newnham is listed twice 	<p>State perhaps hold subsequent competition for alternative name, p48</p> <p>Correct typo p28</p> <p>Correct p30</p> <p>Correct p51</p>
34	ANN GRACE WINTLE 1 Benny's Way Coton, CB23 7PS	<p>I am just writing to day what a great job you have done with the document that arrived through my door. I have just a few comments on it, which I list below.</p> <p>Page 3 I thought that the concept of a "Quarter-to-Six Quadrant" was brilliant.</p> <p>The logo is also brilliant - Can it be put in the location device for the url, so it shows up when you store it as a favourite web site - easier to find.</p> <p>Pages 9 and 14 The maps are good, but I thought that you could make another one specifically for this document. (Do you need to show permissions for these maps? OS and Google?)</p> <p>The new map could show the clock hands, the location of the four villages, the hard outlines of the current built up city areas, and the added shaded areas for the new housing developments mentioned in section 3 (i.e. what the city will look like by 2015).</p> <p>Doing this would I think emphasize "the green quarter" adding on to the existing green quarter within the city limits. The latter is what already makes Cambridge unique (c.f. Oxford).</p> <p>Page 16 Section summary - mention that the "countryside is owned by environmental charities and is constantly being improved to provide local amenities."</p> <p>In third sentence, add some comment about "the four historic villages that have existed for more than 1,000 years"</p> <p>Page 23 In sentence on Madingley 800 wood, mention exactly how many trees were planted - it is an impressive number.</p> <p>Also, this wood is open to the public, as this is not said later on (page 27).</p>	<p>P47: state that a priority is a better map</p> <p>Add pages 5&14</p> <p>Add pages 5&14</p> <p>Add page 25</p> <p>Add page 25</p>

		<p>Page 26 Mention beehives kept in Coton orchard?</p> <p>Pages 34/35 mention that frequent buses run out along, Madingley, Barton and Trumpington roads, and even into Coton (Whippet) - not just to the Park and Ride car parks. These really help link up walks through the QTSQ.</p> <p>page 49 It would be great to have the maps showing footpaths and permissive ways up on the web site as soon as possible</p>	<p>Add page 24 Add page 32</p> <p>P47: state that a priority is a better map</p>
35	<p>Annabel Keeler (currently residing with my mother at 21 King's Grove, Barton)</p>	<p>May I firstly say that I think this is a marvellous initiative, and deserves to be successful. I think that the way you have shown by going round the 'clock face' of Cambridge the importance of QTSQ, and how this is almost the only remaining part in which there is a direct interface between the city and the countryside, is very effective.</p> <p>It is also good to have here so much information about the different countryside amenities we enjoy in this area, some of which I was unaware of, despite having lived in the region of Cambridge for twenty years now.</p> <p>I would like to make firstly some general comments and suggestions, and secondly one or two minor copy-editing points.</p> <p>General comments and suggestions</p> <p>1. It is good that you have included various footpath and accessibility maps, but these are not very easy to read, even in colour on the website. I think it would be a brilliant thing to make some kind of clear and comprehensive map, which showed all the amenities and clearly indicated the footpaths, bridleways and permissive paths in QTSQ.</p> <p>One big weakness in the area of footpaths is the walk from Barton to Coton and access to Red Meadow Hill. Having read your document I tried yesterday to access the Red Meadow Hill, feeling encouraged by the fact that the flagpole near the Barton Road at the edge of the rifle range had no red flag flying. However, as I came down the hill towards the metal gate where the sentry normal sits, I became confused. While the flagpole at the top of the hill had no red flag flying, the one at the bottom of the hill did. Also a seat was placed right in the middle of the path next to the sentry box. So, I didn't dare to cross. I note that in the Ramblers Association's Millennium Survey of Cambridgeshire walks, they also pointed out the problem of knowing when the range is going to be in use, and that even from Coton, going in the direction of the Wimpole Way, a sentry has to take people across a section which is now in use by the military. Moreover, if you follow the track from Comberton Road that runs east of the Woodland Cemetery up the hill in the direction of Madingley, you find that frustratingly you come to a threatening notice saying something like 'Danger, do not touch any military debris. It may explode and kill you.' It doesn't say that this is part of the rifle range, so one wonders if this is something left over from a former use of the site. It would be wonderful if this track could be linked up to the Wimpole Way. Maybe any remaining military debris could be effectively cleared away.</p> <p>Returning to Red Meadow Hill, I have not found on the ordinance survey maps any clear access to the top of it, other than from the Coton-Granchester Road close to 'Wheatcases'. Coming from the Barton direction, even if the rifle range is not in use, it appears from the map that you would have to follow the footpath down to the Granchester Road and walk north around a quarter of a mile along it (not very safe at busy times of day) in order to access the track that goes up to the top of the hill. A permissive path would therefore be very desirable to link the Barton footpath and the track up to Red Meadow Hill.</p> <p>2. Although I spend a lot of time in Barton caring for my mother, my husband and I currently live in a rented house in Gough Way, bang in the middle of the flood risk area, and this winter have had all the hassle of learning how to use the recently constructed flood defences for the house. I fully endorse the comments concerning the ridiculousness of constructing any more homes in the flood risk area. In fact, putting any more housing in the area between Gough Way and the Motorway (to the north of Barton Road) might well increase the possibility for further flooding, since the fields at least are more able to absorb water than concrete and tarmac.</p> <p>I do not know what is planned for the large field to the west of Gough way, other than building houses on it. It is currently used by dog walkers, who come up the track from Blin Brook and enjoy the space of this enormous field, as do herons hares and skylarks (as I state below). Unfortunately, the field is sealed off and there is no link from it to the footpath at Laundry Farm. Imagine how good it would be if people could walk out from the centre of Cambridge, up West Road to Cranmer</p>	<p>P47: state that a priority is a better map</p> <p>Add p47 an objective to work with the Rifle Range & MoD to clarify this</p> <p>Add need for signage to Red Meadow Hill p47</p> <p>Add reference p48</p>

		<p>Road, along the footpath that follows the Bin Brook and then further to cross the big field I have mentioned, linking via a permissive path to the Laundry Farm footpath through to Coton, and then back the other way into Cambridge via Harcamlow Way, Adams Road and so on. This would be a terrific round walk of around 4 miles or more, taking people away from the City, in a route that would be mostly away from roads, into the heart of the countryside and back.</p> <p>3. You have mentioned the importance of QTSQ for wildlife conservation, and I would like to endorse this concerning the fields belonging to Burwash Farm, which as far as I know are farmed organically, where I have personally seen lapwings (a couple of years ago, around the pools), and recently several hares, a marsh harrier and yesterday a red kite. I have yet to explore the Coton Countryside Park. But further in towards Cambridge the land to the north of the Barton Road, is also currently important to wildlife. I have heard numerous skylarks, and seen herons, hares and today, a red kite, wheeling around over Laundry Farm.</p> <p>The residents of Gough Way and Barton Road who were affected by the threat of flooding at one stage proposed expanding the pond for wildlife in the Coton Countryside Park as a way of preventing flood water rushing down the Bin Brook. The Council decided that this would be too expensive and opted instead for subsidising flood barriers for the houses most at risk of flooding. However, a larger expanse of water, either at Coton Park or closer into town would be amazing for wildlife, though I am sure I will be told 'Dream on!' Nonetheless, I think that the idea of this proper wildlife corridor from Coton to Newnham should be seriously thought about, and it will mean involving Laundry Farm and the land immediately to the west of Gough Way.</p> <p>Comments from a copy editing point of view p. 13, line 2 from bottom: I think that 'necessary' should be changed to 'necessity' p. 40, line 6 from top: far-sighed needs 't' p. 7, no 5 and p. 34, section summary: 'There is easy access to and within the QTSQ' doesn't read all that well, I feel. How about 'easy access to and between the areas/villages within the QTSQ'? But I'm probably being too fussy! I shall look forward to attending the meeting on 27th April, and wish you all the best in this worthwhile campaign</p>	<p>Insert reference p48</p> <p>Add reference p17</p> <p>Add reference p48</p> <p>Correct p11 Correct p38 Change p5 & p32</p>
36	Annabel Keeler	<p>Sorry, this is a minor point, but it was a marsh harrier I saw over Laundry farm today, not a red kite. But the red kite was over the Barton fields yesterday afternoon, being challenged by a crow or rook - extraordinary sight!</p>	
37	Amanda and Matthew Miller Lacies Farm, Coton Road, Grantchester	<p>In response to your Consultation draft which, overall, is positive and proactive we would like to make the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the document solely relate to the "Call for Sites" land or all land within the four parishes? We would like clarification on the purpose of it. 2. On page 27, there is a description about Lacies Farm. It states "The College has recently commenced informal discussions with the village about a modest residential development in the redundant farm buildings." <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The farm buildings are NOT redundant and are actively being used. * The proposed development of ten houses, when ST/7 states that Grantchester is an infill village of a maximum of 2 units, is clearly NOT a "modest development." * Furthermore, SCDC's legal department have said that, because it is outside their planning policies to build on conservation land outside the village envelope, it would be refused. This paragraph needs to be removed or redrafted to reflect the accuracy of the current situation. 3. Under section 7.2 "Preserve" (p.52) of the consultation draft there is a paragraph that states "(b) some minor schemes that fall outside the strict application of those policies, whether inside or outside the village envelopes, may be felt appropriate on a case-by-case basis and subject to their individual merits, associated contribution to the locality and community, and the views of local village residents." <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * This is CONTRARY to SCDC planning policy documents and Grantchester's Parish Plan. Where has this statement come from as it is completely at odds with existing planning policies? In our opinion, this paragraph should be removed as it encourages development and the whole purpose of this document is to restrict it. 	<p>Insert clarification p50</p> <p>Delete "redundant" p25</p> <p>Delete "modest" p25 Add "outside policy" p25</p> <p>Redraft p50</p>

38	Robert Smith 21 Stulpfield Road Grantchester Cambridge CB3 3NL	<p>I write to express my strong support for the general thrust of the proposals set out in the consultation draft intended to have the effect of preserving and developing the parishes of Barton, Coton, Grantchester and Madingley in line with previous strategic and operational planning decisions made in their regard.</p> <p>I suggest, however, an amendment to the text of the last sentence relating to the possible development at Lacies Farm (page 27) which, in the light of indicative definitions set out on page 43 of the document might be better expressed as: <i>The College has recently commenced informal discussions with the village about a modest residential development in the redundant farm buildings which would be excepted to conform to the provisions of SCDC's policy ST/7 (for infill villages) limiting development to an indicative maximum scheme size of 2 dwellings per scheme.</i></p> <p>I also note the reference on page 51 of the document to traffic calming measures at peak times on the road between Grantchester and Trumpington which, insofar as it accurately describes the interest of the parish council, is not controversial. However, in this connection, I would ask whether any impact assessment has been conducted into the likely effect of such restrictive measures on the road from Grantchester to Newnham which might be expected to absorb at least some of the displaced traffic movement.</p>	<p>Redraft p50</p> <p>Delete reference to rising bollards p49 (as per comments elsewhere)</p>
39	Sue and Chris Baldwin 2 The Old Wood Mill, Church Lane, Madingley, Cambridge CB23 8AF	<p>We have received a copy of the consultation draft dated 20 March 2012 and would make the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We support the aim to retain the existing planning policy for Madingley of a just small amount of infill development. 2. We support the general proposal to retain this parish, and the adjoining parishes in the QTSQ, as the 'lungs of the city' 3. However, we are not sure quite how Madingley fits into the criteria being applied for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the parish falls north of the QTSQ and has no direct walking or cycling link with the city apart from the Madingley Road and Cambridge Road (along the bottom of the American Cemetery). Cambridge Road has no footpath outside of the village and the ground falls steeply away on the north side. • The majority of visitors come to Madingley by car. There is no off-road parking for the 800 Wood nor in the village where any on-road parking tends to cause obstruction. An accident has already occurred when a visitor to the 800 Wood parked in the road opposite the entrance to the 800 Wood. • Madingley Wood is an SSSI and is strictly not open to the public. There are very few footpaths in the village so increased public access would be entirely dependent on permission being granted by the University of Cambridge and Trinity College (the principal landowners). The only bridlepath that heads towards the city ends up in Girton via the A14. • Madingley is completely blighted by traffic noise from the A14/A428 and M11 – we're not sure if that is what visitors would be expecting if they had read the extract from Forster referring to 'a secluded dell'. If it is possible to obtain funding to help dissipate some of the noise, then that would be very welcome! 	<p>Add p48 "access"</p> <p>Add reference to this p48</p>
40	Dr Alex Thornton BBSRC David Phillips Research Fellow Department of Experimental Psychology University of Cambridge Cambridge CB2 3EB Sub-Department of Animal Behaviour High Street, Madingley Cambridge CB23 8AA	<p>With regards to the recently circulated "consultation draft" of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Review for the Development of the District, I would like to point out a few of important points about the village of Madingley that were omitted from the document:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Madingley Wood is an officially designated Site of Special Scientific Interest containing tracts of ancient woodland. The flora and archaeology of the area have been the subjects of study for 350 years, and the wood continues to be used for ecological and education by the University of Cambridge. 2) Madingley village is the site of the Cambridge Jackdaw Project, a University of Cambridge research project into the evolution of intelligence in jackdaws. There are over 100 jackdaw nest-boxes in and around the village. Moreover, the village is home to a rookery and a winter roosting site where thousands of rooks and jackdaws congregate during the winter months. The roost is known to have existed in the village for generations, attracting birds from a 30 mile radius. 3) The sub-department of Animal Behaviour in Madingley is a world class research centre and has, throughout its history hosted notable scientists including Jane Goodall and Dian Fossey. <p>I hope that these issues will be taken into account when considering the future development of the area</p>	<p>Add reference p25</p> <p>Add reference p25</p> <p>Add reference p28</p>

