

**Cambridge Biomedical Campus Vision 2050
– An Assessment**

By

Great Shelford Parish Council & Trumpington Residents' Association

Prepared by David Plank

With contributions from Annabel Sykes & Stephen Davies

February 2024

This report

This report is written on behalf of the Trumpington Residents' Association and Great Shelford Parish Council, two bodies which have an intimate knowledge of and commitment to the area, rely on the hospitals located on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, and are affected in many other ways by the Campus's presence in our midst. The proposals in Vision 2050 would have a huge impact on our lives.

Great Shelford Parish Council believes that our village is a great place to live and work. The council proactively works to maintain and promote Great Shelford's character as a vibrant and pleasant destination village, respecting the heritage and envisaging the future contribution of this thriving and inclusive community to the wider region. The council recognises it has a responsibility to both preserve and improve the locality and the natural environment.

Trumpington Residents' Association is a registered charity and company limited by guarantee. Our aim is to make Trumpington a better place for the future, by working on behalf of our members to maintain and improve residents' quality of life and engender a sense of community. The Association is apolitical, and encourages input from everyone involved in Trumpington.

CONTENTS

Section	Page	Para- graph
Contents	3	
Glossary	4	
Key points	5	
Why make this assessment?	9	1
What is the Cambridge Biomedical Campus?		4
What happened to Vision 2020?		17
Need for Vision 2050 – Has it been demonstrated?		30
The proposed development		36
Is Vision 2050 the same as “Cambridge South”?		45
The Green Belt and Vision 2050		52
Constraints on development:	24	58
- Water supply		59
- The Environment		67
- Transport		69
Points of significant detail:	29	
- Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust		77
- Community Fund		78
- Research Institutes		79
Overall assessment	30	81
Annexes:		
A – CBC Vision – TRA letter 31 May 2021	31	
- Presentation to Queen Edith’s Community Forum, 30 March 2023 – Community organizations email 12 April 2023		
B – Extracts from “Where we do not and do agree with CBC”, community organizations’ submission to Shared Planning Service re CBC Spatial Framework, December 2022	36	
C - Demand estimates in Vision 2050 and Cambridge South – Lack of Provenance: Correspondence	39	

GLOSSARY

Cambridge South development	An extensive proposed development on 169 hectares of Green Belt land south and west of CBC promoted by St John’s and Jesus Colleges, Cambridgeshire County Council, and a private family trust in April 2021 in response to GCSP’s call for sites for development of a new Local Plan. Referred to as the Cambridge South development
CBC	Cambridge Biomedical Campus
CBC Ltd	Cambridge Biomedical Campus Limited, a company limited by guarantee incorporated on 22 June 2021 by Royal Papworth NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridge University Health Partners, MRC Laboratory of Molecular Biology, Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Trust, the University of Cambridge, and Abcam PLC. AstraZeneca plc became a member in 2022
CSET	Cambridge South East Transport. A public transport project sponsored by the Greater Cambridge Partnership for a dedicated off-road busway to the CBC, linking with the Cambridge Guided Busway network and a Park and Ride on the A11 serving the east and south of Cambridge, and relieving congestion on the A1307 and A1301 corridors
CUH NHS Trust	Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
EWR	East West Rail - the Oxford to Cambridge railway project promoted by the East West Railway Company Ltd – EWR is used for both - involving a new “central” section of railway from Bedford to Cambridge. Its proposed route approaches Cambridge from the south, stopping first at the new Cambridge South station
First Proposals	GCSP’s First Proposals for a Greater Cambridge Local Plan published in November 2021, and its supporting documents
GCSP	Greater Cambridge Shared Planning, the combined planning department for Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council
Spatial Framework	The CBC’s proposed Spatial Framework and supporting documents submitted by CBC Ltd to GCSP in December 2022
Vision 2020	A series of three documents published by Addenbrooke’s NHS Trust (now CUH NHS Trust) entitled “Addenbrooke’s: The 2020 Vision” (published in September 1999 and updated in June 2001) and “2020 Vision at Addenbrooke’s” (published in July 2004). The documents reflected a vision shared with, and endorsed by, the University of Cambridge and the Medical Research Council, which evolved with the benefit of local authority and other stakeholder input.
Vision 2050	“Cambridge Biomedical Campus Vision 2050: Creating a life sciences quarter for Cambridge” - the copy we have worked from is marked “Under embargo until 09.00am BST 7 May 2021” and the signatories are the initial members of CBC Ltd, AstraZeneca plc and the Babraham Research Campus. It was released publicly in connection with the submission of the Cambridge South development to GCSP’s call for sites for development of a new Local Plan

