

PPWG Meeting – 22nd July 2017

According to item 9 on the Evidence Base the SA is going to be presented to the PPWG next week but it is not on the Agenda for next week.

Bidwells Meeting

The recent presentation with Bidwells was supposed to be an opportunity to ask questions about the proposals but there is no master 'plan' it is just a 'drawing' with everything to be determined 'later' so there was no discussion on the 'plan'.

Conflict of Interest

Ultimately Bidwells are doing this for financial gain, and why wouldn't they? By providing a large amount of housing in one location it makes it easier to attract companies and lease commercial R&D space in the Science cluster (it says as much in their documentation). But what about UDC? Why does the same not apply to you? You now have a 50% interest in Chesterford Research Park and need local housing to ensure commercial growth at the Park and thereby increase your revenues – how is this not a conflict of interest? How can you not be considered to have a pecuniary interest in this site allocation and any future planning applications for the Research Park? Will this pecuniary interest be stated in the Local Plan?

Garden Village Principles

Bidwells proposal says it is 'influenced by' the Garden City Principles, when asked if it would actually 'conform' to any of them, the answer was 'depends on what you mean by Garden City Principles'

So taking 2 of them:

Land value capture for the benefit of the community.

I assumed that expectation levels would have been set as part of the 'Call for Sites' but I was wrong and according to Bidwells there has been no discussion with UDC in the last 2 years about expected levels of land value capture or structure of the delivery vehicle for the development. Any land value uplift is being conferred by you when you allocate a site. Land has to be obtained at a

significantly lower value in order to provide funding for the infrastructure, truly affordable housing and a future for the community.

A wide range of local jobs in the Garden City within easy commuting distance of homes.

Appendix 5 - Objectively Assessed Need

10.3.1 ...Minimal additional employment floorspace is likely so as to limit competition with the wide range of employment opportunities close by.

Not everyone will be working in the Science cluster, and don't forget that the housing required for that employment growth has already been provided for in the South Cambs Local Plan, there is still a need to provide a significant number of jobs within the community itself.

According to the TCPA website the Garden City Principles are an '**indivisible and interlocking framework for their delivery**' – I haven't checked all of them but the critical one is definitely missing and so is the ethos.

Apparently this development will 'save us' from the traffic chaos caused by the cars of people commuting to these jobs from outside of the area –in that case provision of cycle and pedestrian routes to ALL of the Science Parks mentioned, and the train station at Great Chesterford must be **mandatory** , and absolutely **non-negotiable**.

The size of the site is likely to be smaller due to constraints , there is no master 'plan', no agreement on land value capture, no agreed delivery vehicle, no named developer and currently no modelling to show how many houses can be located at that site with all the required community infrastructure (which also hasn't been agreed) there is simply insufficient 'evidence' to make an allocation at this point in time – any allocation on this site cannot currently be shown to be achievable/deliverable/sustainable.

We do not want large housing estates with Sec 106 agreements (which will later be renegotiated claiming viability issues!!), if UDC wants support from residents, development **must** conform to the principles we were promised.