

North West Cambridge Development

Responses to Green paper [in approximate order of receipt]

1. Richard Dennis [Development Director & Keeper of the Records, Jesus College]

My comment is about the southern end of the primary vehicular route/public transport route and its relationship to the existing park-and-ride site on the Madingley Road. The extra junction on the Madingley Road (which would doubtless be traffic light controlled) so close to the existing park-and-ride traffic light-controlled exit will cause considerable extra hold-ups to/queues of traffic on the Madingley Road. Double sets of lights cause traffic flow indigestion and in the rush hours this means that the park-and-ride buses, the X5 to Oxford and the other existing local buses will all get caught up in this with extra delays for passengers. It would be good to avoid the chaos/gridlock that for years plagued the entrance to the Cambridge Science Park on the Milton Road just off the A14.

I wonder if some way in integrating the park-and-ride site into our plans cannot be found creating a joined-up public transport hub on the park-and-ride site with the new NWC orbital route buses going through it, and stopping there to exchange passengers. This surely would be advantageous for everyone, especially those living/working/visiting the West Cambridge site.

Why not have the southern end of the primary vehicle route/public transport route turn west just before the Madingley Road and curve into the park-and-ride site's south east corner to link up with its existing park-and-ride entry/exit road?

It might even save the University a bit of money on the basic infrastructure costs - not having to pay the Council for a major new road junction on the Madingley Road!

Cycle and footpaths from the North West Cambridge site should also link directly into the back of the park-and-ride site from the north so that people do not have to walk/wheel suitcases/cycle out onto the Madingley Road and then back in again to the NWC site.

2. Heather Sanderson (Faculty Administrator, Faculty of Philosophy)

I was pleased to read the section on 'Sustainability' in the Green Paper.

'Ecotricity' already have experience with on-site renewable energy, and have just launched 'Green Gas' made from organic waste. These may also be other viable options that could also be considered, if they have not been considered already.

There is more information on the following webpages:

<http://www.ecotricity.co.uk/business/>

and

<http://www.ecotricity.co.uk/about/our-green-gas>

I hope this information is helpful.

3. Lawrence S Greene and Jenny Greene [Huntingdon Road]

We are responding to your invitation for comment on the above Green Paper published in The Reporter on 25 June 2010. My wife and I reside at 161 Huntingdon Road and our garden is directly abutting the 19 acre field portion of the North West Cambridge Site. My wife has been the resident-owner of this property since 1975, so we have had a long-term involvement and deep roots in the community.

Although we are submitting these comments independently we are founding members of the 19 Acre Field Residents' Association (NAFRA), an association that comprises the residents of 23 properties on Huntingdon Road and All Souls Lane – all immediately adjoining the 19 acre field portion of the site. We, and NAFRA, have been involved fully in all of the public consultations with respect to the development of this site since about 2004 – both with the University and with the City of Cambridge and the South Cambs District Council. We have attended many meetings and have submitted innumerable representations. Therefore, we believe that we are reasonably well informed and have participated fully in an attempt to have our voices heard with respect to this proposed development.

First, like many residents of this area we would prefer to see the North West Cambridge Site remain undeveloped, as it is, with much of it remaining in the Green Belt. The development of this site will have a markedly negative impact on our lives over the course of the next 5 to 10-years and beyond. There will be constant construction noise over a vast area just beyond our garden. And, ultimately, we will experience a major change from the pleasant setting overlooking the 19 acre field that we currently enjoy at the bottom of our garden to a view of a major extension of the University and essentially of the City of Cambridge.

However, we realize that University has an expressed need to develop the North West Cambridge Site for housing, academic and research purposes, and we further realize that the accommodation provided by the University will contribute toward meeting the housing needs of the Cambridge region over the next decade. Therefore, we have not been opposed to the development of this site. Instead, we have worked with the Department of Estate Management at the University and later with the North West Project Group, along with the Cambridge City and South Cambs planning personnel, to try to assure that this development would be sensitive to our needs as existing residents as well as being attractive and sustainable in its own right. We are reasonably content that we have achieved these goals and we here are mainly concerned with reiterating some of our concerns to a broader audience within the University. Secondly, we wish here to urge some bodies within the University, which have been removed from this planning process and which have the overall responsibility for fiscal scrutiny within the University, not to unrealistically try to turn the development of the North West Cambridge Site into a major cash generator in an attempt to solve all of the University's fiscal problems.