Key Points

- The CBC's healthcare function is critically important to Greater Cambridge and the wider region, yet its district general hospital has a maintenance backlog of £125 million and is constrained by lack of capacity; it is too small for its rapidly growing population, let alone the escalating population envisaged in the First Proposals and in Vision 2050 itself.
- The CBC's other impacts on its neighbours – for example, traffic, unwanted parking, construction of new transport infrastructure, including park and rides, designed to allow people to reach it - are very significant and generally have adverse as well as mitigating features. Our areas are not mere conduits for other people's needs, travel or otherwise. We live here and our needs warrant up front, not residual, attention.
- The Greater Cambridge Green Belt next to the CBC is of great importance to local people due to its "re-creational" significance in the widest sense – people do not live by bread alone. It provides the essential setting for the City of Cambridge, ensuring the separation from its "necklace of villages" rightly regarded as fundamental to the City's "special character" in successive Local Plans. The CBC's aspirations threaten "Very High Harm" to this existential element of Cambridge – and in consequence to Cambridge's identity as we know it.
- Implementation of Vision 2050 (especially as envisaged in the "Cambridge South" development which would obliterate the Green Belt between the south of Cambridge and its "necklace" of villages) would have profound consequences for Cambridge and its region. Development of the CBC has already taken 77 hectares out of the Green Belt, and the Spatial Framework is founded on the assumption that another 19 will be removed. The First Proposals acknowledge that this extension for which "it may be possible to demonstrate a case", would cause "Very High Harm" to the Green Belt. And the CBC has refused to say that this would be an end to it. Yet Vision 2050 does not even mention the Green Belt let alone take account of it. This lack of respect for a vital asset is even more surprising given the CBC's fragile neighbour, Nine Wells, is part of that Green Belt and of huge historical significance to Cambridge. Remedying this fundamental flaw should be central to revision of Vision 2050.
- For all these reasons and more, the CBC's forward plans are of critical importance, not only to its neighbouring communities, but also to residents of a much wider area.
- Despite this, Vision 2050 reads more like a bid or promotional document than a serious forward plan. For example, it does not include any systematic assessment of:
 - the extent to which the goals set out in the earlier site strategy, 2020 Vision at Addenbrooke's, have been achieved
 - future demand for CBC-based hospital services based on demographic projections and other likely determinants of future health care or
 - the environmental and infrastructure sustainability of its aspirations

- Vision 2050 was not consulted on before publication in May 2021 and there has been no formal public consultation since - awareness of its proposals remains low and they have not benefited from public feedback. Despite this lack of validation, the CBC assumes Vision 2050 as a given.
- Vision 2050 is also substantially out of date. Events have moved on since its publication three years ago. Not least, the Local Plan First Proposals were issued for public consultation over two years ago, and the CBC's forward vision does not yet take account of them or the Development Strategy Update decided in January last year. As a result, Vision 2050 takes no account of the fact that the level of growth it assumes has been rejected by the two Local Plan authorities - for the manifold reasons stated later in this report. [Paragraphs 47-50]
- We have sought to bring Vision 2050's greatest inadequacies to the attention of CBC Ltd and have suggested that it should be rewritten, but our concerns have gone unheeded - it continues to be referenced with approval in the Spatial Framework and relied on uncritically by others, for example, the Government and East West Rail.
- We have therefore gone to the very considerable effort of preparing this document given the vital importance to Greater Cambridge of CBC's forward plans and the lack of public understanding of them and their implications.
- Excellence in clinical treatment, education and research was at the heart of Vision 2020 and one of its key achievements was to secure land for the expansion and redevelopment of Addenbrooke's - in particular, the rebuilding of the acute hospital. The under-developed state of that part of the CBC is a direct consequence of severe capital rationing in the NHS over the past 15 years. Not only does this impact the local population, but it also adversely affects the hospital's capacity to support clinical trials.
- Vision 2050 does not seek to build on this achievement of Vision 2020 or to examine mechanisms to access gain from currently planned development for contributions towards the funding of CUH NHS Trust's new hospital and hospital renewal plans. This report looks in more detail at the progress of the Cancer Research Hospital and the Cambridge Children's Hospital, but if built, each will only be a partial remedy to Addenbrooke's serious capacity constraints.
- Inquiries into the New Hospitals Programme by the National Audit Office and the Public Accounts Committee make starkly clear that the money currently on offer from the Government is inadequate and may well be redirected to rebuild hospitals built from reinforced autoclaved aerated concrete (RAAC) and in danger of collapse. If the new Local Plan when adopted supports expansion of the CBC, a prospect we oppose, the landowners and developers benefiting from that expansion should make meaningful financial contributions to the hospital infrastructure Greater Cambridge needs. An updated Vision 2050 should make provision for this.