41	Dr Chloë Cyrus-Kent, Madingley	<p>Thank you for sending the Consultation Draft of the SCDC vision for the future development of Barton, Coton, Granchester and Madingley. I am writing as a resident of Madingley. Having read through the Consultation Draft I have a few comments, listed below:</p> <p>The Executive Summary states that "Access from Cambridge to the QTSQ is good". This may be true for Barton, Coton and Granchester but it is not so for Madingley. There are only four bus services to and from town each day, shared by GoWhippet service 8 and Stagecoach service 14. One can get the very regular Citi 4 bus, however, that stops at Madingley Mulch, and walk in to the village (takes about 15 minutes, but took me longer when pregnant and pushing pram!). Cycle paths are absent. It's great to read that this lack of access is part of the vision for future improvements!!!</p> <p>In Section 4.3 on Village Histories, Madingley is mentioned as home to the University Institute for Continuing Education (Madingley Hall). It is also notably home to the University Department of Zoology's Sub-Dept of Animal Behaviour – see http://www.zoo.cam.ac.uk/zoostaff/madingley/ and http://www.wildcognitionresearch.com/cambridge-jackdaw-project</p> <p>In Section 4.3 Madingley is described as 'home to some important conservation and wildlife'. It may be worth mentioning the toad conservation program, with volunteers often seen at work in the village (and the special village signs warning about toads on the road!). Also very much worth mentioning is the Cambridge Jackdaw Project, a study headed by Dr Alex Thornton of the Sub-Dept of Animal Behaviour, Dept of Experimental Psychology and Pembroke College Cambridge. His research group (see http://www.wildcognitionresearch.com/cambridge-jackdaw-project) has over 100 nest boxes dotted all over Madingley and the team are seen daily observing the wild jackdaw population, seeking to learn about the evolution of intelligence in these remarkable birds. Dr Thornton's research has captured the attention of the media lately and brought BBC Radio 4 to Madingley:</p> <p>i) http://www.bbc.co.uk/iplayer/episode/b01b8yxm/The_Living_World_Jackdaw_Roost/ ii) http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b01dttzf iii) http://www.bbc.co.uk/nature/17788161</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Section 4.5 on Public Enjoyment, the SCDC may wish to add to the list Madingley Hall. Madingley Hall has open garden events and plant sales several times a year, as well as welcoming visitors to wander around its gardens all year round during daylight hours. The Hall is used very regularly for weddings too. Also worth mentioning, the 800 Wood at Madingley is a great place for a walk even though it is very new (small plants as yet). There are interesting birds to be seen in and near the woods, and you can see Ely Cathedral from the top of the hill on a clear day! <p>Maps in Section 5.2 and throughout Section 6 were not printed at enough resolution to be readable...</p> <p>It is wonderful to learn of the SCDC determination to NOT allow any new house building in the QTSQ. This is great news! Madingley is lovely just as it is, an idyll for walking the Madingley Hall lake, picking blackberries in the hedges and exploring the countryside :-)</p> <p>Thank you so much for taking the time to read these comments and include them where possible in the new Draft.</p>	<p>Add reference to buses p32</p> <p>Add reference p32</p> <p>Add reference p26 Add reference p25</p> <p>Add reference p25</p> <p>Add references p27</p> <p>See reference p27 P47: state that a priority is a better map</p>
42	James Fox	<p>As a resident in Coton I would like to offer my support to the QTSQ draft as dated March 20th 2012. We owe the authors of this document our very great thanks for presenting such a well written and persuasive presentation in an attempt to preserve our local environment. I have little to add. Section 4.2 'Flood Plain' reminded me of a related issue. The following note may or may not be of use (as it may be too generic/ off topic).</p> <p>One aspect that has affected residents along my road (Brookfield Road, Coton) in recent years is that of rainfall runoff. The situation of flash flooding due to insufficient drainage can only get worse for those at lower elevations with an increase in impervious surfaces (new houses) at higher elevations due to drainage impact on those at lower elevations and the increasing occurrence of climatic extremes. The housing development approval process does not appear to check that linked drainage systems have sufficient capacity (or that they are well maintained), just that there is sufficient drainage on the proposed site. In 2008 our local road drainage could not cope with the volume of run off coming down adjoining roads and drains caused by a heavy downpour after a dry spell (see photo attached). As we are at the bottom of the hill, this</p>	<p>Add reference p17</p>

		caused flooding damage in many garages and some houses, as well as a hygiene risk due to the sewage system flooding with fowl water and overflowing onto the streets and into houses. One housing proposal site is just north of Whitwell Way and would directly increase the amount of runoff we experience with the reduction in pervious/porous ground. This is an example of a flooding problem not due to rivers overflowing but is certainly a fore-runner to such and will certainly get worse with increased housing increasing run off. (Photos attached)	
43	Dr C.V.Jeans, West Cambridge Preservation Society, 10 Adams Rd, Cambridge CB3 9AD	<p>This is an excellent project and the West Cambridge Preservation Society is in support of it.</p> <p>One aspect that has not been mentioned is the matter of excessive lighting, light trespass and light pollution. A problem that if it is not already there will soon be present and increasingly invasive on the proposed green lungs of Cambridge. The University has been and is still a major contributor to this. For a University that tell us how wonderful it is, it has shown in our experience no originality in dealing with the light pollution they inflict upon the public other than allowing it to continue irrespective of the public funds that in the end that has to pay for it. In the not so distant future the hugely energy hungry floodlights that flood the skies at night with stray light will be replaced by low level lighting(both in height and intensity) that is adequate for the job. Just inspect the University's new west cambridge site. Of course light pollution is not restricted to the University but unless they set an example many residents, local businesses see no reason why they should unless of course they realise that the money they are wasting is their own!</p> <p>What about a campaign for dark skies over Cambridge and the QTSQ in particular? The British Astronomical Association is part of a worldwide attempt to deal with this problem that is neither good for the fauna and flora that we are trying to encourage back into our neighbourhood nor for human society. Their website is www.dark-skies.org.</p> <p>We wish you success in the project,</p>	<p>Add reference p49</p> <p>Add reference p49</p>
44	Anthony Titley, Harlton	<p>With reference to the draft of the document "A Joint Vision for Cambridge's Quarter-to-Six Quadrant" dated 14 May 2012. Notwithstanding the broad content I wish to bring a couple of points of detail to your attention that you may wish to consider for your final version.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whilst the document references sources of information, nowhere could I find any reference to copyright permissions, or otherwise, in relation to the graphics used from third parties. 2. As public administrative bodies, the Councils should be aware of the advice of the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills available at: http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/nmo/docs/legislation/legislation/units-of-measurement/gnotes-for-public-sector-on-use-of-metric.pdf <p>Also the requirements of the Units of Measurement Regulations in relation to "economic, health, safety or administrative purposes". See: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/1994/2867/introduction/made http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/1995/1804/regulation/6/made http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2001/55/pdfs/uksi_20010055_en.pdf</p> <p>The acre is no longer permitted for use in the registration of land. See: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:114:0010:0013:en:PDF</p> <p>Its use for other purposes therefore appears to be an anachronism and may be at variance with the above advice and regulation.</p> <p>I suggest that by addressing these issues in the QTSQ document will enable it to meet the requirements of other public bodies to which it may be submitted, bring it into concert with other public sector bodies' documents and information (e.g. http://www.scams.gov.uk/CommunityandLiving/NewCommunities/MajorDevelopments/Northstowe/northstowereps.htm) and give it a far more professional, 21st century "feel".</p> <p>I hope you find my comments and observations pertinent and useful.</p>	<p>Add hectare conversion to all references to acres</p>
45	Terry James	I write to say that I am in full support of the vision set out in the QTSQ draft and only make two comments here as I cannot	

		<p>attend the meeting on 27 April.</p> <p>First, a much shorter, and sharper, main document with what is supporting detail in appendices would surely capture the closer and more positive attention of recipients. (Decades of receiving weighty documents on significant matters colour my views!)</p> <p>Second, the desirable restriction of development of the villages will increase their attraction to incomers as Cambridge expands. This means that the next generation of those establishing and maintaining the amenities and assets of the area will find it difficult to afford local housing.</p> <p>This point, perhaps, could be made more strongly in the final document.</p> <p>Good luck with your mission!</p>	Reinforce reference to affordable housing p49
46	<p>Andrew Roberts Company Secretary Trumpington Residents' Association 53 Shelford Road Trumpington Cambridge CB2 9LZ</p>	<p>Thank you very much for sending a copy of the draft report to the Trumpington Residents' Association. We are very impressed by the document which gives a useful background to the four parishes and an important statement of the value of maintaining your area as a 'rural lung' for the city and surrounding district.</p> <p>As you note in the report, the Trumpington area to your immediate southeast has already been earmarked for substantial development and we are concerned that any development in addition to what has been approved will be greatly to the detriment of our area and also to yours (see http://www.trumpingtonresidentsassociation.org/no_more_developments.html).</p> <p>If you could stress the importance of preserving the green belt and linking your green area to those to the south between Trumpington and Harston, Hauxton and Great Shelford, we would be very grateful.</p> <p>Specific comments:</p> <p>page 13, para. 8: we would be grateful if you could rephrase this paragraph to emphasise the developments that have been approved and stress that the other proposals (including Grosvenor's) have no official status and have been promoted by landowners against the wishes of local residents in Trumpington and the surrounding parishes;</p> <p>it would also be useful to give greater emphasis to the value of the country parks that will be developed along the river in Trumpington Meadows and between Clay Farm and Addenbrooke's and stress that the former will be an important continuation of publically-accessible land beyond Granchester Meadows/Byron's Pool providing a river valley walk and cycle route to Hauxton Mill;</p> <p>we would be grateful if you could omit the name 'Great Kneighton' to which we have strongly objected (it's historically inaccurate and conveys a sense of a separate place, whereas the Clay Farm development to which it refers is an integral part of Trumpington)</p> <p>page 20, reference to Venerable Bede, are you sure Bede said this of Grantchester? I think he was referring to the abandoned Roman area of Cambridge</p> <p>page 22, in the Bryon's Pool section, add a note that this will open up into the new Trumpington Meadows country park starting from 2013 (ref to page 26)</p> <p>page 48, we welcome the access ideas and the suggestion about longer-distance routes; as you know, we are developing trail leaflets from Trumpington to the surrounding areas</p>	<p>Add text p6 & 50</p> <p>Text deleted p13</p> <p>Add text p13</p> <p>Delete p13</p> <p>Add reference p22</p>
47	<p>Lance Rayner, Barton</p>	<p>As a long established Local Retail Business (from Rayner & Bullen 1946) and now run by the fourth generation Barton Rayner, we think we should be included in the list of Retail Outlets in the Village, even if only for historical record and future planning interests.</p>	Add p29
48	<p>Robin Pellew PhD OBE 32 Selwyn Gardens Cambridge CB3 9AY</p>	<p>I congratulate the four Parish Councils on working together so effectively in producing this report – you have provided a model of joint working that I hope other areas will copy whilst at the same time giving some reality to the concept of localism that the Government is so keen to promote.</p> <p>There is no doubt that the landscape and countryside of the QTSQ area is, in the South Cambridgeshire context, of particular value, and that it should therefore be preserved and enhanced. As an area designed as Green Belt, it is particularly important in preserving the setting and special character of Cambridge as an historic city, in preventing urban</p>	

sprawl, and in assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. These are all key purposes of the Green Belt, as confirmed by the new NPPF, and therefore reinforce the significance of the area. In the light of the above, I personally have no hesitation in supporting the main thrust of the Vision – that it should serve as one of Cambridge’s ‘rural lungs’ for the benefit of both the local communities and the people of Cambridge as a whole.

