

From Jean Glasberg : Re Newnham Mill, Lorraine Casey did get back to say that she would be taking the application to committee in July/August with a recommendation for refusal. The developers have put in appeal re the refusal to fell trees on the site but this is based on inaccurate information - has it been challenged by planners?

From David Plank TRA : Further to our question at the last meeting, will you confirm that the only control on jobs growth is the market's ability to deliver on the "large supply" of land that is already available - 135 hectares - plus new land proposed in "First Proposals"? If so, what control do you intend to introduce given market driven growth could far exceed the 58,500 new jobs forecast between 2020 and 2040 so that even more new homes are required than the 44,400 planned by 2040?

From Judith Perry : If the government sets a minimum have they considered our water shortage? I know that the local planners are aware of it but can we, locally, set limits on the development in line with the water supply?

From Andrew Milbourn : Why is this presented as providing more housing when the growth in jobs and extra people will be a lot more than the increase in housing? Why is there a "need" for this growth when the government wants to level up the north?

From CllrMarkAshton(Cambr : How many local residents are on the housing waiting list and does a " local plan " ensure that the housing being built will ensure that they have a home rather than keep using the term affordable homes.

From Nick.McCave : from Nick Mccave CPRA

From Nick.McCave : Not just water supply, which is piped in, but river water quality which is already POOR.

From Judith Perry : The rivers and the chalk streams!

From Judith Perry : Is there any hope at all of public transport run by local government rather than staying dependant on the private sector which doesn't profit from serving wide areas and late night service?

From David Plank TRA : Do the two councils see a reasonable limit to Cambridge city edge development given the unsustainable damage to Cambridge's "special character" of significant incursions into the Green Belt already envisaged in First Proposals up to 2040 such as the surrounding of White Hill by Cambridge Biomedical Campus development, and beyond that after 2040? Does minimizing carbon emissions trump the Green Belt and its quality of life?

From David Stoughton : What consideration is being given to the disruption of communities when new developments are suddenly included. There is a risk of community disintegration

From John Latham : Please can we see the previous slide about water again ?

From David Stoughton : How do you define an increase in biodiversity?

From CllrMarkAshton(Cambr : The claim is that all these new homes are needed for jobs, what is the current unemployment levels in Cambridge and S Cambs.

From David Plank TRA : "affordable" housing at 80% market rents is not affordable for many. What measures are proposed to ensure much more housing at truly affordable rents?

From Judith Perry : Electric car charging points will be very difficult to install in the city centre particularly in Victorian House areas. Will the chargers be fast enough so that anyone living in those areas can actually run an electric car?

From Jean Glasberg : Water supply is one issue -what plans have been made to deal with the sewage?

From CllrMarkAshton(Cambr : How does our local plan fit in with the govts pledge to levelling up because it appears we will need to bring people down from the North to fill these jobs. Have we actually identified who will be providing these 58,000 jobs.

From Jean Glasberg : Electric cars are not the answer - sourcing the materials needed causes environmental harm, they will still cause congestion, and require more roads - and they are very damaging in terms of the micro plastics from their tyres ..

From Andrew Milbourn : What can actually change as a result of the consultation? Clearly not the scale of growth or the development sites. What has changed as a result of the consultation so far?

From Peter Blythe : can you clarify where the funding for the modelling for the local plan came from given the focus on jobs?

From David Plank TRA : Have you encouraged the Biomedical Campus to search the 135 hectares of land already available for employment growth for suitable sites? Some of this land is accessible to the Campus. As far as we know, the Campus has not done this yet.

From Peter Blythe : Question about Cpier strategy and modelling please clarify where funding for this came from.

From David Plank TRA : The evidenced case for co-location and agglomeration is not strong. It is strongly asserted but not evidenced. Has the evidence been tested?

From Daniel Fulton : As Caroline Hunt has said, the amount of housing growth is dependent upon employment growth. Employment growth must be a matter for consideration in the local plan process. Instead, the councils are using extremely high employment growth as a starting point that constrains the quantum of all other development. This is fundamental flaw in the proposal.

From Judith Perry : Is there actually a legal method to limit the growth jobs or establishment of new businesses?

From Andrew Milbourn : Not allowing the development of new offices etc would be a start

From Peter Blythe : Agree. Where is the evidence that companies will re locate abroad? These questions about evidence were put to the Director of Planning by senior academics.

From Daniel Fulton : Central Government has indicated that the standard method is a starting point for housing growth. The Government may be willing to agree to a number below the standard method figure, but the councils have not engaged with the Government on this issue. In fact, the councils are pushing for 8,000 more houses than even the Government says are necessary.

From Charles Nisbet : May we please see again Jon's slide about water supply issues. We can watch it during the Q&A

From CllrMarkAshton(Cambr : what is affordable because majority of these jobs will not be high skilled high salary. We should know the actual cost of affordable homes on these proposed sites as we seem to have experts who know the number of jobs that are coming and the homes needed

From Edward Leigh : Answer to question about housing waiting lists. These figures were reported to government in 2018/19:  
Cambridge: 2,624, South Cambs: 1,315, (Some households may be on both waiting lists.)

From Peter Blythe : Cambridge Ahead modelling is cited in the Employment Paper in the local plan and issues have been raised about who funded the modelling, given that this is cited as the argument for very high employment growth.

From Andrew Milbourn : It seems growth is seen as a good thing and I don't sense any desire to question this. The other city in the county which was doubled in size was Peterborough. I wouldn't consider this a success myself.,

From Sam Davies : Sorry to correct you Caroline, but precision is important here. The application is not from the Campus, it is from four landowners - St John's College, Jesus College, Pemberton and the County Council

From Daniel Fulton : Judith Perry writes, "Is there actually a legal method to limit the growth jobs or establishment of new businesses?" The local plan process is supposed to regulate the use of land for employment and business use. The time to regulate the amount of that development is now—during the local plan process. The question is why aren't the councils willing to constrain employment growth, which is within their legal powers to do.