- Vision 2050 seeks to “broaden” the CBC’s purpose from excellence in clinical treatment, education and research to a non-specific commercial life sciences purpose. As a result, the CBC’s prime clinical purpose is undesirably diminished and its claimed space requirement increased significantly by uses which do not need to be located on the CBC site. The estimates of need provided in Vision 2050 itself are unprovenanced and those underpinning the CBC’s Spatial Framework are determined by this broadening of purpose which undermines their validity. Vision 2050 needs to be rewritten to put healthcare at its heart and identify in specific terms what really does need to be co-located with the hospitals and research institutions at CBC.
- Vision 2050 envisages a single campus for this broadened purpose, thereby inappropriately ruling out the assessment of other reasonable options at nearby sites identified in the First Proposals and as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. This restrictive approach must be changed to look outwards to alternative sites and support, not undermine, the Green Belt.
- Vision 2050’s “urban extension” or “peri-urban quarter” proposal is incoherent and out of date, and does not recognize the extent of recent housing growth in the south of Cambridge. It should be written out of a revised vision document - and, if any housing is contemplated, it must be genuinely affordable and reserved for key workers (unlike the housing proposed in the Cambridge South development).
- Since the publication of Vision 2050, it has become very clear that Greater Cambridge is water-stressed. The current rate of abstraction cannot be sustained, let alone increased. It seems likely that some development allowed in the current Local Plan will not take place or will be significantly delayed by the water supply shortage. There is no quick fix for this. A revised Vision 2050 should recognize this, curtail its ambitions accordingly, and explain how it will play its part in reducing and managing demand.
- Improved public transport to the CBC is of fundamental importance to CBC itself, to its workers, to those visiting its hospitals - and to its neighbouring communities. Vision 2050 assumes that the transport links it mentions are a “free good”. CBC can no longer assume that all or most of the cost will be met through the public purse. A revised Vision 2050 needs to explain how its development will contribute financially.
- A revised Vision 2050 should take full account of the overdue and much needed revision of the CBC’s transport and travel strategy. The revision must take a realistic view of any public transport projects it plans to rely on as CSET is at present “paused” and EWR continues to look uncertain. The constraint this represents must not be allowed to increase the CBC’s reliance on the private car with the substantial harm this would entail.
- Vision 2050 does not acknowledge major environmental issues, such as climate change, biodiversity loss and flood risk. Its use of the word “sustainable” refers to market viability not environmental integrity. These issues must be addressed expressly, with a

revised Vision 2050 fully informed and affected by its environmental implications from the outset.

- Vision 2050 is not fit for purpose and needs to be updated with an open mind and replaced with the benefit of public consultation. Its failings are fundamental. The collective reputation of the CBC and the bodies it comprises are at stake. Vision 2050 cannot and should not be relied upon by the CBC as its forward vision or by others, such as the Government and EWR; nor, in its unrevised form, should it be central in CBC Ltd's constitution.

For all these reasons, we urge the CBC to review Vision 2050 with an open mind and replace it - and ask others not to rely on it until this is done

Cambridge Biomedical Campus Vision 2050 – An Assessment

Why make this assessment?

1. The Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) is a large presence next door to our communities. Residents from the locality and from the wider region rely on the hard-pressed health services its hospitals provide. We appreciate the excellence of those services and strongly support further development of their high quality. It is the largest employment centre in Cambridge with many of its workers living in our areas - and others travelling through our areas in large numbers every day. Therefore, the vision the CBC has of its future is important to us and we want to make sure it is right for us as well as others. Vision 2050 is the forward view that the CBC has adopted. It is central to the constitution of CBC Ltd which brings together the main CBC players.¹ It is relied on implicitly by other organizations including Government and East West Rail (EWR).
2. Contrary to statements made at the time and since, Vision 2050 did not benefit from informed public consultation. There was limited communication to community organizations based on a summary document which did not include key information published shortly thereafter in the full document. This led the Trumpington Residents' Association (TRA) to complain that it felt "misled." [See the first communication in *Annex A*] There was cause to remind the CBC of this subsequently. [See the second communication in *Annex A*] As the opportunity to comment on the full document has not been provided, we have decided to create it ourselves.
3. This is why we have spent much time assessing Vision 2050 – and, as will be seen, found it wanting in critical regards. Accordingly, *we urge the CBC to review and revise Vision 2050 with an open mind. We say with an open mind because our close observation is that adherence to Vision 2050 is at risk of becoming a matter of faith. The future of our area is too important for that.*

¹ "The object for which the Company is established is to represent and promote the interests of its Members as owners and occupiers of the CBC and to that end to seek to ensure that proposals for the development of CBC Expansion Land (a) take account of the interests of the Members as owners and occupiers of the CBC: and (b) are delivered in a manner complementary to the CBC and are consistent with Vision 2050." [Articles of Association, Companies House Register of Companies – to which Vision 2050 is appended as per Article 1, Interpretation, 1.1, CBC Vision 2050] We are aware CBC Ltd has sought to change its object, but the change has not been validly made (see section 31 Companies Act 2006).