One of our major concerns with the development of this site has been to assure that the houses built on the periphery of the site are sympathetic to our houses along Huntingdon Road and All Souls Lane and that there is some buffer between our properties and what will certainly be a vast development. We believe that this has been achieved in the masterplanning designs that have been put forward by the North West Cambridge Project planners. We have been assured that the edge of the site will be two-storey, single family houses no higher than about 10 metres with gardens of at least 20 metres in depth backing onto our gardens. These houses will be sympathetic in design to our properties and will not overlook our properties. In addition to providing us with a buffer from the site, these gardens will function to extend the wildlife sanctuary and corridor provided by our gardens and will protect the habitats of birds and small mammals which can then populate the site. We have been assured that there will not be solar collectors facing our properties (to the north) or wind turbines on the roofs of houses immediately adjacent to our properties and that lighting will not be intrusive. We have also been assured that taller buildings will be placed toward the centre of the site.

Another concern is that the Ascension Parish Burial Ground along All Souls Lane, the burial site of many Cambridge and University notables, be respected and that buildings constructed on the site not overlook this historic burial ground; and that pedestrian and cycle paths not lead into or encourage movement through the burial ground. The masterplanning has, as far as we can tell, addressed these concerns. Furthermore, we have been concerned that youth play areas on the site not be located in close proximity to the burial ground with the risk that the associated noise will disturb the tranquillity of both the burial ground and what is a renowned and much visited arboretum. These concerns have been conveyed to the design team at both the last masterplanning workshop and by follow-up email.

We have considerable concern about the size of the supermarket on the site. We believe that it should not be greater than the current limit of 2500 sq. m. of net trading floor space and that the attendant car parking facility should be minimized. We believe that the supermarket should be large enough to serve the needs of the North West Cambridge Site and the surrounding communities (including the West Cambridge and NIAB Sites), but should not be so large as to draw shoppers from a distance. We are particularly concerned about the effect of vehicular traffic seeking access to a large supermarket on the site from both directions on the already considerable traffic congestion on Huntingdon Road. In the context of the additional vehicular traffic on Huntingdon Road associated with the North West Cambridge Site and the adjacent NIAB Site, situating a large regional supermarket on the North West Cambridge Site would not be sustainable.

We have additional concerns that have been oft repeated verbally and in writing during the various consultations. We are hopeful that the houses on the edge of the site bordering Huntingdon Road and All Souls Lane, and for that matter all of the two and three storey accommodation on the site, will have double pitched roofs in sympathy with our properties. We are also hopeful that flat-roofed houses with attendant roof structures will be located toward the centre of the site.

We realize that there will be a variety of architectural forms and surfaces for the housing on the site. In this context we have expressed our preference for darker red/brown brickwork seen on the new graduate accommodation on the Trinity Hall Wychfield Site on Storey's Way. The light brown, almost white, brickwork seen on the Accordia development on Brooklands Avenue has been frequently mentioned by the University's design team. We feel that this colour brickwork is satisfactory at the Accordia development, which is shaded by mature trees, but is too light to be used extensively on the North West Cambridge Site where there are almost no trees.

Number 92 of the Green Paper states that. "...Modern methods of construction such as off-site manufacture will also be encouraged, whereby waste can be recycled at the factory..." We are concerned that these are code words for the least expensive possible pre-fabricated construction. We are not entirely opposed to prefabricated buildings, but believe that the University will get what it pays for. We agree that the University's reputation will not be enhanced by poor quality construction (Green Paper No. 131a), and we suggest that a repeat on the North West Cambridge Site of the residential construction on the West Cambridge Site, and some of the research buildings on the West Cambridge Site, will not enhance the University's reputation nor compare favourably with that seen at its competitor universities. Off-site construction can also have significant transportation costs, particularly when it turns out that it cannot be sourced locally. Further, unattractive construction dictated mainly by cost will degrade the quality of the site and drive off prospective purchasers of the market housing and commercial research facilities, whereas a site with some architectural distinction, even if it is a bit more costly, will attract prospective buyers and renters at higher prices and thus prove to be less expensive over time.