I do however have a number of points that I offer in the constructive hope that they might strengthen your case:

1. **your argument lacks an objective evidence-base to support the contention that the QTSQ is particularly special.** It could be argued that other areas around Cambridge are just as significant – for example Wandlebury, the Gog Magog Hills, and the chalklands running out to the A11 or the River Cam corridor, whilst some people find the open vistas of the Fen landscapes inspirational. These are all subjective value judgements, but it can be argued that so too is your assertion that the SW of Cambridge is special.
2. To demonstrate that the QTSQ is indeed special, **some form of objective assessment of the quality and value of the countryside in the Green Belt around Cambridge is needed.** You might want to consider calling for this as one of your recommendations. This assessment might look at a number of key components such as landscape character, significant views and panoramas, current and potential value for nature conservation, opportunities for public access opportunities, agricultural land quality, water catchments, areas liable to flooding, and the like. These elements could all be mapped and then overlaid using a Geographic Information System, thus providing an aggregated mastermap showing the quality of the Green Belt, which, hopefully, would provide the independent evidence of the importance of the QTSQ area.
3. The Vision would be considerably strengthened if it could be **presented more in the context of other appraisals and policies that have already been approved.** SCDC, Cambridge City Council, Natural England, the Landscape Institute, and other bodies have already undertaken studies that cover the QTSQ area, yet your report reads as if its recommendations are entirely new. For example, it is a serious omission not to link your report to the **2006 Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy**, or to the **Nature Conservation Strategies** produced by both Local Authorities. Whilst this may seem bureaucratic, it is essential if you want the report to carry weight with the Local Authorities.
4. **More should be made about the significance of the location of the QTSQ within the Green Belt.** The revised NPPF reinforces the importance of Green Belt designation, and it is clear that the QTSQ has been crucial to delivering the prime objectives for Green Belt land (as stated in the second paragraph above). However whilst the Green Belt has been largely successful as a planning tool in preventing urban sprawl, it has been much less effective in promoting the enhancements and improvements that were originally envisaged in the enabling legislation. These public benefits included greater public access and recreational opportunities, nature conservation initiatives, landscape enhancement, and so on. With the exception of some enlightened landowners and charities in the last decade, including in the QSTQ area, these public benefits have been slow to materialise. As a consequence the Green Belt is now widely perceived in negative terms as a means of restricting growth, a perception that is not balanced by recognition of its public benefits. The QSTQ area could position itself to rectify this by **becoming a demonstration area of how with a little imagination and goodwill, the Green Belt can be managed to provide material gains for the local communities.**
5. Both SCDC and Cambridge City Council are at the moment totally preoccupied with the preparation of their **2031 Local Plans**. These have got to be produced in a hurry because of the limited time allowed for the transition to the new NPPF. You should recognise this political reality and do more to **position your report as a significant contribution from the four Parish Councils to the preparation of the SCDC Local Plan.**
6. In the same way, you should consider giving greater emphasis to the **2011 Localism Act** and its drive to empower local communities. Although your report does not constitute a **Neighbourhood Plan** as defined by the Act, you should

Add p47

Add p45

Add p45

Add p50

		<p>position your report as a direct response to this drive towards greater localism. You might want to consider 'up-grading' the status of the report to meet the definition of a Neighbourhood Plan if this will give it more muscle with SCDC.</p> <p>7. Finally, there is a risk that your proposals could end up by restricting development in the four villages to their long-term detriment. You don't want these villages to become just places of retirement for an aging population: the needs of the younger generation for affordable housing, employment, and social facilities must also be accommodated. Some infill will be essential to meet the housing needs of young people who want to stay in their villages, so you need to allow for some level of organic growth whilst rejecting inappropriate large-scale development.</p> <p>I hope these comments are helpful – as I said before, I congratulate you on pulling together to produce this Vision and I very much hope it receives the respect it warrants from SCDC.</p>	Add p50
49	Guy, Ruth, Isabel, Alice, George and Grace LEWIN-SMITH (Grantchester)	<p>We refer to the Consultation Draft of 20 March 2012.</p> <p>We fully support the conclusions and Vision set out in Section 7 of the draft. In particular we would emphasise the vital importance of the measures set out on page 52 under "Preserve" to protect the unique rural environment of the QTSG and preserve its special atmosphere and attractiveness for future generations of residents and visitors.</p> <p>We would also suggest consideration is given to actions to reduce the noise pollution from the M11, light pollution from neighbouring areas and measures taken to prevent the use of village roads as "rat runs" by commuters (a growing problem in Grantchester).</p> <p>There has been more than enough development in the City outskirts and the unique character of the City is already under threat and its infrastructure overwhelmed. This must not be allowed to continue.</p> <p>Congratulations on a thorough, thoughtful and convincing document.</p>	<p>Add comment p32</p> <p>Add comment p48</p> <p>Add comment p49</p> <p>Add comment p49</p>
50	Jenna Bishop	<p>I am a resident of Coton, a trustee of the Wildlife Trust and of Cambridge Past, Present and Future, and have a professional background in the legal aspects of countryside management. I think that the QTSQ Vision document is a compelling and well put together argument for the need to preserve the special character of this area of rural land to the West of Cambridge and its communities, and to build and collaborate on the work already being carried out by the various landowners and charities. The team that produced it are to be congratulated. It is a positive and visually pleasing document, with useful maps and illustrations.</p> <p>My comments are as follows:</p> <p>I know that there has been some confusion in readers about the purpose of this Vision – is it just to respond to the SHLAA exercise, or does it have a wider function? As suggested in your introduction, it is clearly of great importance that it is used to influence the formation of the next Local Plan, as this will have potentially even greater influence under the new planning regime set up by the recent NPPG review.</p> <p>I also know that some readers have felt that the document would be strengthened by greater reference to existing policy and research documents which support its objectives, such as the Biodiversity Action Plan, and work done by the Landscape Institute and the Green Infrastructure Forum. I believe CambridgePPF are to help with highlighting some of these.</p> <p>Whilst the living, working, community-led area of countryside managed for conservation and access analogy with National Parks is well-made, and the concept of welcome, the comparison falls down on the intrinsic character of this area of countryside, which is probably not of a calibre to acquire any national designation. However, you are exactly right to emphasise its importance, notwithstanding, to its local population, as this is exactly the type of otherwise undesignated land given recognition in the revised NPPG document and within the spirit of the Localism Act.</p> <p>Any assistance that this Vision can give with raising the profile of this area, and of its increasingly interesting conservation and access value, is to be greatly welcomed and will hopefully bring resources for further beneficial management.</p> <p>I think that a very important component of this landscape is indeed Red Meadow Hill, but also the larger area once known as Barton Down. I would love to see this whole ridge revert to grassland and be made more available for public access and for walks between Coton and Barton, within the constraints of MoD requirements. It would be a fantastic resource for green</p>	<p>Add comment p3</p> <p>Add comment p45</p> <p>Add reference p15</p>

		<p>space enjoyment, given the few high and expansive areas around Cambridge. And in more detail (page references to the A5 version distributed to households): p.20 – is there a word missing at the end of the 3rd line? p.21 – I think that the Wimpole Way is a public bridleway, rather than footpath? And should there be an “it” or “Coton” after the comma in the 4th line of the 4th para? p.24 – Burwash section – refers to St Catharine’s Farm. Is this another farm in Barton? Can there also be a reference to links to and from the Coton Countryside Reserve (once St Catharine’s Hall Farm)? That is a lovely walk, with a coffee or shopping too, on days when the Range is closed or with the short diversion. p.27 – King’s section – presumably any residential development at Lacies Farm will have to comply with existing and future policies relating to the Green Belt, village envelopes and the Infill Village status of Granchester? p.28 – Rectory Farm section – I think for many people this will be confusing, as the land owned and managed under Stewardship by Mrs Bradford is at a distance from the B and B and its surrounding fields and woods, where there is no public access. p.30 – Univ. of Cambridge – a slip to St Catherine’s rather than St Catharine’s – and in the Polhill section, farm shop rather than show. p.34 – para 5.1, 3rd para – canoeists from rather than form?</p>	<p>Correct p19</p> <p>Add p22</p> <p>Amend p26</p> <p>Correct p28 & 29</p> <p>Correct p32</p>
51	Lesley Sherratt	<p>I should like to see Byron’s Pool and its surrounding area included in the concept of the QTSQ/rural lungs of Cambridge. I wasn’t clear from the document if it was inside the ‘6’ or not. I appreciate that some of the land between Byron’s Pool and Trumpington Meadows is not in Grantchester PC, but developing Trumpington Meadows further will clearly clog the lungs here.</p> <p>I happen to think having the rural lungs not perfectly overlapping with the four parish councils would be a good rather than a bad thing, because it would counter the accusation of nimbyism (note I’m not accusing it of that, I just think that’s where it will be attacked.) Perhaps calling it ‘Cambridge’s rural lungs’ rather than QTSQ, not necessarily including the total area of all of the four parishes and including in the lungs a few bits beyond, like Byron’s Pool’s surrounding area, would strengthen it by making clear that the four parishes make the case for the breathing and recreational space of all Cambridge residents, not just ourselves.</p>	<p>Yes, add p6</p> <p>State perhaps hold subsequent competition for alternative name, p48</p>
52	Ian Steen, Resident of Grantchester and Parish Councillor	<p>Generally my response to the QTSQ CONSUL TATON DRAFT is very positive. My general concerns are as follows: (1) The draft down-plays the landscape qualities of parts of the non-QTSQ ‘three-quarters’ , which makes it appear partisan. Also, by not analysing the particular qualities of the other areas that contribute to the setting of the city, the opportunity is missed to compare and contrast – that is to explain why their individual qualities are already compromised and by contrast why it is so important to preserve the QTSQ.</p> <p>P15 (5.) the river bank and fields towards Fen Ditton form a valuable contribution to the city, not least because of the bumps, but also because they give the impression of walking into genuine countryside. As they have a flanking setting of largely undeveloped agricultural land, they provide a ‘landscape’ corridor, similar to but less broad than Grantchester Meadows. The access from Cambridge , however, is through extended development and does not widen out until the railway bridge is passed, so the experience is less immediate than Grantchester Meadows.</p> <p>P15 (6.) access beyond the Airport for example to Anglesey Abbey is not only by car, but pleasantly achieved by bike</p> <p>P15 (7.) the Gog Magog hills are only easily accessible by car and Wandlebury is a valuable asset, however, the setting is compromised by the growing Addenbrooke’s Hospital development.</p> <p>Other areas of green; Stourbridge Common, Clay Farm, Trumpington Meadows are all ‘urban parks’ and not countryside.</p> <p>The principal area our genuine countryside close to Cambridge is Grantchester Meadows and the QTSQ</p>	<p>Re-draft p13</p> <p>Add reference p13</p> <p>Add reference p13</p>

		<p>3. I like section 7 with the model of 'National Parks', though this might seem a tad pretentious. These are lower level qualifications such as 'Area of Special Scenic Interest' or 'Special Landscape Area'. It would be useful to see what other parallels exist. I like the detailed analysis of what this means. P49 'historic field names' could also say 'field uses and their mediaeval origins'</p> <p>4. Detailed 'nit picks' are: P7 (2.) 'rural countryside' is a tautology – surely only 'countryside' P17 (4.1) lit (from the west)</p> <p>5. Does it need to be stated somewhere that the individual Parish Councils will be making their own representations and how and when? It would be useful to establish what the status of the QTSQ document is in relation to individual Parish Council's decision making.</p>	<p>Add comment p46</p> <p>Change p47</p> <p>Change p5 & 8</p> <p>Change p14</p> <p>State p45</p>
53	Andrew Matthews Resident of Grantchester and Parish Councillor	<p>Executive Summary of my response</p> <p>I have essentially made four significant points (in order of the QTSQ document):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The QTSQ document seems to state that the QTSQ is the only 'rural lung' of Cambridge, which will draw criticism and is highly debateable. In doing so, and separating itself from its neighbours, particularly those only divided by an artificial Parish/District Boundary, the document rejects the fact that geographical environments are joined and that we should be aiming to protect the special geographical features of our location, such as the area of Byron's Pool. This linking of adjacent locations is recognised in Council documents and its omission, I believe, limits its impact. • Grantchester's rural environment is equally, if not more significantly, at threat from additional (proposed) developments on Trumpington Meadows. Following from the above point, more detail should be forthcoming on potential developments affecting this particular rural environment to ensure that both sides of the river are protected and any additional (beyond that currently approved) development on the Trumpington Meadows site is strongly opposed by Grantchester, as evidenced by the passionate informal village consultation in Grantchester by Grovesnor Estates. Trumpington Meadows is a matter of significant concern to Grantchester. • The QTSQ document has the intention of being a planning document that aims to influence the Development Plan. However, by delving into many minutiae of Parish Council duties, the document potentially undermines the powers of the Parish Councils on many fronts and sets a precedent that Parish Councils cannot deliver, well beyond the focus of 'development'. I believe a clear statement needs to be made in the document clarifying that the responsibility for delivering the aspirations set out in it, that are normally the responsibilities of the Parish Councils, remain so. This is all the more important in light of the statement that the to-be-developed QTSQ organisation will require funding, and yet the source of this funding is not clear at this time and how the disbursements would be coordinated or apportioned between the Parishes (which are not equal in size). This statement will not undermine the document as the Parish Councils will (provided this is clear) approve it. I have proposed a small change that I hope clarifies this legal position. • The document refers to a "particular interest in investigating" rising bollards. As Councillor with the transport and traffic portfolio, I do not support this position and would instead (having spent a lot of time talking to people and reviewing statistics) propose that Grantchester is particularly interested in pursuing a reduction in the speed limits along Coton Road and a restriction of 20 mph through the village. <p>The detailed arguments are made below:</p> <p>① Page 3 – Letter - This section states that the "QTSQ is Cambridge's "rural lungs"", which potentially undermines the importance of other locations that form elements of Cambridge's rural lungs and potentially opens it up to broad criticism. I believe the QTSQ document needs to be inclusive in order to demonstrate continuity with other environmentally significant areas close to the City. Specifically the area around Byron's Pool and the "Green Corridor" identified and protected in SCDC's Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan (AAP) CSF/2 (Development and Countryside Improvement Principles) adopted February 2008, which neighbours this quadrant. I also believe this case is of particular importance for</p>	<p>Clarify this is not the case p6</p> <p>Refer p50</p>

the QTSQ quadrant because in this instance the District boundary is derived from a distinct natural feature, namely the river, which is of critical importance to the setting of the City and surroundings. The areas on both sides of the river need protection, and to exclude one bank because it is another district diminishes the proper emphasis on this unique feature bordering the QTSQ villages. Furthermore, I believe this area and should be considered more fully in the QTSQ document as considerable development is already noted in the document (Item 8, page 13 of QTSQ document), without making a position statement in this respect or identifying that a similar vision is being drawn up for this region, or that there already exists a Countryside Enhancement Strategy (CSF/5) within the AAP. An alternative proposal that would mitigate this criticism would be: "We believe that QTSQ forms a very significant/major part of Cambridge's "rural lungs".