From David Plank TRA : It wasn't the Campus which proposed all of "Cambridge South". It was the landowners who looked to benefit from their large bid.

From CllrMarkAshton(Cambr : the last local plan would have stipulated how infrastructure would cope with increased homes and help mitigate increased traffic but all aware of gridlock so how will this local plan ensure we do not have gridlock

From Peter Blythe : Re David Plank and Campus landowners, the Pemberton's and Pigeon James Buxton were cited in MP Stephen Barclay complaint to the auditor general. Was this complaint from Barclay about developers and City Deal scheme funding followed up? Barclay is now a Cabinet Minister.

From Judith Perry : When you say you enforce hedges do you enforce hedges growing over the pavements so that people cannot walk down the street without going into the roadway?

From Peter Blythe : I am hoping that there will be a discussion of how enforcement relates to green spaces and tree felling. Nearly an hour's q & a discussion about enforcement at a recent Natural Cambs meeting was edited out of the official record of the meeting circulated afterwards. Rules and regulation is an issue that concerns the whole country at the moment. What record does the council have of enforcement taken?

From Peter Blythe : Regarding the breach of conditions at 291 Hills Road the neighbours do not even know what plan the developers are working to! If there is subsidence later who do they take to court?

From Peter Blythe : By the way Peter Blythe is Wendy Blythe ( I am away at the moment

From David Stoughton : There were egregious breaches of planning conditions on the CB1 development. None seems to have been effectively resolved they were just left - facts on the ground!

From CllrMarkAshton(Cambr : When the City Council had Rangers they were very efficient in dealing with hedges on pavements but they stopped the rangers and now have overgrown hedges on pavements

From Edward Leigh : How is enforcement funded? Any estimate of how much illegal development is not enforced because of lack of funding?

From Sam Davies : I agree with Cllr Ashton, the loss of the Ranger service has made it significantly more onerous to get action on straightforward matters like overhanging hedges

From Peter Blythe : But where is the record of enforcement ? How many times have you prosecuted?

From CllrMarkAshton(Cambr : Do we have enough enforcement officers to deal with the problems we face with retrospective applications that are being used as a way to bypass the formal planning process

From Judith Perry : Isn't subsidence a building control issue?

From CllrMarkAshton(Cambr : How did the developers with the hotel on the old coopers site manage to demolish that terraced house without asking permission

From Peter Blythe : It may be but the point is there has been so little enforcement on this site that the neighbours have no idea what plan the developers have been working to. What of the trees ? What long term plan is involved for the trees on the site that have been impacted when the developers sell the flats? who is responsible? The question has not been answered

From David Stoughton : There was an additional flow added. Unresolved noise limitation issues and other minor but damaging infractions

From Peter Blythe : Can you give us the info about nos of prosecutions and data re enforcement please?

From Peter Blythe : But this has been raised before and we were promised the info,

From Karen : Discharge into a ditch bordering a building site was reported to Planning Enforcement and the Environment Agency. The latter viewed it as a serious problem. Planning Control said that protecting watercourses was a recommendation rather than a condition, despite the planning permission listing it as a condition. The EA has referred us back to LPA. Where does that leave us? This discharge will reach a nature reserve of county level importance.

From Peter Blythe : It would be really helpful for residents to have some simple instructions about their rights and what they can do relating concerns.

From CllrMarkAshton(Cambr : How many planners did Cambridge City have before shared service and how many do we have now.

From Sam Davies : I would very much like GCSPS to produce clear advice for residents who wish to object to applications in the same way that GCSPS produces 'how to' guides for applicants (as promoted recently on Twitter). It would save significant officer time as well as allowing residents to understand what constitutes legitimate planning grounds for rejection

From Peter Blythe : I have asked Cllr Thornburrow. Please can we have a list of ALL the sites submitted in the local plan. Not just the ones taken forward. It is time

consuming to scroll through all the maps to find these sites. It is clear that developers have spent a lot of money on some of their plans such as for example the leafy Victorian villas on Station road which are seen as an opportunity area. Given the concerns about the flying Pig many residents would like to know about ALL the other areas are perceived as 'opportunity' areas and on going discussions with the planners given the time frames of local plans and later submission.

From David Plank TRA : The Shared Planning Service is aware of the high level of enforcement issues in the new developments in Trumpington relating to planning conditions - and even more so building regulations where following de-regulation developers in effect mark their own homework much to the aggravation of householders. Government is well aware of the significant quality issues concerning newbuild but has not prioritized it for action. Many green measures are not as effective as they should be due to poor construction quality, e.g. water saving.

From David Stoughton : Thank you for pointing that out Peter. The developer is PACe who've just been blackmailing us about the Flying Pig. Quite unsuitable! Also the site contains some of the only substantial trees in the area and these should be protected from any development

From Peter Blythe : Peter is me Wendy David!

From Katie Thornburrow : Wendy Blyth - I will get these lists to you and ask that they are available to all.

From David Stoughton : Ah! well I saw you listed separately so I assumed you were both on

From Peter Blythe : thank you Katie that would be so helpful.

From Peter Blythe : Katie can we also have a list of the green sites submitted too as this will interest residents especially as the planners have told us previously that ELMs is funded by development and/or offsetting. And these other funds may be for example the central Cambridge Nature fund ( OxCamArc fund)



From Cllr. Dr. Tumi Hawkins : Thank you all. Looking forward to seeing your responses to the First Proposals consultations