Finally, we are quite concerned about comments made in the Board of Scrutiny Report in the 21 July 2010 issue of The Reporter, particularly number 20 in their report in which they state, referring to the North West Cambridge Project, that "...This is Cambridge's biggest capital project. It is the University's opportunity to make money from land development..." We agree that the University should make every effort to cover its costs and seek long-term profit from the development of this site. However, the Board of Scrutiny and other University bodies should disabuse themselves of the notion that the North West Cambridge Site is a cash cow that is going to solve all of the University's considerable financial problems. This land has been taken out of protected Cambridge Green Belt status to provide for the University of Cambridge's housing, academic facility and research facility needs. It has not been taken out of the Green Belt to solve the University financial woes by creating a vast shopping mall, or high-rise science park, or high-rise housing project, or whatever – all of which would be unsustainable in the context of the considerable development that is also taking place at the NIAB Site and the fact that the residents of Cambridge wish to live in habitable communities with adequate and affordable housing and not on the edge of the University of Cambridge's 'economic generator'.

Again, the University should expect to receive a fair return on its investment in the North West Cambridge Site. However, the site is not in the middle of nowhere and there are constraints on the degree to which it can be developed yet be sustainable. The guiding bodies of the University of Cambridge must be realistic in dealing with the University's financial circumstances by increasing grant and independent fund raising and by adjusting enrolments and costs appropriately. The costs of developing the North West Cambridge Site should not exacerbate the University's financial woes, but it is not realistic to expect that the development of this site will make a major positive contribution to the University's balance sheet.

4. Nineteen Acre Field Residents Association

The Nineteen Acre Field Residents Association (NAFRA) is pleased to have this opportunity to comment on the North West Cambridge Green Paper published in the Reporter on 25 June. NAFRA represents residents of 23 properties on Huntingdon Road and All Souls Lane which adjoin the Nineteen Acre Field portion of the North West Cambridge Site. Some of the area that we represent also forms part of the Storey's Way Conservation Area. NAFRA has, over the years, had extensive discussions with Estate Management and, more recently, with the subsequent North West Cambridge Project team. Naturally, we have also responded to all of the formal consultations emanating from the Councils.

We should reiterate that NAFRA has never opposed in principle the development of the site, but has recognized the needs of both the University and the Councils. However, we have always tried to encourage the site to be more sustainable in the longer term, something that the University also aspires to, and are pleased to see the proposals for the Open Space provision (paras 35-42), as well as the

emphasis placed on community and design quality. To date we are broadly satisfied that our concerns have been taken on board, based on the many assurances which have been made. We hope that this can be maintained throughout the remainder of the planning and development process.

This communication consciously reiterates our concerns in the context both of the Green Paper and of comments concerning the money-making possibilities of the development made recently by the Board of Scrutiny (Reporter, 21 July 2010).

We have the following specific comments to make with respect to the development of the North West Cambridge site as outlined in the Green Paper (utilising the paragraph numbering adopted by that paper):

4. NAFRA looks forward to similar soliciting of feedback from all with an interest in this project as it proceeds, and hopes that this won't be restricted to members of the Regent House and to formal University decision-making procedures.

6. A Green Paper is an uncommon (but by no means unwelcome) approach to University development. However, unlike comments made at a Discussion, there is no suggestion that the comments received will be made publicly available. In the interests of transparency, and to give greater credibility to the outcome, we would urge publication (via the NWC website) of comments received. Even if that is not possible for this particular Green Paper, perhaps it could be for any future consultations of this sort (see para 4).

10. The arc referred to is more conceptual than practical. There is nothing in planning terms linking Addenbrooke's with the West Cambridge and NWC sites. We do not feel any aspect of NWC development benefits from linking to Addenbrooke's in this way.

13. These are grand aims and aspirations. If previous experience of other University sites is any guide, we can all – University and local residents alike – expect compromises to be required along the way.

14. NAFRA agrees strongly with this statement.

16. This is an important point, particularly in the light of the Board of Scrutiny's comments referred to elsewhere in this response.