② Page 5 – Executive Summary - Item 7 – Same comment as above, with the following proposed modification: "Our vision is for the QTSQ to be preserved and enhanced as a major part of Cambridge's "rural lungs", dedicated....."

③ Page 9 – Second from last para, same as above: "It's status as "a significant contributor to "Cambridge's rural lungs" should be enhanced and preserved"

④ Page 13 – A Tour around the Clock - Item 8 – This is an opportunity to show support for and continuity with one of our neighbouring districts and to clarify that the exact demarcation of the "vision" behind the QTSQ document is not strictly limited by District Boundaries, but rather by geographical features, such as one of the main features of the City, the river. This section states ""Within less than a decade.... there must be the possibility of further applications for development and the landowner has commenced informal consultations with residents about additional housing and sports facilities.... Therefore, although there is currently open countryside close to Cambridge in this area, much of it will soon be developed". Although the first half is factually correct, the second half seems to imply that the QTSQ villages accept that this is an inevitability. I feel strongly that this needs re-drafting as (I believe) the Grantchester Parish Council will aim to oppose any additional developments of Trumpington West and certainly do NOT want this document to reflect (a possible interpretation of) acceptance that "much of it will be developed", whatever the outcome. Therefore I would propose either striking the entire section starting from "Trumpington Meadows will come close to the M11.....", or adding comments to the effect that Grantchester Parish Council will oppose any additions to the developments currently approved at Trumpington Meadows.

⑤ Page 20 – Grantchester - Ideally we should add material about Byron's Pool and references to the neighbouring Nature Reserves (included on Page 22 onwards). However, at this point the document suffers a bit from inconsistency, including references to Nature Reserves inside and outside the QTSQ, while only addressing the aspirations of QTSQ. The document seems to be attempting to gain advantage from their presence while only aspiring to protect those villages inside the QTSQ boundary. As indicated above, for consistency, to prevent being criticised for NIMBY, and to be inclusive, this relationship needs further clarification or tidying up. My personal opinion is that we should refer to the other neighbouring elements of the "rural lungs" and refer to documents, discussions and plans that provide complementary visions for enhancing and preserving the compactness of the City and importance of the Green belt, whether or not it neatly fits into the QTSQ. In particular the SCDC AAP.

⑥ Page 45 - SECTION 7 – VISION FOR QTSQ - At this point the document dives into a plethora of visions that have little or nothing to do with "development" and creating a vision for the protection of the QTSQ from excessive housing development. The pursuant sections make detailed statements about a number of areas of responsibility normally under the remit of the Parish Councils, including placement of bridges, benches, signage, wheelchair access, buses, working with Highways, litter collection, etc.. While this section is predicated by the statement: "Specific recommendations and action(s) plans will be developed over the next few years...., but some current ideas include", I feel this statement absolutely needs to be qualified, to put the document in context with the duties of the respective Parish Councils. A suitable wording might be: "Specific recommendations and action(s) plans will be developed by the Parish Councils over the next few years, to reflect the vision and 'context and philosophy' set out above, but some current ideas include:" Note that the subsequent bullet point proposes the creation of a joint working group from the Parish Councillors, so there is consistency. This retains the power of

Change p3

Change p5 & 45
Change p9

Delete p13

Add references p20

Add these words p47

the document, which will be “blessed” by the Parish Councils, but does not set a precedent that potentially undermines the function or responsibilities of the Parish Councils and does not commit them to delivering the “ideas” contained in this section. I think it is vitally important for the Parish Councils to retain their freedom of operation within the currently granted legislated powers. Personally I feel this is critical. Having made this clear, I will continue to comment on the pursuant sections.

⑦ Page 45 - Section Summary – Same argument as above, proposing QTSQ as the only “rural lung”. Instead propose “... as a major element of Cambridge’s ‘rural lungs’,”

⑧ 7.1 Context and philosophy - End Para 3 – “We believe that the next stage of the development of the QTSQ and its immediate neighbours will be optimised by considering it as a unified whole”.

⑨ Page 46 – 2nd Para. Again – “... we have reflected that closely by referring to QTSQ as a major element of “Cambridge’s rural lungs””.

⑩ Page 46 – I don’t have a section 7.2!

⑪⑪ Page 47 – Section 7.3 – Enhance and develop - Organisation: Please add a bullet point: To co-ordinate better the preservation, enhancement and development of the QTSQ with neighbouring Parishes and Councils to optimise the benefit of the southern and western fringe rural lungs for residents and visitors alike.

⑫⑫ Page 49 – Safety - The QTSQ document identifies a number of specific safety aims, as quoted:

- *to reduce speed limits on the A603 and A1303, and improve the junctions onto and crossings over them*
- *to introduce alternative permissive routes to avoid traffic danger-spots*
- *to enhance existing, and introduce additional, traffic-calming measures along the main roads and within the villages. In particular, Grantchester is interested in investigating rising bollards on the road to Trumpington at peak times, modelled on those on Wort’s Causeway.*

The reference to Grantchester’s interest in rising bollards is inappropriate, as this is only one of a number of different proposals that we are interested in investigating, and the use of them at only Peak Times significantly, in my view evidenced below, reduces their potential benefit from the perspective of pedestrian (and particularly child safety) in the village. To express a view that the village is particularly interested in this approach cannot be evidenced as it has not been debated (as far as I am aware) at any time by the Parish Council or widely by members of the community, other than a limited number of comments. There are many other proposals that have been considered in much more detail and if reference to bollards is made, then reference to other proposals should also be made.

Further, as Parish Councillor with responsibility for traffic matters, I would not support the proposal as expressed, although I certainly am interested in and intend to investigate their possibility and impact, from financial, environmental and safety perspectives, just as I am interested in, and indeed in the process of, investigating other safety-enhancing proposals. In my opinion we are not interested ‘in particular’ in this singular investigation. I would also not support the expressed aim to place them towards the Trumpington end of the village, as this minimises their impact on traffic volumes.

The reason for my being unconvinced at this time of their safety benefit is based on the following evidence:

- Speeding along Coton Road has been identified by consultation for the Parish Plan as a matter of concern for villagers
- Road traffic accidents are the largest global cause of child mortality and excessive speed has been repeatedly shown to increase the likelihood of severe injury or death
- It is further evidenced in research that children of primary school age cannot accurately assess speeds in excess of 20 mph
- It is for the above reasons that inner city areas across the country are moving towards 20 mph zones as the norm in residential areas, as recommended by a number of bodies including the NHS
- Grantchester traffic surveys show that speeding occurs at ALL times, not just during peak hours
- These traffic surveys also show that traffic volume, while maximised during peak hours, is relatively consistent

Change p45

Add p45
Change p46

Renumber
Add p47

Delete reference p49

		<p>throughout all periods of the day and proposals for calming measures should consider all of these periods, not just peak periods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In particular, children return home from school outside peak hours, and this is their opportunity to play and socialise Additional research shows that whilst the present era is the safest period for children in our history, parents' safety concerns are increasingly causing children to be prevented from socialising outside the home environment <p>I therefore believe strongly that we should aim to manage speeding with a higher priority than traffic volume to maximise safety and enhance the feeling of "community". As Parish Councillor with portfolio responsibility for traffic and transport, I am particularly interested in investigating the possibility of obtaining a reduction of the speed limit through the village to 20 mph. If the statement about bollards is included, then I would require the statement to be amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To enhance existing and introduce additional traffic calming measures along the main access roads and within the villages. In particular, Grantchester is interested in investigating reducing the speed limit through the village to 20 mph and placing rising bollards at the entrances to the village to control peak traffic volumes (such as those exemplified by Wort's Causeway). <p>I also feel the first bullet point needs modification and additions should be made to increase sustainability in transport (which is generally what this section refers to). I would therefore propose the following paragraph to replace the existing statements on safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To reduce the speed of traffic through the QTSQ villages in consultation with District Traffic Officers (<i>NB - optional - shows interest in consulting with responsible Officers</i>) To reduce the speed limits on sections of the A603, A1303 and Coton Road, and improve the junctions onto and crossings over them To introduce alternative permissive and safe cycle routes to reduce congestion, increase environmental sustainability and avoid traffic danger-spots To enhance existing and introduce additional traffic calming measures along the main access roads and within the villages. In particular, Grantchester is interested in investigating reducing the speed limit through the village to 20 mph and placing rising bollards at the entrances to the village to control peak traffic volumes (such as those exemplified by Wort's Causeway). <p>13 Page 49 - Community: - Not sure why we talk about correct levels of primary educational supply? I must be missing the point, but surely this indicates that we would accept a large number of new houses in the QTSQ, placing pressure on existing schools, but the whole point of this document is limiting development to in-fill only (therefore no pressure??). Also, we obviously know of the new school at Trumpington Meadows, so how does supply affect the QTSQ picture? Where has this come from? "To ensure that our village amenities survive and grow – schools, shops, etc.?"</p> <p>14 Page 50 – Finance - The document acknowledges that many of the aspirations of QTSQ will require financing. While many of the quoted "ideas" may be generic, many of them will be Parish-specific. Unless ALL of the funding comes from external sources, the subject of finance has to be coordinated with the Parish Plans. Further, the subject of finance raises all sorts of questions about prioritisation, Parish Council contributions, apportionment, etc.. Further to my point above about the QTSQ aspirations needing to be subject to Parish Council approval, this aspect of finance reaffirms my belief that a conditional statement is absolutely required. Hence my recommendation for changes to the Vision statement on Page 45, stated above: "Specific recommendations and action(s) plans will be developed by the Parish Councils over the next few years, to reflect the vision and 'context and philosophy' set out above, but some current ideas include:"</p>	<p>Remove reference p49</p> <p>Use highlighted words only pX</p> <p>Add p49</p> <p>Add highlighted words p49</p> <p>Delete/don't add these words p49</p> <p>Add words p49</p> <p>Add words p47</p>
54	Will Lusty, Savills	<p>On behalf of our client, St John's College, thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the above document. The College is a substantial landowner within the Quarter to Six Quadrant (QTSQ) area. Notably, the College owns College Farm at Coton and Grange Farm on the western edge of Cambridge. The College acknowledges that parts of the QTSQ serve important recreational and environmental functions. It is therefore</p>	<p>Add comment p52</p>

essential to afford appropriate protection to these areas. However, it is also important to consider social and economic factors and we do not consider that the Vision document properly considers these matters, particularly in view of recently published Government planning policy guidance.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012. Chapter 1 of the NPPF recognises that ‘the Government is committed to securing economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity, building on the country’s inherent strengths, and to meeting the twin challenges of global competition and of a low carbon future’. The NPPF also reflects this in support for a prosperous rural economy. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF remarks that ‘planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development’. As such, the need to foster economic growth is a key, if it not the most important, objective of the NPPF.

The QTSQ lies on the edge of a city which is of national importance to the economy. There are also a number of rural communities lying within the QTSQ. Therefore, in order to plan sustainably for the future of the QTSQ, the need to protect and enhance the area’s environmental and recreational resources must be considered alongside the social and economic implications of planning for Cambridge and also the rural communities within the QTSQ. This is easier to address, when considering the communities within the QTSQ, but clearly more difficult when planning for the needs of Cambridge, where we consider it must be appropriate to consider the QTSQ ‘in the round’ of planning for Cambridge as a whole. If it is the purpose of the QTSQ to provide a comprehensive package of planning policies across the QTSQ area, then the Vision document might be considered as premature, until the outcome of the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans are known. If it is an analysis of the landscape of the QTSQ and its communities, then it serves this purpose very well.

Turning more specifically to policy contained within the NPPF in relation to the rural area, the NPPF recognises that all types of business and enterprise in rural areas should be supported; that diversification of agriculture and other land based rural businesses should be promoted; that rural tourism and leisure development that benefit businesses should be supported, including the provision and expansion of tourist and visitor facilities; and, that local services and community facilities in villages such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship should be supported and retained. As such, our interpretation of the Government’s Policy for the rural area is that of providing support to the economy of the rural area through sustainable development.

In applying the policies of the NPPF to the QTSQ, a key consideration in planning for Cambridge should be to assess whether growth of the city could be sustainably accommodated in the area. The Vision document provides a planning policy history, particularly in terms of the parts of the QTSQ lying immediately to the north of Barton Road. There is no doubt that planning policy has historically resisted development on this part of the edge of Cambridge. However, those policies decisions were taken at specific points in time, in accordance with evidence available and the relevant considerations at those times. Planning policy history should not therefore be seen to set precedents for future reviews of planning policy.

The current circumstances which are relevant to whether land to the west of Cambridge might be suitable to accommodate growth of the town include the fact that previously planned development on other sites in Cambridge, such as the Airport are no longer available for development. This requires re-assessment of other alternatives about how that existing planned development and any additional growth should be accommodated. The western edge of Cambridge as a background to potential further development is also changing. This edge of Cambridge is becoming increasingly urbanised, with the most recent addition of a prominent new building for the University’s Department of Materials Science & Metallurgy. Against this backdrop, it becomes less relevant to resist expansion of Cambridge in this direction.