What is the Cambridge Biomedical Campus?

4. What is the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) meant to be? It is necessary to ask this question because the CBC's purpose has changed – and changed in a way that is neither necessary nor desirable.
5. The original CBC vision document, Vision 2020, which described itself as “2020 Vision at Addenbrooke’s” and “the future of the hospital campus”, made explicit –

“... our commitment to the ultimate goal of the vision: outstanding excellence in health care, education and research – for public benefit.”
6. Vision 2050, however, describes the CBC as –

“... the anchor of the South Cambridge life sciences cluster”, and states that –

“CBC is one of the world’s leading centres of life sciences research, medical innovation and healthcare provision... a globally important life sciences engine...”
7. This snapshot shows that whereas the hospitals were at the heart of and in the lead in Vision 2020, they are no longer in this position in Vision 2050. Indeed, the hospitals are not clearly visible in Vision 2050, being obscured by a blanket life sciences vision “broadened” to include a larger range of commercial life science activity purportedly linked by a research and development theme:

“The most effective innovation districts host a range of businesses that can share ideas and collaborate on projects in a dynamic and agile way. *By broadening its offer and welcoming a wider variety of businesses in their early stages and others with complementary specialisms outside of life sciences*, CBC will encourage that diversity and fulfil its role in the Cambridge innovation ecosystem. (our emphasis) [Page 35]
8. Where are the hospitals in this? Where is “outstanding excellence in health care, education and research – for public benefit.” They have been obscured – if not overlooked.
9. The consequence of this broadening of purpose is inevitable: the CBC’s claimed space requirement has increased significantly; *and* the prime link with the hospitals’ clinical treatment, education and research functions has been diminished. The advancement of health care now seems subordinate to a primary purpose of advancing commercial life sciences research. This wider objective should not be the CBC’s purpose as it does not need to be met on the CBC site – it can be located elsewhere on land already designated for employment use. This needs to be changed.

10. Directly related evidence of this is to be found in the CBC's repeated unwillingness to specify what uses can be located on the CBC and what cannot. CBC says that not every life science land use can legitimately claim location on the CBC, but despite our urging, the CBC has failed so far to make this clear in precise written criteria. Instead, the case for co-location of diffuse activities is asserted with little convincing evidence to support it – or to justify its implications in terms of land requirement. Indeed, Vision 2050 itself is confused in the case it makes for the importance of “chance encounters” in life science discovery – arguing at one point that location in Cambridge is important for this, not location on the CBC per se: “The city offers the quality of life... the accessible social spaces where chance encounters can take place...” [“Our Vision for CBC: A Summary, page 10] If it is location in Cambridge which is critical, why then the obsession with co-location with the CBC?
11. The consequences of the “broadening of the CBC’s offer” are also evident in estimates of demand submitted by the CBC in support of its proposed Spatial Framework to the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service (GCSP). These assert -

“Based on the evidenced take up at CBC, it is clear that the Campus creates its own unique demand and it will also attract a percentage of space demanded across the wider city region.

Over the next 2 years, because of interest in Discovery Drive 1000, Knight Frank have forecast the CBC will attract *30% of all Cambridge demand*, thereafter, it is conservatively forecast that CBC take up will taper to 20% and, in 10 years’ time, a conservative forecast would see CBC attracting 15% of all take up. Due to the unique occupier mix on the CBC take up is expected to be predominantly from commercial research organisations. However, with science and technology converging, take up could be more blended and comprise laboratory and office accommodation with an innovation focus. Using take up forecasts from Knight Frank, the CBC could attract commercial occupier take up, on average, of 290,000 sq ft per annum every year over the next 10 years. Thereafter average annual commercial take up of 250,000 sq. ft per annum is forecast.” (our emphasis)

[Knight Frank. CBC: Demand and Deliverability 2022 – 2050. November 2022, 7.2 Forecast Demand]

12. It will be noted that this forecast goes way beyond even the unprovenanced estimates in Vision 2050 – way beyond the doubling of the workforce Vision 2050 estimates. The passage highlighted in the extract from Vision 2050 quoted above, helps to explain why: “... it is clear that the Campus creates its own unique demand *and* it will also attract a percentage of space demanded across the wider city region.” This is clear evidence of the prime purpose of the CBC having changed. If this broadening of purpose was to be accepted, which we argue strongly it should not, “the hospitals campus” of Vision 2020 would be no more. This should be rejected.