26. Whilst not opposed to the University's development of this site for its academic, research and housing needs, there is concern within the Association about the risk of over-development of this site. The size of the site and the amount of housing on it has increased considerably in the course of the Inspectors' Hearings (as has the size of the adjacent NIAB site). Excessive development of North West Cambridge would not be sustainable and would further impinge on the amenity of adjoining residents.

Our major concern with the development of this site is to assure that the houses constructed on the edge of the site are sympathetic to our houses along Huntingdon Road and All Souls Lane and that there is a sufficient buffer between our properties and this very large development. We have had various discussions and consultations with the University and Council planners with respect to these issues and as a consequence of these discussions we feel that our concerns have been addressed in the masterplanning designs. We have been assured that the edge of the site will be two-storey, single family detached houses no higher than about 10 metres with gardens of at least 20-metres in depth backing onto our gardens. These houses will be sympathetic in design to our houses and will not overlook our properties or the Ascension Parish Burial Ground. The gardens will augment and buffer the wildlife habitat in our gardens. We have been assured that taller buildings and areas of denser construction will be located toward the centre of the site.

We are anxious that the development of the site respect the integrity of the Ascension Parish Burial Ground, the burial place of many Cambridge and University notables. We are concerned that buildings on the site not overlook this historic burial ground and arboretum and that pedestrian and cycle paths on the site do not encourage movement through the burial ground or along the private All Souls Lane. We are reasonably assured that the masterplanning has addressed these issues, even though the Burial Ground is not specifically mentioned in the Green Paper.

28. There is clearly a risk – or likelihood, indeed – that at least some of the facilities proposed for the Local Centre will encourage significant amounts of inward traffic, an issue about which we have grave concerns. In particular, the advent of a large(ish) supermarket will have a very considerable impact on traffic levels in the local area which need to be very thoroughly investigated. We trust that the anticipated Report to the University will await the outcome of the current consultation on retail provision being undertaken by the Councils, since this is clearly a key issue for all concerned with this development.

30. NAFRA notes that the list of facilities “intended ... [for] early ... development” differs from that given in para 103. It would be helpful if para 30 could concentrate, as para 103 does, on Phase 1 developments, since everyone will have their own understanding of what's meant by “early”.

41. We confirm our existing view, expressed to the Project Team at the last masterplanning workshop, that an informal play area envisaged for the Nineteen Acre Field portion of the site not be located anywhere close to the Ascension Parish Burial Ground so that the peace and tranquillity of the Burial Ground not be disturbed and inappropriate youth access to the Burial Ground not be encouraged. We have suggested that the informal play area for this portion of the site be located beyond the avenue of chestnut trees, near Storey's Field.

43. The masterplan doesn't currently seem to distinguish between the locations of these two types of housing. This may become a more significant issue in later stages of planning.

56-62. This whole section seems worryingly vague at present. However, NAFRA notes that the space concerned is sited a long way from its own area of immediate interest. (See also para 98.)

74(g). In para 29 a residential population of some 7,000 people is mentioned. Some will work on-site, some will cycle to work. Some will work on-site or cycle to work but nevertheless maintain a car for other purposes.

But 40% of even 4,000 people (for example) is still a very large number of extra drivers on the roads! We have seen little evidence yet – and nothing in the Green Paper – that suggests current road structures will be adapted, or able, to cope.

Equally, it is unclear how the University plans to ensure that this maximum of 40% is to be delivered. It's hardly feasible to refuse to sell more than x% of residences to car owners. This seems to be nothing more an aspiration and in view of the significant impact on local traffic (and on local residents, therefore) we trust that there will be much more substance on the transport issue in the report to be presented to the University.

83. Para 48 suggests a relatively high turnover of populace over a 3 year cycle, and this is reiterated in para 53. This only increases the pressures and challenges in making the site sustainable over the longer term, particularly with the proposal in paragraph 83 that:

"the site influences residents to behave in a sustainable manner"

We would hope that the relatively high turnover of people is taken in account when planning such sustainability.