Turning to the QTSQ’s rural communities, in order to support the economy of this rural area, we consider that appropriate levels of new development should be allowed, including housing development comprising of a mix of sizes, types and tenures. We notice that the document proposes that in order to preserve the area, new house building should be limited to infill only, broadly in line with existing planning policies. We do not consider that this approach would broadly align with existing policy, with both Barton and Coton identified as Group Villages within the Adopted South Cambridgeshire Core

<p>Strategy Development Plan Document (January 2007).</p> <p>In order for a truly sustainable strategy for the QTSQ area, it is of course essential that environmental protection and enhancement is provided for, but balanced with appropriate levels and types of new development. At present, we do not consider that this balance is struck by the QTSQ Vision.</p> <p>As a matter of context, we would point out that Cambridge already benefits from a number of public open spaces including parks and commons. Furthermore, Granchester Meadows is not unique in providing a green corridor into the countryside. For example, Stourbridge Common provides a corridor of open space and public access along the River Cam, into the open countryside beyond Fen Ditton.</p> <p>The College welcomes the efforts that have been taken to present the document to the public for consultation. However, we consider that it would have been helpful for the consultation to allow for further time after the Open Meeting on 27 April to submit representations.</p> <p>Thank you again for this opportunity to comment upon the document. Should you have any questions or wish to discuss this letter with us further, please do of course contact us.</p>	
---	--

55

James Ingram, Savills

Add p52

Add comment p50

26 April 2012
LJG/loaol

savills

QTSQ
c/o 17 The Broadway
Grantchester
Cambridge
CB3 9NQ

JAMES INGRAM BSc (Hons) MRICS FAAV
E: jingram@savills.co.uk
DL: +44 (0) 1279 756808
F: +44 (0) 1279 756811

Chequers
19 North Street
Bishop's Stortford CM23 2LD
T: +44 (0) 1279 756 800
savills.com

Dear Sir

A JOINT VISION FOR CAMBRIDGE'S 'QUARTER TO SIX QUADRANT' BY BARTON, COTON, GRANTCHESTER AND MADINGLEY PARISH COUNCILS

Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the above document. We are replying on behalf of King's College, the major landowner around Grantchester and therefore an owner who is directly affected by the proposals. The College owns Manor Farm, to the west of the village and including land to the west of the M11; Lacies Farm, which includes land to the north of the village; Grantchester Meadows; and other property within and around the village.

King's College welcomes the initiative and efforts taken by the Parish Councils to prepare this Vision, in seeking to provide a coherent strategy for the area. The College acknowledges that parts of the QTSQ area serve important recreational and environmental functions to local inhabitants, City residents and visitors. The intention to increase this function within the area, in itself, is laudable. However, a significant proportion of the QTSQ area is in commercial agricultural production and not currently publically accessible. Residential use and other uses associated with the predominant agricultural use of the area and the rural communities are set within it. Those not supportive of the initiative should not suffer the consequences of a blanket approach to the area. Whilst the document makes reference to retaining working farmland, it does little to address the conflict between such use and high levels of public access and recreation.

This existing pattern of land uses underpins the current functioning of the area. To open up significant additional parts to provide public access and to restrict new development would undermine this function of the area and therefore its sustainability as a series of rural communities. It may be desirable to establish appropriate additional public thoroughfares within the area, in particular to provide an improved resource for the City. However, to establish more significant 'open access' areas and to restrict appropriate new development is not considered as representing the most sustainable long term strategy for the area and its communities.

Within the above context, we are concerned that the document unduly focuses upon environmental considerations, particularly the landscape value of the area, with insufficient weight given to economic and social considerations for the communities within it. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which was published in March 2012 supports a prosperous rural economy. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF remarks that planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development.

Add p48

Add p48

Add p26

Add p36

Delete p52

The NPPF recognises that all types of business and enterprise in rural areas should be supported; that diversification of agriculture and other land based rural businesses should be promoted; that rural tourism and leisure development that benefit businesses should be supported, including the provision and expansion of tourist and visitor facilities; and, that local services and community facilities in villages such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship should be supported and retained. As such, our interpretation of the Government's Policy for the rural area is that of providing support to the economy of the rural area through a balance of land uses, including the provision of sustainable rural tourism that benefit communities and visitors respect the character of the countryside.

In order to support the economy of this rural area, rather than just opening it up to more visitors, we therefore consider that appropriate levels of new development should be allowed, including housing development comprising of a mix of sizes, types and tenures. We note the document proposes that in order to preserve the area, new house building should be limited to infill only, broadly in line with existing planning policies. We do not consider that this approach would broadly align with existing policy, with both Barton and Coton identified as Group Villages within the South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (January 2007).

In order for a truly sustainable strategy for the QTSQ area, it is of course essential that environmental protection and enhancement is also provided for as appropriate within the QTSQ, but balanced with appropriate levels and types of new development, along with maintaining the viability of commercial farming. At present, we do not consider that this balance is struck by the QTSQ Vision. Many will appreciate the pressures King's College faces in trying to maintain agricultural use of Grantchester Meadows, the use which initially created that landscape, rather than allowing it to become a public park.

As a matter of context, and in relation to comments concerning the lack of access for City residents to the countryside, we would point out that very few towns or cities of a similar size to Cambridge benefit from the number of public open spaces including parks and commons to be found in the City. Furthermore, Grantchester Meadows is not unique in providing a green corridor into the countryside. For example, Stourbridge Common provides a corridor of open space and public access along the River Cam, from very close to the City centre out into the open countryside beyond Fen Ditton.

In addition to the concerns and points raised above, the following practical observations have been noted in reviewing the document and in relation to public access, leisure and the environment:

1. The need for dog waste bins in the Meadows and elsewhere, to prevent the alternative littering with waste bags
2. The document should not make reference to picnicking on the Meadows – it is unavoidable after centuries of informal limited recreational use, but promoting such activities threatens the continued agricultural use of the land
3. Likewise, when referring to the Bird Sanctuary, the document should mention watching birdlife from the footpaths on the Meadows, rather than suggesting any form of open access.
4. The document mentions the public access map for Barton, but not the one the College, through ourselves, has provided for Grantchester.

We would also prefer the reference to Savills not to include an individual's name.

The College welcomes the efforts that have been taken to present the document to the public for consultation. However, we consider that it would have been helpful for the consultation to allow for further time after the Open Meeting on 27 April to submit representations.

Thank you again for this opportunity to comment upon the document. Should you have any questions or wish to discuss this letter with us further, please do of course contact us on behalf of the College.

Yours faithfully



JAMES INGRAM BSc (Hons) MRICS FAAV
Associate

27 April 2012
CAPL MISC/CC/TE

QTSQ
c/o 17 Broadway
Grantchester
Cambridge
CB3 9NQ

By email: consultation@qtsq.org.uk



Colin Campbell BSc DipTP MRTPI
E: ccampbell@savills.com
DL: +44 (0) 1223 347068
F: +44 (0) 1223 347111

Unex House
132-134 Hills Road
Cambridge CB2 8PA
T: +44 (0) 1223 347 000
savills.com

Dear Sir/Madam

A Joint Vision for Cambridge's Quarter-To-Six Quadrant

We write on behalf of Grosvenor and Wrenbridge in response to the four council's consultation on its Vision for the area.

We agree that it is important that local people are involved in shaping the future of their communities. We also recognise the important role this area plays in terms of recreation and environmental quality close to the edge of Cambridge. However, we would wish to comment on the number of points the document makes in relation to adjoining areas, the description of the area covered and the approach to the analysis of sustainability issues.

We consider the area would be better termed the Quarter to Seven Quadrant. The River Cam (going upstream) follows a north/north-east to south/south-west alignment which on a clock face is more akin to seven than six. This is simply seen on page 7 where the diagram shows an arrow pointing due south and the alignment of the Cam can be clearly seen.

Page 13 of the report describes Trumpington Meadows as being between five and six o'clock on the clock face. We would suggest that if the centre of the clock is the historic core, the broad line of Trumpington Road runs at six o'clock and therefore Trumpington Meadows falls between six and seven. As the document states, it applies only to the four parishes and its boundary is the River Cam, we consider the area covered needs to be described more accurately or else it may be considered by some to effect a wider area than it actually does.

Page 13 also suggests that Trumpington Meadows will soon be significantly developed, that the land is in private ownership and is not widely used. It implies that significant areas of countryside will soon be developed. The current planning permission for Trumpington Meadows involves development of 13 hectares of previously developed land. The current permission comprises 30 hectares of built development (a net change of 17 hectares) and a country park of 60 hectares. Significant works have already taken place in relation to the country park and further work is currently underway to enhance the Cam corridor, provide access to the countryside and provide pedestrian and cycle links to the wider rural area. The text should be amended to reflect more accurately the Trumpington Meadows proposals.

The text implies that there will be significant impact on green corridors, a statement with which we do not agree. Indeed works are underway to enhance the green corridors through the creation of a 40 hectare wildflower meadow, 10 hectares of woodland and 4 kilometres of hedgerow. In addition 1 ½ kilometres along the River Cam has been restored and enhanced.

Comment p6

Deletion p13

Add

		<p>The document focuses on the environmental qualities of the area, but as far as we can tell there has been no analysis of social or economic issues facing the parishes. For example, much of the area is farmed commercially and there is no analysis of the factors affecting the farming industry and how that might impact on the economy and the environment of the area. There is no evidence that housing needs of local communities have been considered and what the implications of that might be. For example, we understand that there are 43 persons currently on South Cambridgeshire's housing waiting register with a local connection to the area. We consider that if the document is to inform local planning policy, it would benefit from analysis of economic and social considerations of the area. It also needs consider the broader economic and social context and the strategic needs and priorities as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. It would be helpful to undertake a sustainability appraisal of the document in order that the environmental, economic and social impacts can be assessed and compared in a holistic way. Without such a rounded consideration of the economic, social and environment factors the document will not be able to be accorded any significant influence in informing policy development.</p> <p>We note that the Councils intend to hold a public meeting on the 27th April and that comments on the document are invited by midnight on that day. We consider that in forming their views it would be helpful for people to have time to be able to reflect on the various opinions which will no doubt be expressed. We suggest therefore that the deadline for comments should be extended to allow stakeholders time to reflect on the public meeting, and consider the various views before submitting comments.</p> <p>We trust these comments are helpful in moving forward the vision for the four parishes.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>  <p>Colin Campbell BSc DipTP MRTPI Director</p>	Add comment p45
57	Christopher Thorne 17 The Footpath Coton, CB23 7PX	<p>I have read the document with interest, and am in full agreement with the sentiments. Some comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The sector is only really "quarter to six", if measured from Arbury. But I suppose that "twenty-five to eleven" (as measured from the centre of Cambridge) does not roll off the tongue! 2. Spelling of St Catharine's (my own College) is consistently correct, EXCEPT on page 30 (5 lines up from the bottom). 3. My most serious point: more should be made of the wildlife interest (which might well be the reason for an increase in visitors - so long as they keep their dogs from running free). To improve accuracy in the draft - (a) note that (p23) Red Kites and Black Squirrels are quite frequently seen in Coton and other parts of the area - not just Madingley. A really rare bird (currently), the Lesser spotted Woodpecker is still to be seen in Madingley Wood. (b) Buzzards and Hobbies should be mentioned, both to be seen over the Coton Countryside reserve. (c) the open fields of the countryside of the QTSQ area were once a stronghold of Corn Buntings, Skylarks and Partridges, all "vanishing species" now due to human population pressures. These species are still to be seen, although in reduced numbers; but would be encouraged to continue to breed so long as the relevant land is not swallowed up by building. 	<p>Correct p28</p> <p>Mention p19</p> <p>Mention p25</p> <p>Mention p23</p>
58	Mark Abbott and Michelle	In response to your Consultation draft which, overall, is positive and proactive we would like to make the following points:	