13. At the same time, the CBC silently rejects the alternative locations that do exist on its doorstep, or not that far away, by refusing to contemplate or even respond to the precise locations that have been drawn to its attention many times. There are suitable sites already designated or envisaged for development which the CBC appears unwilling to assess – sites drawn to its attention not only by us² but also by the two Local Plan authorities.³
14. This is unacceptable when the cost of not assessing them in favour of unjustified immediate co-location includes “Very High Harm”⁴ to the Greater Cambridge Green Belt and the separation it achieves between Cambridge and its necklace of villages – a separation essential to the “special character of the city” and “the quality of life and place enjoyed here”, according to successive Local Plans.⁵
15. The unwillingness to specify uses, meagre evidence for co-location and unwillingness to assess other reasonable options is addressed more fully in the community organizations independent submission to the GCSP on the CBC’s proposed Spatial Framework, “Where we do not and do agree with CBC – summary”, December 2022. Paragraphs 4 to 10 of the submission, which also cover demand, are reproduced in *Annex B*. (For “demand”, see later section of this assessment report, “Need for Vision 2050 – Has it been demonstrated?”)
16. Vision 2050 also infers that there will be positive spillover from increased life sciences investment in proximity to NHS hospitals. The only evidence given in support of such effects is a small number of case studies. One of these – relating to CMR Surgical - is misleading. [Page 25] This company’s product was not developed at CBC and the CUH NHS Trust was not involved in its development. Such misrepresentations should be removed, and more robust evidence presented, if it exists.

² Trumpington Residents’ Association. Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals, Cambridge Biomedical Campus – Policy S/CBC, Note & Comment, March 2022, Part Two in particular. Copy available on request to TRA: admin@trumpingtonresidentsassociation.org

³ Local Plan First Proposals Development Topic Strategy Paper, September 2021, page 132; and Greater Cambridge Employment Land and Economic Development Evidence Study, Appendix H, Summary of Land Availability in Greater Cambridge, November 2020, page 177 et seq

⁴ “Very High Harm” to the Green Belt is the official classification of risk if the 19 hectares were to be released for development as proposed by the CBC – as classified in: Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Final Report, August 2021, Land Use Consultants for Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council.

⁵ In the current Local Plan, Cambridge City Local Plan 2018, pages 28 & 39.

What happened to Vision 2020?

17. Has this change in the CBC's purpose - this "broadening (of) its offer" - happened because the aims of Vision 2020 have been achieved? No – it has not.
18. The "Strategic Case" in Vision 2020 prioritized development of hospital and healthcare services –

"Need (extracts)

Addenbrooke's is both the local hospital for Cambridge and the surrounding area and a provider of specialised services to the Eastern Region and beyond. The hospital needs to grow to meet increasing demand for both local and regional services

- A growing population... 100,000 extra people... to 2016
- An ageing population... placing more demand on hospital services.
- Reducing waiting lists...
- Higher expectations. Patients rightly expect hospital buildings to be of a higher standard than in the past. Many of the buildings on the existing hospital campus are now over 40 years old... Modernisation of wards, clinics and operating theatres will often require further expansion of the hospital to meet current standards.
- Centralisation of specialised services. These include services for patients with rare diseases and those requiring special expertise...
- Cardiothoracic services. Papworth Hospital... it is considered that in the long-term interest of patient care, research and education in its specialist areas of medicine the preferred strategy for the... (Hospital) is a move to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus" [Page 7]

19. The Vision 2020 Strategic Case also notes that "The Addenbrooke's Hills Road site presents an exceptional opportunity to develop a centre of *excellence in clinical treatment, education and research* that would be unmatched in the UK." (our emphasis) But this clinical excellence is predicated on rectifying "Current capacity shortfalls in the local NHS" [Pages 8 & 9]
20. Achievement of the "Need" priorities quoted above is at best mixed. Apart from the move of Royal Papworth Hospital to the CBC, development of the Addenbrooke's Treatment Centre and expansion of the Rosie Hospital, which are significant achievements, few of these objectives have been fully achieved. Certainly, the first four have not; in fact, they have fallen further behind due in significant part to the very jobs and population growth Vision 2050 seeks to continue in greater volume and at greater pace, exacerbating these major deficiencies. This cannot be right.
21. Capacity at Addenbrooke's Hospital continues to be stretched despite valiant efforts made to provide clinical accommodation in re-purposed temporary buildings originally intended to meet needs arising from the Covid pandemic. Many of the buildings on the existing hospital campus are now over 60 rather than over 40 years

old, and the CUH NHS Trust, including Addenbrooke's Hospital, has a maintenance backlog for the year to 31 March 2023 of £125 million, 50 per cent of which is high risk and a further 19 per cent significant risk. The extensive refurbishment and renewal needed by Addenbrooke's Hospital is not in any funding programme. This includes the rebuild of the acute hospital for which land has been reserved since 2008. Surgeons / clinicians operating "at the edge of life" are being expected to work with facilities that are at or near the end of theirs.