91. If “a high proportion of the available water resources is already being exploited” NAFRA would be interested to know what plans are in place to ensure that when 7,000 extra people (plus those coming to the NIAB site) are drawing on these resources we shan't become short of water or have water restrictions. If we are already exploiting a “high proportion”, surely some new measures are needed to manage the future demand? Again, we would welcome additional information in the report coming to the University.

95. This para talks about restrictions on cars, but there is no equivalent statement in the section of the paper concerned with Transport (paras 72-78), where one would reasonably expect to find it (in that section “discourage” is used, but that's a rather different idea).

97. NAFRA welcomes this, and trusts that lessons learned from the mistakes of West Cambridge will be used positively to inform NWC development. It would be reassuring if the report to the University were to acknowledge this explicitly.

101. We acknowledge that complete development will inevitably take many years and that NWC as a whole will be a building site for a long time. Consequently we would appreciate development of the Nineteen Acre Field taking place in Phase 1 so that construction in our area of direct concern is limited to a single phase with the least possible impact on our neighbourhood.

103. See para 101.

106. Although the section on Governance is clearly addressing the issue within the context of formal University structures, we do hope that there will be a role for local associations such as ours to be involved at some level – for example, in the Sustainability and Quality panels referred to in the Paper. There is no reason why community engagement (para 139) should not be put on a more structured footing, for example, allowing bodies such as our own the chance of formal representation on the issues which such a development raises.

119 and 122. The Board of Scrutiny thinks that this is “...the University's opportunity to make money from land development”. We beg to differ, and await with interest the Council of the Senate's response to that comment later in the year.

The University is in a very privileged position of having land previously designated as Green Belt become available for development for its longer term needs. This brings responsibilities of which the

University must never lose sight. One of the drivers for this development is the long-term future of the University, particularly with the advent of increased overseas competition (paras 8 and 130). We also note (and fully accept) the requirement for an "acceptable financial return" (para 120). However, we should hope that such constraints do not become overriding factors in decisions about the development of the site, and that any Governance body is sensitive to this.

The Green Paper represents the basis of a prospective Outline Planning Application based on the Area Action Plan that was approved for the North West Cambridge Site in 2009 as a result of extensive consultations between the University, the Cambridge City and South Cambs District Councils, and the Planning Inspectorate. Any significant increase in the housing density or commercial retail density on the site will greatly undermine the sustainability of the proposed development, especially in the context of the very large development taking place on the NIAB Site.

5. Professor Robert Neild [Trinity College]

I write to suggest that paragraph 45 should be reconsidered where it says, 'In order to help the University maintain its long-term interests, the market properties are expected to be disposed of on 999-year leases'.

I take it that 'maintain its long-term interests' means that with a long lease the University can make conditions with respect to usage that are not possible with freeholds. That is a weighty consideration, but it does not justify the making of leases for 999 years.

To make a lease for 999 years is to surrender to someone else for all those years the rise in rents associated with inflation (and with any rise in rents relative to other prices). It is a safe generalisation that over recorded history prices have gone up and have very rarely come down. I have just looked up the figures for the price of wheat, the only commodity for which there are figures reaching back a long way. They have increased 133 times in the last 500 years. Goodness knows what the University might lose in 999 years.

I am not familiar with the rules of leasehold enfranchisement, but I believe it may be felt that long leases serve the purpose of ensuring that were enfranchisement to occur the university would still have some say over the usage of the enfranchised land; But if the law today - or tomorrow - permits enfranchisement, it does not mean that 999 year leases are appropriate. Think how much the law may change in 999 years.

I conclude that the Council should reconsider the length of lease on which market properties are to be disposed of. My view is that a much shorter period should be explored. 99 years used to be a customary figure and seemed to provide plenty of reward to developers; 50 or 150 years might not be silly.

I am sending copies of this letter to Mr Landman and Sir John Bradfield, the present and former senior bursar of the college, with whom I have discussed the problem.

I should perhaps add that I am a long-retired economist who recently wrote a financial history of Trinity and is now working on a financial history of the University.

P.S. A small point. Para 63 says 'This is the last major piece of undeveloped land in the ownership of the University'. I believe the University owns some 1,700 acres used by the University Farm, of which this a modest part.