	<p>Miller The Old Rectory 73 High Street Coton Cambridge CB23 7PL</p>	<p>1. Does the document solely relate to the "Call for Sites' land or all land within the four parishes? We would like clarification on the purpose of it.</p> <p>2. On page 27, there is a description about Lacies Farm. It states "The College has recently commenced informal discussions with the village about a modest residential development in the redundant farm buildings."</p> <p>* The farm buildings are NOT redundant and are actively being used.</p> <p>* The proposed development of ten houses, when ST/7 states that Grantchester is an infill village of a maximum of 2 units, is clearly NOT a "modest development."</p> <p>* Furthermore, SCDC's legal department have said that , because it is outside their planning policies to build on conservation land outside the village envelope, it would be refused.</p> <p>This paragraph needs to be removed or redrafted to reflect the accuracy of the current situation.</p> <p>3. Under section 7.2 "Preserve" (p.52) of the consultation draft there is a paragraph that states "(b) some minor schemes that fall outside the strict application of those policies, whether inside or outside the village envelopes, may be felt appropriate on a case-by-case basis and subject to their individual merits, associated contribution to the locality and community, and the views of local village residents."</p> <p>* This is CONTRARY to SCDC planning policy documents and Grantchester's Parish Plan. Where has this statement come from as it is completely at odds with existing planning policies? In our opinion, this paragraph should be removed as it encourages development and the whole purpose of this document is to restrict it.</p>	<p>Insert clarification p50</p> <p>Delete "redundant" p25</p> <p>Delete "modest" p25 Add "outside policy" p25</p> <p>Redraft p50</p>
59	<p>North Newnham Residents Association 9 Wilberforce Road Cambridge, CB3 0EQ</p> <p>Chair- Penny Heath Secretary-Kate Crofts</p>	<p>Thank you for sending the NNRA a copy of the Joint Vision for Cambridge's quarter-to-six-quadrant. Our committee expressed whole hearted support for this initiative and congratulate you on the well written and expansive document. We are generally in favour of preserving the rural lungs and cautiously welcome enhancement as a place for enjoyment of the countryside, for every age group. We would like to see the strictest controls on any housing developments and welcome any strengthening of preservation policies that will protect the green corridors and landscape and views of the historic city centre.</p> <p>Further additions or comments brought to the table were:</p> <p><i>2.0 Summary vision. Page 8-9</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add or mention 'The Great West Field' pre enclosure common land which defines the landscape development to West of Cambridge. • Request for more explicit mention of links to the green corridor into the Backs, which are so important for wildlife. • It would be good if the Coton footpath/Wimpole Way axis was better mentioned in relation to City fringes. Suggest routinely add Coton footpath/Cranmer Road to Barton Road? <p><i>4.4 Landholdings and land Characteristics Landholdings.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add to the list of landowners –University of Cambridge and the West Cambridge Site. This 90 acre site is having a huge impact on the top section of the QTQS. • Better mention of College ownership of farmland (St John's, Jesus & others?) <p><i>4.5 Public enjoyment Recreational amenities.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a qualification about avoiding noise pollution late at night from festivals. (For example the Haggis Farm Rock Festival. It would help if this was subject to stricter conditions on noise levels and hours than last year). • Add a qualification about avoiding excessive lighting, especially floodlighting. Lighting is a statutory nuisance and developing sports fields need strict controls. The Observatory on Madingley Road already suffers from encroaching light pollution. <p><i>5.1 Public access from the City.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.2. Definitive rights of way maps. Although there are footpaths East West, there is a shortage of North to South and routes that link up Madingley Road to Barton Road. 	<p>Mention p8</p> <p>Mention p32</p> <p>Mention p32</p> <p>Add p26</p> <p>Mention p26</p> <p>Mention p49</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there scope for creating new or better footpath or cycle links North to South if land owners worked within developing QTQS? A continuation of Clark Maxwell road was on the cards at one time and could be converted to a cycle track? Add Boundary lines. The County and City Parish boundaries and significance of the boundary footpaths could have better mention. <p><i>7.3. Enhance and Develop Awareness:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns were expressed at asking Highways department to create more signs from the City. There is a danger of urbanising the country side. The track record of maintenance and design of appropriate signs in the City & County is poor. For example- The Coton Footpath has unnecessary number of footpath & cycle signs generated from Section 106 funding (West Cambridge site) that are out of character with rural interface of City and countryside. <p><i>Resident and Visitor enjoyment:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit Interpretation boards. Too many turn the place into a theme-park and have no place in real countryside. Need for better sound reduction from the M11. Special road surface measures. Better noise and visual attenuation needed. Plant more trees. Add impact of the prevailing wind and when air is damp, traffic noise affects Newnham and Cambridge City. <p><i>Safety Traffic calming measures.</i> Some us think that many villages around Cambridge have been vandalised by hideous traffic calming schemes, bossy notices and twee entrance gates. The QTQS villages deserve better.</p>	<p>Add p48</p> <p>Caveat p48 Reinforce p49</p> <p>Mention p49</p>
60	Sally Bott	<p>Just a few comments on the draft, which I think makes a very strong case for the area having "tourist potential". I'm not sure how those of us who live in the area (outside of Grantchester) really feel about that, and whether we'd be happy to see a regular spring/summer minibus service from the Park and Ride sites out to our village, so that the beautiful environment we enjoy can be shared with others! I think it's somewhat far-fetched to suggest that visitors would walk from Trumpington or Madingley Park and Ride to these villages.</p> <p>On page 21 of the draft, you have omitted to mention the safe cycle path and footpath from Cambridge to Coton, and that, in Paragraph 3, Madingley is accessible from Coton "via the American Cemetery".</p> <p>On page 31 you omit to mention that Polhill Nursery has a very pleasant cafe.</p> <p>Page 33, final paragraph, what are village "days"? I suggest "fetes" might better describe a typical village event.</p>	<p>Add p21 Add p21</p> <p>Add p29</p>
61	Jane Berrill	<p>I admire both the concept and title of QTSQ and agree that it is a near perfect geographical match for the are of the four parishes concerned; I am also appreciative of the immense amount of work that has gone into its production and circulation. My comments are personal although I am also a member of Grantchester Parish Council and as such have confined any criticisms to this village alone.</p> <p>King's College is a significant landowner in Grantchester and the housing estate built there on land bought from the college is not nearly as extensive as was originally proposed when it would have included a school. I find it sad, as a resident of Grantchester, that among the objectives given under the heading 'Community' on page 51 is 'to ensure that our village amenities survive' when in Grantchester three out of the four mentioned have already been lost to the village.</p> <p>I recognise that Grantchester has a special place in the affections of many people although I believe that Rupert Brooke would have been highly amused to find his semi-comic poem elevated to near iconic status. Byron's Pool is obviously included in the area but since it is managed by Cambridge City Council has not been described in detail. E.M. Forster's pet hate was Sawston and I cannot recall the context of the quotation from 'The Longest Journey' but find it ironic that among the landmarks seen from Red Meadow Hill in Barton the University Library is included which, before my time, was claimed to have ruined the appearance of Cambridge for ever!</p> <p>Which brings me to my own reaction to QTSQ: I feel it is in danger of appearing, however unfairly, as hindered by an emotional nimbyism and there is also a flavour of 'stop the world I want to get off'. I will admit to having been influenced by</p>	<p>Refer 'economic context' p45</p>

		<p>an earlier refusal by the village to recognise a legitimate right to attempt to find a viable solution to the problem of Lacies Farm which is no longer economic as a working farmyard and which cannot be allowed to fall into disrepair. I believe that some conflict between preservation and profitability is inevitable and have lived in Grantchester long enough to remember when a line of elms broke up the view across what has become, from my window, dangerously near to 'a wildlife desert consisting of large fields and monoculture farming.' But, apart from widening field edges, is it fair to expect tenant farmers to plant hedgerows, with all the attendant costs of their maintenance, at no personal benefit to themselves?</p> <p>I am most interested in the Buchanan Study and also in the judgments of the High Court and the Court of Appeal in relation to any proposed development on the Barton Road; I have not yet read either Appendix. As a regular user of the Junction 12 roundabout I have an affection for the informal planting of trees and find a slight contradiction in terms between wishing to see it as a 'green' entrance to the city if it is thought at the same time that the city should in no way be allowed to develop any closer to this same entrance. I am unaware of the scale of the development turned down in 2007/8.</p> <p>I have commented elsewhere on the problem of traffic through the village and here again I do not see how this can be thought of in isolation from our neighbours. I am unaware of any widespread interest in the possibility of rising bollards during peak times on the road to Trumpington and, as I have already said, my immediate question would be: "What is the reaction of Trumpington Farm Company?" but perhaps they have not yet been asked. I believe the analogy with Wort's Causeway is a false one.</p>	Delete p49
62	Jennifer Donkin 13, Roman Hill, Barton	I greatly appreciate the splendid report you have prepared for the Consultative Draft and agree with all your proposals	None
63	Jackie and Geoff Meeks 11 Clarkson Road CB3 0EH	Our central comment on the QTSQ initiative is that we strongly support it and wish you success in your endeavours to preserve and enhance this important green corridor into the city. We have minor concerns that increasing some recreational facilities in this fairly compact area might harbour a risk of undermining the special qualities of the QTSQ (e.g through light pollution or noise pollution) but we expect you will be alert to such dangers? (Perhaps they could be taken into account more explicitly in your documentation?) But the main point is that, as residents of North Newnham, we very frequently take walks in your area, appreciating the views, the wildlife and the surprising degree of rural calm. Long may it last. We feel that in celebrating these beautiful villages and adjacent countryside as the 'lungs' of Cambridge you are recognising benefits they give not just to your own immediate communities but also to the residents and many visitors to Cambridge City itself.	Add p49 and 49
64	Stephen and Joanne Howard 71 Coton Road, Grantchester	<p>First of all thank you for the opportunity to read and respond to your draft vision for Cambridge QTSQ.</p> <p>There is a lot of condensed information in the document and so we also welcome the open meeting at Barton School to discuss it. Here are our general comments and thoughts about the document and the area:</p> <p>As parents who have brought up young children in the village we are glad to see a welcome emphasis on providing safe and attractive traffic-free routes through the area, both for walking, running and cycling. Right now as the draft notes there are a number of attractive routes available but they are not well connected and the roads in between are not safe. For example the Coton Countryside Reserve is a lovely venue. It is less than two miles from us but when our daughter cycled to Coton Primary School through the reserve we had to transport her part way by car rather than cycle from Grantchester on the dangerous roads.</p> <p>The summary mentions SCDC's 'Vision for South Cambs Communities' which starts with fine words about 'South Cambridgeshire will continue to be the best place to live and work in the country...'. However there is one glaring area where it currently falls well short. Despite being so close to Cambridge, there are still many areas within the Quadrant which do not have access to a decent high speed internet connection. The desire for this is surely shown by the success of Coton and Madingley in the BT 'Race To Infinity' competition a year or so back. Surely any plan for the area should look to address this huge weakness. It will over time fundamentally change the nature of businesses in the area and the prospects and quality of life for those living there. Please do something about it. Cambridge should be leading the country in such</p>	<p>Add p48</p> <p>Add p49</p>

		<p>endeavours.</p> <p>The draft quite rightly describes the unique rural nature of the area and indeed the summary emphasises the importance of limiting new house building to infill-only. Section 7.2 also stresses the need to preserve the rural nature but then goes on to suggest that the current policy is generic in nature and that under some circumstances it should not apply. We do not agree. Our concern is that this inevitably weakens any resolve to ensure development should not be considered outside the village envelopes. Surely it is this very specific policy that has been applied over many years that is the reason the area has remained uniquely rural.</p> <p>As if there were any further need to emphasise how such a weakening of the resolve would be used we refer you to section 4.4 under King's College discussing the Lacies Farm development in Grantchester. It is described as a modest residential development in redundant farm buildings. The proposed development by no means modest (10 dwellings!), the farm buildings are not redundant. The development included a proposal for an access road that would have extended development outside of the village envelope destroying a uniquely rural aspect to the village.</p>	<p>Delete word p25</p> <p>Delete word p25</p>
65	<p>David Ousby 29 High Street Madingley CB23 8AB</p>	<p>Having recently moved to Madingley our comments are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic Calming - despite there being a 30mph limit in the village and a few token measures to reduce speeds, we are too often disturbed by cars and lorries, mostly in the evening and early morning, travelling at great speeds, certainly well in excess of 50mph. We feel it more than others as our house is not set back from the road. If Cambridge is to expand as planned, we expect more traffic through the village, unless some serious attempt to deter people from using Madingley as a cut through is made. We need speed tables to force all traffic to slow down to 20mph through the middle of the village, with speed ramps to force all traffic to slow down to 30mph at the entrances to the village. I mean proper speed ramps, and not the benign lumps in the road outside the three horseshoes that do nothing at all to deter speeding motorists. 2. Cycle routes. Many people cycle through Madingley from Girton, Dry Drayton etc towards Cambridge and more could be encouraged to do so by making a serious attempt to make dedicated cycle paths as an alternative to risking life and limb on Cambridge Road out of the village. A similar route up to Madingley Mulch would also be welcome. Combined with the traffic calming measures outlined above, prioritising highway developments in favour of cyclists above motor vehicles would make the idea of the QTSQ being the "Green Lungs" of Cambridge a reality and not the somewhat distant dream it is at present. 3. Public Footpaths. Contrary to what is stated in the 'Joint Vision' document, Madingley Hall is not open to the public. Certainly there are three events each year where the general public are welcomed, but at all other times a permit is required to walk on the estate and access is strictly limited to designated paths. For example, access to woodland and pasture is prohibited, which are amongst the most interesting parts of the estate. Improvement of access to the estate through the provision of new bridle ways and footpaths linking to existing rights of way would improve matters for residents and visitors alike. 4. Conclusion. Yes the QTSQ should be safeguarded from development and there should be no more housing built in the area apart from infill developments and exceptions sites where affordable homes to meet local village needs can be built by a Community Land Trust. For the QTSQ to service the needs of Cambridge as its 'Green Lungs' requires significant infrastructure development in the villages - especially robust traffic calming measures combined with substantial investment in dedicated cycle routes, new bridle ways and new public footpaths, as described above. The cost of all these can be afforded from the Developers Contributions (S106) dues on the West Cambridge development. The improvements to the infrastructure outlined above must be implemented before the development of the West Cambridge sites commences 	<p>Refer p49</p> <p>Refer p48</p> <p>Change p27</p> <p>Refer p48</p>
66	<p>Barry Kingston Barton</p>	<p>I have just returned from the open consultation meeting in Barton. I am indeed broadly in agreement with the Consultation Document. However I think that the Green Belt should be vigorously maintained, and we should resist any development at all. Small developments will be the thin end of the wedge and would result in the piecemeal development that we are all so familiar with. The Green Belt is constantly being eroded to the detriment of village communities. The issue of affordable housing is in my view a misleading concept with the QTSQ area as such affordable housing would rapidly escalate in price</p>	<p>Add p50</p>