22. The proposed new specialist cancer research hospital is reliant on the fragile vehicle of the New Hospitals Programme (NHP) scathingly criticized by the National Audit Office and Public Accounts Committee⁶. This hospital is in the funded cohort 2 of the NHP, and its Outline Business Case has been approved. However, approval of its Full Business Case now appears to depend on approval of the Business Case for the whole NHP, as is the release of a further £18.5 million announced by the Secretary of State as "expected" in May 2023. Given the reality that even this larger sum will still not be enough to fund the proposed NHP, and the pressing need to rebuild seven "wholly RAAC" hospitals (see next paragraph), some further re-prioritization of the Programme is to be expected. No scheme awaiting final approval can thus be said to be certain to proceed. As for the proposed regional children's hospital, despite the Eastern Region being the only region without a dedicated children's hospital providing a comprehensive range of specialist services to the region, this much needed hospital is not even in the NHP. Even if it was to receive the expected level of central funding, despite the high level of fundraising achieved, a significant funding gap would remain. Vision 2050 claims that "... soon building will commence on a new cancer hospital and a new children's hospital on site... providing further opportunities for teaching, research and innovation." We are not so confident.
23. In this context, it is astonishing that Vision 2050 makes no substantive reference to progress on the objectives of Vision 2020. Surely, this is the right place to start a "refresh." [Page 30] It is essential that Vision 2050 is revised thoroughly to start from the basics of hospital / health clinical treatment, education and research for Greater Cambridge and the wider region. Major deficiencies existed in 2004 when Vision 2020 was updated for the third time. Many are greater now, and we are particularly concerned at the critical shortage of capital funding to improve Addenbrooke's Hospital and secure the regional children's hospital. The NHP did not feature in the Autumn Statement and the major problem of reinforced autoclaved aerated concrete (RAAC) in hospital buildings referred to in the previous paragraph, is a threat to the funding of hospitals which are in the NHP let alone those that are not.⁷ We also share the NHS Trusts considerable concerns about staff capacity, the huge pressures on

⁶ <https://www.nao.org.uk/reports/progress-with-the-new-hospital-programme/>
<https://committees.parliament.uk/committee/127/public-accounts-committee/news/198486/new-hospital-programme-inquiry-finds-no-confidence-government-will-deliver-on-promises/#:~:text=In%20a%20highly%20critical%20report,40%20new%20hospitals%20by%202030.>

⁷ <https://healthmedia.blog.gov.uk/2023/09/01/media-fact-sheet-raac-in-the-nhs/>

staff who are overworked and lack time for research, combined with the costs of living in Greater Cambridge and pressure this exerts on quality of life. Not least the long and expensive journeys to work for those who cannot afford to live nearby or are unwilling to accept the cramped quarters this would require.

24. Vision 2050 should spell out how it is intended to put this worrying situation right – and, in broad terms, where the necessary funding is expected to come from. How, for example, are the NHS Trusts planning to meet rising demand from a growing and ageing population: Vision 2050 does not appear to be informed by a systematic demand and capacity analysis. This is a fundamental issue for the CBC – for “the hospital campus” envisaged in Vision 2020. Yet it is not even recognized in Vision 2050 which asserts “We are home to state-of-the-art research hospitals.” [Page 7] A review of Vision 2050 is essential to put this right.
25. This chronic lack of investment in the CBC’s clinical infrastructure is a direct threat to its directly related life science aspirations, a threat which is growing not receding. In their recent report “A New National Purpose: Innovation Can Power the Future of Britain”⁸, Tony Blair and William Hague sounded some important warnings about the UK’s life sciences industry:

“... despite strong foundations our overall performance across the (biotech) sector continues to fall as international competition hots up. Unfortunately, the key markers of success are now pointing in the wrong direction. For example, we are seeing ... (a) marked decline across all phases of clinical research... Despite these worrying signs, the government and the NHS do not sufficiently recognize the risks... [Pages 12-23]

Our own life sciences industry did not happen by chance, but by a concerted national strategy of anchoring investment in research organisations such as the Laboratory for Molecular Biology backed by the capabilities of an integrated health care system.” [Page 18]

26. With its lack of a proper assessment of whether Vision 2020’s priorities have been achieved, Vision 2050 fails to recognize the imperative of excellence in clinical infrastructure in practical terms as against the complacent words it uses (quoted above in paragraph 24). In crumbling, outdated buildings which have deteriorated not improved during the period of Vision 2020, and with minimal prospects of the major investment that is needed in the CBC’s “beating heart” hospitals, the CBC is trying to erect a world class life science superstructure without benefit of sound healthcare excellence foundations. The necessary review of Vision 2050 must have this issue in the centre of its sights. It cannot afford to draw a veil over it as the current document does.