6. Representatives of local Faith Communities¹

We, the undersigned, have been meeting together, facilitated by the East of England Faiths Council and accompanied by Community Planning Officers from Cambridge City and South Cambs District Councils. Some of our members have been involved in earlier briefings on the emerging 'Masterplan', and we thank the University for communicating with faith groups at an early stage.

1. Our response to Section 5b & 30b on the vision for 'Community Space' within the 'Local Centre'. We were heartened to see the aim of 'Creating a sense of community' articulated clearly, and so early in the report. Furthermore we were delighted to see the inclusion of faith provision within 'Community Space' as part of the plan for the 'Local Centre', which will be a central focus of the community.

Government and academic research shows that faith communities add tremendous capacity to the work of building cohesive community and so we want, in a similarly early fashion, to declare our interest in participation and partnership in this task, with people of all faiths and none.

A study commissioned by Cambridgeshire Horizons (Facilities for Faith Communities in new developments in the Cambridge sub-region) recommends the provision of facilities for faith groups in all new developments of more than 2,000 dwellings at the rate of 0.5 hectares of free land (or equivalent) per 3,000 homes, and we ask the University to consider providing this equivalent. This could potentially be in the form of one large room to be used by faiths but available to people of all faiths and none; and several smaller rooms (see below) for specific faith purposes, as part of the proposed Community Centre.

Different faith communities have different cultural and ritual needs, so we would ask for opportunities to be involved with architects and designers at the earliest possibility in order to add 'design-savvy' to the plans for the 'Community Space.' We are of one mind that our particular traditions of prayer need their own dedicated space in continuity. So we would like to contribute to discussions about the equipping of the envisaged larger room to optimise access for different faith communities as well as the provision and designation of smaller rooms for faith-based activities such as pastoral consultation, small-group study, prayer, meditation etc. This may well be the first opportunity arising in the UK for designing and implementing such an arrangement in a new development, but the University of Cambridge is no stranger to leading the way! We are awaiting the outcome of a small funding application for undertaking a feasibility study.

2. Our response to Section 51 and 54 on the allocation of key-worker housing.

To our knowledge neither the University nor the Colleges currently have a fully-fledged system for appointing chaplains or other pastoral leaders for the minority faith communities; such work is generally sponsored by external bodies or provided on a voluntary and part-time basis. It is highly unlikely that these faith leaders would be eligible for housing under the proposed terms, and we ask for them to be re-considered

Again, we commend to the University the Cambridgeshire Horizons report. This also acknowledges the benefits of housing faith leaders and other community workers early in the life of a new development. Cambourne provides a good example of the benefits accruing to community cohesion from the early presence of a faith minister, helping the emerging community work through issues.

¹ Rev Peter Hayler	Chaplain to University Staff
Rev Dr Tim Macquiban	Methodist Minister & Chaplain
Mr Mirza Baig	Pakistan Society, Cambridge Muslim Council
Rev Tony Barker	Church and Community
Ms Priscilla Barlow	County Ecumenical Council
Mr John Chaplin	Shared Churches (Ely) Ltd.
Rev Dr Geoff Cook	Shared Churches (Ely) Ltd.
Ms Nasim Mavaddat	University Baha'i Society
Mr Thak Patel	Indian Community and Cultural Association
Dr Jim Platts	Society of Friends (Quaker)
Mr Lakhwinder Sagoo	Cambridge Sikh Society
Ms Eva Simmons	Cambridge Jewish Residents Association

We believe it is essential that the availability of housing be made more inclusive and enabling.

3. Our response to Section II on the question of Syndicate Governance.

In the 'hard' sense of 'ownership' we understand that NW Cambridge will belong to the University.

In a 'softer' sense we would like a share in the 'ownership' or governance of the 'Community Space', and so have confidence in inclusive access to it as a base for the work of 'creating a sense of community'.

The idea of a 'Community Trust' has been suggested and, we believe, commends itself for exploration as being more open than a University Syndicate.

We would also commend for the University's consideration the work of Shared Churches (Ely) Ltd, which has local experience and expertise in both building and managing shared facilities.