		(the same way Cambourne houses are no longer affordable). Barton, and the surrounding villages, are such prime locations that they will always be very expensive. The population of the UK is growing and it is inevitable that villages will fill up. More housing will then be demanded, with always the statement that we just need that little bit more. But few years later, similar requests will again be made. I think we should very firmly resist any development within the Cambridge Green Belt.	
67	Joanna H. Amick 23 Broadway Grantchester Cambridge CB3 9NQ	I have been a resident of Grantchester for 18 years, and I fully support the joint vision document prepared by Grantchester and other neighbouring parish councils.	None
68	Ann Keith 59 Bridle Way Grantchester CB3 9NY	Hallo Thank you very much for all your work and for arranging the meeting this evening. Just a few comments: 1. I think it's important that the area <u>doesn't become a theme or national park</u> as that spells certain death to an area. 2. Far too much emphasis is being placed on the area being a 'green lung' for Cambridge and assorted tourists. Personally I think that Grantchester has too many tourists as it is and this will get worse when the Trumpington sites are in full swing. The important thing is that the villages are retained as pleasant environments for their existing residents - who, after all, pay handsomely to live in them and whose interests should be of chief importance. I don't see we have any obligation whatsoever to the residents of Cambridge or to anyone else. 3. No account seems to have been taken of the fact that any local decision can be overridden at a stroke by the government (as we will find out if any of our local landowners apply to put up wind turbines). Thank you again.	State p50
69	Peter and Pat Magill 2 Hines Close Barton CB23 7BB	Thank you for organising tonight, it has given me much food for thought. We are residents of Barton. We chatted on the way home with neighbours and have come to the view that what we must try to do in conjunction with the other villages around Cambridge, particularly in the QTSQ, is try to maintain the individual appearance and character of each village, while accepting that some small amount of housing in some of the villages will probably be necessary over the development period 2017 - 2031. Our view is that any such housing should be well within the village envelope and as far as possible not change the appearance of any of the approaches to the village. Tourists and visitors to Cambridge come from all directions, north, south, east and west and part of the beauty of the city is that to date one arrives in it in quite an unspoilt and beautiful way; through the pretty necklace villages which give it its unique character. Our view is that: Each village has its own unique approaches and character and these should be preserved.	None
70	Bev and Sue Edwards Barton	Thank you for all the hard work that you have put into the production of the very comprehensive and thoughtful Consultation Draft. We wish to offer our support to your document. In regard to the Community heading of section 7.3, we support the aim of ensuring that children, who wish to, can remain in the villages. We should like to add older people to this. Providing sufficient suitable housing to enable older people to downsize will help to free up housing stock for families. This would also allow residents to continue to play an active part in the communities that they have lived in for some years, whilst working and bringing up their own families. Any new low cost housing should have restrictive covenants attached so that the housing remains available to local people when it is subsequently sold and should therefore not be put into the general housing market which would result in price increases that would make them 'unaffordable'. The document quite rightly recognises the need for the continued small-scale development of our villages that will be vital to ensure that they continue to thrive	None
71	Richard and Celia Beadle 2A Church End Coton Cambridge CB237PN	We found the 'Joint Vision for Cambridge's Quarter-to-Six Quadrant' document a balanced, fair and comprehensive account of the region and its future planning needs, and we are fully in agreement with its objectives. As residents of Coton, we thought it would be worth mentioning (p. 21) the village's large area of <u>allotments</u> , which, as a general amenity and a significant economic benefit for those who wish to grow their own produce, deserve special protection in any future planning decisions.	Add p19

		<p>unsound, not to mention incredibly expensive and long term.</p> <p>(3) A number of points were raised at the meeting which I would be very interested in having answered. Where does the number of new houses needed per year come from, and who are these houses for? The discussion suggested that the houses need to be for young academics coming into the area, and for the young and the old of the villages. But every development only produces the minimum number of affordable houses, and many large or luxurious houses and flats which can only be aimed at commuters and more wealthy incomers. If the houses need to be affordable, then only affordable houses should be built (and water and energy saving devices in new housing should be compulsory, as in Germany). Also, what of the houses ear marked but yet to be built at Northstowe? From the numbers quoted, it would seem that the development there would take care of all the required growth. If further houses are built in the QTSQ, they are likely to be much sought after and expensive, for all the same reasons as those that are put forward for protecting the area - it is pleasant, rural and yet close to the city.</p> <p>(4) The issue was raised of how the QTSQ villages sit with their neighbours, and the effect that development "next door" can have on the QTSQ. I would particularly like to raise the case of Trumpington Meadows. As a member of the Cam Valley Forum at the time that this development was under consideration, I and others was shown around the site by the developers, and shown how the new houses would be only on the footprint of the former Monsanto site. The river was to be protected and developed into a wildlife area, and the southern end of the site was to be parkland to welcome drivers entering the city from the M11. Much of this is happening, but the site has already extended south of the Park & Ride (no longer brownfield?), and now we hear plans to hugely extend the site as well as build a "Sports village" and football stadium. I feel that I have been lied to; looking at the website, I feel that potential purchasers of the Trumpington Meadows houses are also being lied to. We have only just lifted some of the traffic congestion with the new Addenbrookes Road, and the new development at Trumpington Meadows and Clay Farm will no doubt create it again. Further development along this road is manifestly too much for the infrastructure to bear, as well as putting intolerable pressure on the river corridor and ruining the supposedly "welcoming" entrance to Cambridge.</p> <p>(5) Generally, the huge traffic problems of Cambridge need to be considered, and I would maintain that they cannot be improved (the guided bus has made little difference to this area; now we hear that bus services are being restricted. People want to use their cars, and sometimes have no alternative). Further development will only lead to worse traffic, more pollution and more accidents. I endorse the comments about the noise from the M11; traffic and its noise are the things which currently detract from the enjoyment of nature in the area.</p> <p>In summary, the strength of Cambridge itself is the fact that it has just about managed to remain a compact, ancient city of a manageable size with easy access to the countryside. We have seen this being eroded, especially on the eastern side of the city, but increasingly on the southeast and northwest as well. QTSQ is our last chance to retain easily accessible countryside and protect the setting of Cambridge, and it must be recognised that there may need to be a limit to growth in terms of expansion, but not hopefully in terms of improvement both to the quality of life and the quality of surroundings. We should not be driven by the vision of developers, who see a thriving region where money is available and landowners willing, but by the vision of the communities that make the area work.</p> <p>Thanks to everyone involved for all the hard work on this vision.</p>	<p>Mention p50</p> <p>Mention p48</p> <p>Quote p5</p>
75	Mrs R Sharrat 94 Cambridge Road Barton	<p>Here are my comments</p> <p>If a large number of new houses are to built be could they be built in a manner that is sympathetic to the local area, well designed and in a well planned layout. South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge itself, have many beautiful well designed individual buildings, both old and new, yet all the recent large scale developments appear to follow a uniform pattern of bland houses in a maze of cul de sacs. Good planning and design makes such a difference</p> <p>Can serious consideration be given to traffic flow, bus routes and improving, or creating new cycle paths. The new development near Trumpington Park and Ride appears at present to have made no new provision for cycling into</p>	<p>Reinforce p48</p>

		Cambridge and has one exit and entrance by road. This exit/entrance is onto a busy road that now has 4 sets of traffic lights in close succession, which at busy times is surely going to restrict the volume of traffic that can exit the development. Bearing in mind the known problems of water supply in the region, can any future developments be made to incorporate water saving measures (eg porable surfaces, rainwater harvesting systems, planting schemes using drought resistant plants)	
76	Ralph Wilkinson	I have only just had sight of your draft consultation document, and have not yet digested it in depth, but my immediate reaction is of being deeply impressed. I offer warm support.	None
77	Cambridge Past, Present & Future	<p>Dear QTQC Team</p> <p>CambridgePPF welcomes that four neighbouring villages are closely working together to enhance their local environment in a vanguard way. The idea of a joint up neighbourhood plan is strongly supported – particularly in relation to an expanding Cambridge City towards the west, north and south. Seeing this Green Belt area further positively improved will benefit not just current local residents but also future generations.</p> <p>However significant improvements are required to make the draft QTCR document more useful and stronger as well as giving it sufficient weight within the planning process whilst addressing wider range “quality of life aspects”. Clearer understanding of what is wanted to be achieved will help. CambridgePPF’s main comments are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Already existing developed evidence base and policies are missing and overall completed well researched work has been ignored e.g. covering green infrastructure, wildlife conservation and enhancement of the local landscape – in particular refer to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --- Understanding of landscape characters of the Region and local specialness is missing (see http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/landscape/englands/character/areas/default.aspx) and now defined landscape typology/landscape framework see http://landscape---east.org.uk/ ---SCDC Biodiversity Strategy – see http://www.scams.gov.uk/environment/conservation/wildlifeandecology/biodiversity.htm see proposals map and reference to Nature Enhancement Areas ---Cambridge City Council – Nature Conservation Strategy http://lnr.cambridge.gov.uk/uploads/Nature%20Conservation%20Strategy%20Sept%202006%20(Section%20A).pdf note ‘green fingers’ protruding into the countryside from the City’s edges & vice versa --- Green Infrastructure Strategy 2006 and recent review 2011 (now adopted as material consideration by all districts of Cambridgeshire) -http://www.cambridgeshirehorizons.co.uk/our_challenge/GIS.aspx refer to pages relating to Strategic Networks’ Strategic Area 6 – the areas of ‘Cambridge and surrounding area’ (pp. 116 onwards). --- Wear and tear of urban rural fringe juxta-posed with wildlife conservation etc needs to be better understood --- Quality of life issues such as noise and other pollution not tackled (adverse impact to villages as well as countryside) ● Thus the overall quality of the local landscape needs to be studied and evidence gathered – CambridgePPF would like to see a landscape character appraisal to be undertaken in particular covering the Green Belt. This to ensure a better evaluation of the land in light of the various development, recreational and other pressures. ● Growth in villages needs to be better studied and catered for to ensure the village communities also thrive in the future – more emphasis on integrating younger generation and their access & enjoyment of their local countryside and village environment as well as needs of the older generation and disabled/ less mobile people (from suitable housing – young as well as old people to enable them to stay in their village --- transport and recreational issues) ● Public transport links and overall quality has not been sufficiently discussed --- connections of villages, local countryside and attractions as well as Cambridge City are poor (ref p34) and innovative opportunities to improve such should be explored. ● Other sustainable transport links should explored – the footpath network is well developed in areas but other routes for 	<p>Refer p45</p> <p>Mention p47</p>