⁸ <https://www.institute.global/insights/politics-and-governance/new-national-purpose-innovation-can-power-future-britain>

27. In this context, it is important to ask and answer the question why hasn't the growth of the CBC met these basic objectives. Why hasn't sufficient value been transferred from CBC development to fund these major needs? These are fair questions, after all. Is it because "development gain" within the planning legislation does not provide anywhere near the level of resources that is necessary, and other means of "value transfer" from landowners and developers have not been secured? We think it is – adding as it does to chronic government under-investment. As a result, our hospital services languish under the growing demands of a rapidly growing and ageing population, and investment for cutting edge clinical research and practice development lags behind. Yet we are asked by Vision 2050 to overlook this adverse situation – to further aggravate it by "broadening its (CBC's) offer" so that it moves from being the "hospital campus" to a global life sciences "innovation district." [Page 35] This fatal flaw in Vision 2050 needs to be addressed in the fundamental revision that is necessary.
28. Why also have so many other objectives of Vision 2020 and its associated planning permissions not been met? What has stopped CBC organizations achieving them? For instance:

Vision 2020 – "a strategy for improving the quality of the existing environment and landscaping" (page 13); "provision of a new campus hub, including retail, food and meeting facilities" (23); "safe and convenient pedestrian and cycling routes" (27).

06/0796/OUT planning permission – "Circus and Piazza areas to enable them to function as a strategic area of public realm"; "Transport: Boulevard"; an "Amenity Space Strategy" including "informal landscaped open space"; and a "Public Realm Design Strategy" [Decision Letter 15.10.2009]

None of these have been achieved. Why not, are they still needed and, if so, how can they be achieved? These are the very questions Vision 2050 should ask to inform the CBC's future - but does not.

29. While it might be argued that these are now being catered for in the CBC's proposed Spatial Framework, this is predicated on 19 hectares of "expansion" land being allocated for development in the Local Plan at the cost of "Very High Harm" to the Green Belt. This cannot be assumed. So, where is Plan B to meet this long unmet need which was supposed to be delivered by Vision 2020? There is no Plan B – and Vision 2050, which should make provision for it, does not. Yet again Vision 2050 is found wanting.

Need for Vision 2050 – Has it been demonstrated?

NOTE: The directly related issues of "broadening of the CBC's offer", land uses appropriate for the CBC, co-location and other reasonable options are addressed

above in the section “What is the Cambridge Biomedical Campus?” (paragraph 4), which should be read together with this section that focuses on lack of provenance.

30. If, for a moment, Vision 2050 were to be taken at face value, has the need for it been demonstrated? Again, the short answer is “No”.
31. Vision 2050 tells us that a “conservative estimate” of the projected need is –
- “... an annual average need from R&D focused businesses (note the broad specification) would require a development pipeline of between 100,000 and 150,000 sq ft GIA (gross internal area) per annum. This would support only those companies with a need to be within the South Cambridge life sciences cluster and, in particular, CBC assets. Over the next twenty years, this would equate to an additional workforce of between 14,000 and 20,000 – approximately double the staff presently working on the campus.” [Page 35]
32. Clearly, this is a very important estimate given the role Vision 2050 plays in the CBC’s “pitch” to Government and in the promotional efforts of others such as the East West Railway Company Limited (EWR). Yet it is without provenance. Questions to the CBC have established that it does not know what the origin of these figures is. It is possible that they are taken from the supporting documents to the “Cambridge South” development, the bid to the Local Plan Call for Sites for a huge development south of the CBC, east and west of Cambridge Road made on behalf of four major landowners (Jesus College, St John’s College, Cambridgeshire County Council, and a private family trust) – but the provenance of the projection informing that bid is not known by CBC Ltd. [See exchange of correspondence reproduced in *Annex C*] It should be unacceptable to the CBC that a projection of need of this importance whose origin is not known continues to be a central tenet of the CBC’s Vision 2050. It is certainly not acceptable to us.
33. The strategic weakness of Vision 2050’s estimate of need / demand is addressed more fully in the community organizations independent submission to the GCSP on the CBC’s proposed Spatial Framework, “Where we do not and do agree with CBC – summary”, December 2022. Paragraphs 4 to 10 of the submission are reproduced in *Annex B* of this document.
34. The CBC may point to the estimates of demand presented to the GCSP as part of the proposed Spatial Framework for its existing site and proposed further extension into the Green Belt as part of the new Local Plan. [Knight Frank. CBC Demand and deliverability 2022-2050. Prepared on behalf of CBC Ltd., November 2022] These estimates are based on the inappropriately broadened definition of the CBC’s uses which is not informed by specific criteria for what can and cannot be located on the CBC, and is, therefore, not valid in our view. Much of the development could be located elsewhere on designated employment land – it does not need to be on the CBC.