4. Pastoral Planning.

This is our general point in response to the Green Paper, and touches on all we have said thus far: we want to encourage the University to develop a 'Pastoral Plan' in parallel with the infrastructure and building plans represented by the Green Paper. We are absolutely not interested in social engineering but, sensing the enormity of the undertaking and the potential fragility of a new, diverse and transient community, we do want to contribute to its strength, its cohesion, its wellbeing and its success through our diverse faiths, and in partnership with others.

(Please also note that this remark concurs with those made by Professor David Thompson at the discussion on the Green Paper in Senate House on 12th October.)

7. Mrs Gillian Craig [Huntingdon Road]

I am opposed to the proposed North-West Cambridge development on practical and moral grounds. It is an over large development which will spoil this part of Cambridge for the existing residents. We will lose the open space we have come to enjoy and our lives will be blighted by congestion, noise and light pollution.

It is already clear to the local residents that the Huntingdon Road cannot take any more traffic. During peak periods, the traffic crawls past this house nose to tail, with emergency vehicles struggling to get through. It is unlikely that the new residents of the development will be car less, however much that may be desired. In addition, the supermarket will attract car-driving customers and heavy lorries will have to come onto the site to deliver supplies to the supermarket and to the school(s). It is also the case that many parents drive their children to school, especially in bad weather.

I do not think that it is right for the university to build on the green belt, especially a development of this size, which will ruin this part of Cambridge forever.

8. Professor E J Craig [Huntingdon Road]

I write in connection with the University's consultation procedures relating to the NorthWest Cambridge Development plans, I wish to mention two points, neither of which will be new to you, but which are of the first importance and will bear as much repetition as they can get.

First, the University is very fortunate in being allowed to build on former greenbelt land.

It would be scandalous if any considerations of financial gain were to interfere with the aspiration to develop this site to the highest standards.

Second, what is said (and not said) in the recent Green Paper about (a) traffic and (b) provision of utilities is very far from convincing; it reads rather like a commercial developer's PR exercise. Much more thought, and in the event of the plans going forward more money and more work, will need to be put into these aspects if the development is not to turn into a disaster. The University should be under no illusions as to just how bad things could become if these problems are not solved, and just how hard it is going to be to solve them - if it can be done at all.

Finally, I applaud what is said in the Green Paper about resisting 'development bias' and hope that it is sincerely meant.

9. Chairman of University Biomedical Strategy Group and Head of School of the Biological Sciences

Following discussion about the potential location of the new Cambridge police headquarters at 307 Huntingdon Road, we are writing to express our concern about this proposal. The plan shows a three storey police building of approx 10,000m² with a substantial basement in very close proximity to buildings in regular use for experimental work under the Animal (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986. It also occupies about 50% of the available grazing on the site. With this location, the building would compromise academic activities under this Act, both during the build phase and subsequently. Major issues include security, access to adequate grazing and compliance with the Act. With recent building projects on this site (one of which was further away from existing buildings than the present plan) the biofacilities were de-designated for experimental work under the Act either wholly, or in part, which meant severely curtailing, or the cessation of, experimental activity during the period of building work. Currently, such a stoppage would adversely affect research productivity of multiple groups within 5 different University departments across the Biological Science and Clinical Schools. Unfortunately, there has been no consultation about the plan for the police station with either School or with any of the University committees responsible for the animal facilities.

Over the last 5 years, the University has invested nearly £2M in refurbishing and restructuring the facilities on this site to produce a first class research station for experimental work on farm animals. These facilities are not available elsewhere in the University. Indeed, they are unique in the UK. Offering the 307 site to the police for consideration, therefore, not only jeopardises important, ongoing research and future grant applications but also squanders the University's recent financial investment in the site. While the University is considering the long term (15 – 20 year) future location of these facilities, there is no immediate plan to move them elsewhere. Clearly, a new research facility would have to be built and be fully functional before the site could be relinquished for alternative use. This would involve detailed planning, funding, construction and designation by the Home Office - a lengthy process which could not be completed by the projected start date for the new police headquarters in July 2012, even if a site for the farm animal facility had been found elsewhere. Consequently, the new police headquarters cannot be built at 307 Huntingdon Road and needs to be re-located to a vacant site within the North West Cambridge development area.