		<p>disabled users, horse riders certainly not. Note permissive paths are short-lived and recent withdrawal of subsidies by the British Government will see increased loss of permissive paths in the next decade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Water bodies and their quality has been ignored --- local streams such as Bin Brook, Bourn Brook, River Cam are important in relation to relatively arid climate of East Anglia and potential climate change issues. In recent years CambridgePPF is promoting an integrated River Corridor Strategy for the River Cam in and around Cambridge and recent meeting with the Cam Valley Forum this notion was further stretched and interest expressed by many other local groups ● Notion that Coton Countryside Reserve should take over some of the tourist volume of Grantchester Meadows --- this together with other local countryside access/ attraction providers needs to be carefully planned – from access infrastructure, transport and on-going landscape--- scale enhancement and management to benefit biodiversity and countryside amenity and recreational provisions and we would welcome further discussion and clarification to ensure achievable solutions. <p>Appendix – some further notes</p> <p>Some errata ref 'Red Meadow Hill' not in Barton but part of Coton Countryside Reserve (p11 (picture), 17 (picture), other CambridgePPF factual matters need to be resolved</p> <p>Definition of – e.g. environmental amenity (p5); environmental resource (p10)</p> <p>P 11 – mention also Entry Level Stewardship (many more) and only some to date have HLS</p> <p>P7 – Green Belt – major development has happened in recent years – to south and west Cambridge (Clay Farm, Trumpington Meadows etc)</p> <p>P 18 – refer to new planning policy NPPF and relevant sections and not PPS 25</p> <p>P19 – there are ongoing desire for flood attenuation schemes to prevent flooding further down stream of e.g. Bin Brook</p> <p>P 22 – Grantchester has not only traffic but also parking issues (space and visual intrusion)</p> <p>P24 – Burwash Manor Farm – path link with St Catharine's Farm – is Coton Countryside Reserve meant – if so please change and check referencing</p> <p>P 25 – change CPPF to CambridgePPF; note currently under Countryside Stewardship Scheme and Entry Level Scheme (HLS application due in 2014) – text could be widened in view of access, species & habitat conservation, landscape recreation, partnership working etc</p> <p>P 8 – easily accessible from the city – very limited circular and safer access routes available for pedestrians, cyclists and horse rider (particularly latter have major gaps in the recreational path network)</p> <p>P12 – infill housing also undertaken as affordable housing to various villages (ref permissive affordable dwellings – Coton Barton etc) and without real master planning and no doubt further will be done – more work on local need of affordable/ social housing required – young and old</p> <p>Right of way maps – includes also permissive paths – need to key such properly and improve definition</p> <p>Para 6.3 – CambridgePPF was instrumental in achieving the Green Belt designation in the 1960s and land owned and covenanted by the Society quasi are fore runners of the Cambridge Green Belt</p> <p>P13 – summary – unclear definition of compact city versus encircled city?</p> <p>p15 – 5 – green corridor/ wedge is actually quite wide in comparison of retained ones proposed ref Cambridge East development proposals or Girton Gap at NW Cambridge development; 8 – what about old railway line to Bedford – any new transport opportunity?</p> <p>P16 – contours are lit from NW;</p> <p>P17 – where is the 'purple line'?</p> <p>P29 – Mullard Radio A. Observatory - Worth mentioning that it is on a disused railway line; Madingley Hall is a Registered Historic Park and Garden Grade 1 and as such very significant not only nationally but on an international scale; other sites/ landowners/ usage seem to be out of date – please check with current land owners/ managers</p> <p>P30 – Rifle Range – check text with Public Rights of Way Team of the Cambs. County Council</p>	<p>Refer p48</p> <p>Refer p15</p> <p>Amend p15</p> <p>Mention p9</p> <p>Amend p16</p> <p>Change p22</p> <p>Change p23</p> <p>Mention p38</p> <p>Correct p14</p> <p>Mention p27</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>P32 – what / how many pubs have been lost in recent decade(s)?</p> <p>P33 – Coton C Reserve – also many guided walks, increased conservation activities and usage of site by local groups</p> <p>P34 – easy access to and within QTSQ – for some users yes but others like disabled, horse riders certainly not. Note permissive paths are short-lived and recent withdrawal of subsidies by the British Government will see increased loss of permissive path in the next decade</p> <p>P 36 – some M11 footbridges need upgrading to take e.g. horse riders and create circular bridleways; Wimpole way also know as Harcomlow Way and still promoted as such by the County Council</p> <p>P37 – map not just definite right of way – includes permissive paths and needs labeling</p> <p>P38 – what is data based on (any measurements and comparable data available over what hectareage)?</p> <p>Section 7 – suggest addition: local Parish Council together with local land owners/ manager will work in partnership – essential to make this work</p>	<p>Add p31</p> <p>Amend p34</p>
78	Karolin Rejniak Grantchester	<p>Evolution not revolution. Too many times already have the authorities in Cambridge shown themselves blind to what is important and worth preserving and what could and should be developed in a subtle way. Too often have areas been destroyed - the Kite and Petty Cury - for us not to feel cynical about the proposed plans for the QTSQ. Once destroyed, we will never be able to reclaim this glorious part of Cambridge, which feeds the spirits of all who experience it.</p>	None
79	Roger Clemo Kings Grove Barton	<p>I very much support the views put forward by Robin Page in the meeting this evening, although I am not convinced that the high tech companies in the area would be in favour of their staff working in isolation behind computer screens instead of the face to face interaction they would get in the company. The idea of people commuting from further afield has the advantage of not saturating the immediate area with population etc. It has the great disadvantage of wasting lots of energy and generation tons of carbon which we are told is bad?</p> <p>However, I firmly believe that solving our problems by concreting over vast areas of local land, spilling out into villages, destroying the amenities we all enjoy will bring many more problems than what we currently have in terms of traffic congestion, pollution and loss of rural ways of life. The side-effects of this treatment will be worse than the sickness. Someone at the meeting questioned why we cannot follow the approach of other European countries, where populations are spread out in smaller, reasonably spaced communities, and this causes me to think of Germany as a good example of this; I have many years of experience in Germany with business travel.</p> <p>The answer is, of course, that Germany has excellent infrastructure, with reasonably priced, fast and efficient rail travel between industrial cities. But more significantly, you can board a frequent, clean and comfortable bus service in a village, and buy a ticket which allows you change to the railway, and later onto a tram, or the underground to reach your destination. This is called good infrastructure, and until the short-sightedness we have in this country is overcome, we will spend billions and still never reach the goal we seek to achieve.</p> <p>I also have mixed feelings about the issue of younger people finding it hard to get onto the housing ladder and the political solution of “Affordable Housing.” Mixed feelings on the one hand because I remember how hard it was for me back in the early 70’s, and I sympathise with the first time buyers who are experiencing the same difficulties today. On the other hand, I remember that it was also said to be “impossible” for youngsters to buy in the 80’s, and in the 90’s, and the noughties, etc.; my memory doesn’t go back further than the 70’s, but I would guess it must always have been that way. Somehow though, years later, many of us managed it.</p> <p>We live (thank goodness) in a capitalist economy. Prices are set by the rules of supply and demand; if first time buyers cannot afford the prices asked, the prices must come down until sellers are to find buyers. Unless, of course, the buyers can get the extra money from lenders, in which case the prices will go up to the highest workable level. Perhaps we need to look at the debt market to find the answer to this.</p> <p>The “Affordable Housing” brigade meanwhile, are trying to distort the market by building cheap, with low quality materials,</p>	None

		<p>and lowest possible specifications (since they cannot change the price of the land they need to build on). We need to be careful what we wish for! I understand that some sort of restrictions are placed on the later sale of such properties to avoid profiteering, but for how many reselling's will this be maintained? Perhaps we will continue to amass vast quantities of low quality housing for the foreseeable future, spreading ever further outwards from our towns and villages?</p> <p>Placing restrictions on who can buy new housing stock, such as young people wishing to stay in the area where they were born and bred seems a good way to go. Proper building standards could be maintained and prices would be regulated by how much these first time buyers were prepared/able to pay.</p> <p>Yes, all markets are subject to speculation, and influence from time to time by external factors, but everything has its intrinsic value at its core. However, the market entry price is still governed by money supply, and we should seriously look at putting an end to unreasonably large loans of several multiples of income, and get back to lending only what the buyers can be reasonably expected to repay.</p> <p>Finally I should say that I am as anxious as everyone else in our quadrant that we should try to stop ill thought out developments destroying the wonderful villages we have. But if we win our case, will villages in the other quadrants have to bear the pain? I would not wish that on them but, unless the basics are put right, i.e. the infrastructure, I fear that the concrete will continue to flow outwards until there really is no going back. Tokio?</p>	
80	Andrew Margetts	<p>As residents of Coton we are generally supportive of this document. However, the issues we are most concerned with are the noise from the M11 and the lack of safe cycle routes from Coton to the other villages (particularly to Barton Rd linking to the village college).</p>	Strengthen reference p48
81	Keith Scott	<p>On the face of it, it is extremely disturbing that it should be deemed necessary that such a representation should need to be made in the first place. I think the very fact that this exercise is in place reflects the extent to which the local population's elected representatives are seriously concerned about the possible consequences of the planning exercise on this particular region and why residents should also be concerned. We have seen the consequences of the abandonment of the Green Belt protection at Clay Farm/Trumpington meadows and now can only wonder at what lies in store elsewhere. None the less, it is extremely refreshing that this exercise, which encompasses four parish councils has come about at all. The circulated document is an excellent draft both in content and strategic purpose; it emphasises the local area and portrays the area in a new way that not even its current residents may have recognised but will nonetheless be readily acknowledged. Where the document may be improved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The document MUST recognise that some development is necessary (even desirable particularly for affordable development) if each parish could recognise this fact and indeed make available proposals or plans in support of that position. 2. The document (although clearly a representation from the residents of Barton/Grantchester/Coton/Madingley) must also accommodate and recognise the significance of other areas in this representation. In particular representation from within the city (Newnham in particular) would give added weight to the case in hand. The qtsq is not only a benefit to its residents, it is also a resource and benefit to those within the City itself. 3. No one should underestimate the potential for collaborative representation of this nature. In essence we are all challenging 'those that be'. At one level we are competing to divert planned development somewhere else. What we should be doing is challenging whether the scale of such development is necessary at all. To that extent it would be far more effective to align all interested parishes and wards both within South Cambs and the City towards challenging the pretext of the development requirements rather than accepting the development requirements and competing with each other as to where it should be. This exercise has demonstrated the power and potential of collaborative representation within the Barton/Madingley/Coton/Grantchester area of South Cambs. Coupled with the use of co-ordinated local referenda on the subject of development it is only logical that extended co-operation to all Cambridgeshire areas affected by development issues would pose significant obstacles to any excessive development proposals. You should not shy 	<p>Add p6</p> <p>Mention p50</p>

		<p>away from challenging the validity of the development requirements or the legitimate authority of those that dictate the planning requirements,</p> <p>4. You should consider continuing the collaboration on this subject beyond the initial representation. It is refreshing and far more effective than individual representations and each parish council should be commended for their contribution.</p> <p>5. The circulated draft is excellent and professional. However, it is wordy and there is a significant number of people who will not wholly appreciate it in its current form. It really does focus the mind on just how fortunate we are to live here and to remind us of what it is we could lose.</p> <p>6. There is a lack of emphasis on resources required for continued development - in particular water. On the issues of light pollution and electromagnetic radiation it would be instructive to determine Cambridge University's Observatory (Lords Bridge) position on further development. At one time they were very involved in planning issues and may still have some input today.</p> <p>Good luck and Thank you</p>	Mention p49
82	Mary Dicks (Barton)	<p>Dear QTSQ group, well done for producing a forward thinking, detailed plan for the four villages in question and the south-west corner of Cambridge. I hope you can still consider these comments, which although a day after you consultation closes are hopefully still accepted.</p> <p>I am sure others will make many more general and detailed points, however this is a specific suggestion about trying to be clearer and a bit more detailed about the answer to the question: what makes the existing boundaries of the 4 villages important to both their character and setting and the setting of this part of South Cambridgeshire? For example, in Barton, this village we live in, specific field boundaries, hedges, tree lines, and historic field boundaries have helped contribute to the low density, compact and historic character of the place. There are clear and definable boundaries to these edges and the relevant planning documents of South Cambridgeshire indicate where these form the current edge to the Green Belt. I would urge you, if time is available, to include text, photos and illustrations of the existing edges of all 4 villages as a way of providing clarity about what represents the appropriate boundaries, beyond which it is considered further expansion is inappropriate due to the likely adverse impact new development would have on the villages. The so called "SHLAA" sites "threaten" these current boundaries, so being clear about their importance (in addition to promoting rural recreation etc.) is crucial to putting a constructive case forward for why they should not expand. All of the relevant sites in/around the 4 villages are published on the SCDC website http://www.scambs.gov.uk/Environment/Planning/DistrictPlanning/LocalDevelopmentFramework/SHLAA.htm Equally there may be potential for small, individual sites within the existing village boundaries which if properly designed could enhance and add to the character of the villages</p>	Mention p15
83	Mal Schofield 90 Grantchester Meadows Newnham Croft	<p>Pam and I were at your meeting on Thursday evening. For the most part a defensive nimbyism pervaded the debate with alarm bells ringing on threats that frankly do not exist. However there were some sound mature contributions and the debate improved as younger residents contributed. I have attached details indicating that continued growth is a fact not an option. It can be no more contained than natural growth in any context. The big issue therefore is where. If not Newnham then Barton? If not Barton then Cambourne? Dispersion without supporting travel infrastructure simply means more cars and more congestion. A fuller picture of growth is under preparation. See ? ? ? I do hope that your contribution to the development of a collaborative Local Plan for the City Region is constructive and progressive. There has to be preservation and enhancement of the green lungs/corridors and in particular the Cam River valley. Equally your four villages must protect their beauty, boundaries and unique appeal. But houses can be built closer in to the city inside the M11 boundary as the better option for sustainable living. That includes a number of the "edge of City" SHLAA's under review.</p>	None

84	Judith Ayling 16 High St Grantchester	My response comes after your deadline and so I hope that it can be taken into account. I would like to endorse wholeheartedly what is said in the QTSQ document which I received here, having read it carefully. I have lived in Cambridge since 1983 and in Grantchester for the last 3 years, and it does seem to me essential that the nature of this part of the city is preserved as its "breathing lung" permitting access to the countryside, and views of Cambridge from that countryside.	None
85	Chris Jiggins Reader in Evolution and Biological Diversity Department of Zoology	I am a resident of Madingley, and also a Reader at the University of Cambridge and Fellow of St John's College. I am also a governor at Coton Primary School, although needless to say I am writing in a private capacity. I wish to offer my strong support for the initiative to protect and develop the future of the QTSQ region in a sensitive manner. Cambridge is almost unique as a city in having such green countryside within easy walking distance of the city centre. This is only due to the vision of our forebears, as is described in the QTSQ consultation document. It would be a great crime if we were not to leave the beauty of this region intact for future generations. I strongly support the initiative to reject large scale commercial or residential development in this area.	None
86	John Kerrigan (Prof.) 63 Broadway, Grantchester, CB3 9NQ	This comes 36 hours late, for which I apologise, but I want to send my thanks and congratulations for the well-conceived documents you have produced and the campaign you are initiating. I wholeheartedly agree that keeping this quarter of the Cambridge area green is essential to the long-term quality of life in the city, as well as gratifying for those fortunate enough to live in it. I look forward to doing what I can to help as your campaign develops.	None
87	Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum has already responded to the above consultation, but one member has provided a late comment and Cambs LAF would like to add the following points made to its response: 1) It would be great if the large number of permissive paths could be designated as Rights of Way – so that, at the very least, they can get onto OS maps. 2) It would be even better if the relatively poor network of paths in Madingley could be improved. A right of way through Madingley Hall grounds and woods is highly desirable. 3) It is very good to see how the 'quadrant' links to the city of Cambridge. It would also be valuable if a map could show the 'onward links' of the quadrant via Rights of Way with parishes further out from the city.	None
88	Clive Haines, 1 Spens Avenue, Cambridge CB3 9LS	I have just read the first part of the QTSQ documents having only heard of QTSQ from Chris Wagner's report in the May 2012 edition of the Parish Magazine for St Mark's Church, Newnham. I really do agree with Chris that this is an exceptionally well-written document and easily readable. So much so that with all the problems we are having with proposals for development West of Newnham, this is the best news we could possibly have. Just brilliant, and my congratulations to all those who worked on the document.	