35. For these reasons, the need for yet more land to be taken at the cost of “Very High Harm” to the Green Belt for another extension of the CBC has not been demonstrated. It should be revisited by the CBC using specific criteria directly relevant to the CBC’s central purpose of excellence in clinical treatment, education and research - which have been tested in public consultation.

The proposed development

36. We struggle to understand the physical development that is proposed in Vision 2050. It is variously described as –
- a. “A 20 minute neighbourhood” [page 7]
 - b. “A fully functioning urban extension to Cambridge” [page 7]
 - c. An “innovation district” [page 20]
 - d. “the anchor of the South Cambridge life sciences cluster” [page 26]
 - e. A “balanced peri-urban quarter” [page 30]
 - f. “New homes, affordable homes” [page 35]
37. No explanation is given of what CBC means by a “20 minute neighbourhood”. If it is taken to mean “the idea that people can meet their essential needs within a 20-minute walk” (see Living Streets⁹, for example), this is clearly not applicable to the CBC. It is inconceivable that an area with a 40,000 workforce by 2050 could house itself within a 20 minute walk of their CBC jobs. In any event, many will wish to support their life/work balance with some physical separation between the two.
38. This would also be considerably more than an “urban extension to Cambridge”. It would not be a mere extension of the city edge. It would obliterate the gap between the current city edge and Great Shelford that has been regarded as essential to the “special character” of the “historic city” of Cambridge in successive Local Plans. [See section below, The Green Belt and Vision 2050, paragraph 52 et seq, for these references] It would also considerably reduce the essential gap with other settlements in Cambridge’s “necklace of villages” such as Little Shelford, Hauxton and Harston.
39. It should be remembered that this edge of Cambridge City has already been greatly extended into the Green Belt by the now nearly complete “Southern Fringe” developments of Clay Farm, Glebe Farm and Trumpington Meadows in Trumpington comprising 3,622 dwellings, and Ninewells in Queen Edith’s (270 dwellings). Smaller incursions further eroding the Green Belt have also occurred, for example at Newbury Farm (230 dwellings) and Netherhall Farm (200 houses). An even bigger “urban extension” on top of this would distend the city, damaging the very quality of life the historic city of Cambridge affords. A quality which Vision 2050 says it values

⁹ <https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/media/8794/20-minute-neighbourhoods.pdf>

but would undermine: “The city offers the quality of life... a beautiful city with a small town feel...” [Our Vision for CBC: A Summary, pages 10 & 17]

40. The concept of a “balanced peri-urban quarter” is unclear. Wikipedia’s definition is that –

“Peri-urbanisation relates to those processes of dispersive urban growth that create hybrid landscapes of fragmented urban and rural characteristics.”

Its origin is “... to describe spaces between the city and countryside that are shaped by the urbanisation of former rural areas in the urban fringe...”

41. In other words, areas which are neither one thing nor the other but a “fragmented” mix of the two. Is this something to be aspired to? We think not. A clear distinction between the two is desirable, not least to avoid the “Very High Harm” to our Green Belt it would inflict including the environmental damage of habitat fragmentation.
42. As for “affordable homes”, it is not made clear how it is intended to achieve this for a significant proportion of the CBC’s sizeable workforce. It is also difficult to see how it could be achieved given the rate of jobs growth Cambridge is experiencing and its associated very high housing costs. A modern form of “industrial village” with subsidized rents seems unlikely, and sufficient land would not be allocated for this within the Local Plan even if it was the intention. (See also the next section which gives the Local Plan councils’ reasons for rejecting the “Cambridge South” development, including reasons for rejecting the substantial amount of housing proposed).
43. The high skill jobs being created in Greater Cambridge draw people into our area from elsewhere thus increasing the overall demand for housing, with supply struggling to keep pace despite increased housebuilding. This maintains or increases housing costs – it certainly does not make them “affordable”. Unless the rate of jobs growth is reduced or reversed, it is difficult to see how housing is to be made more “affordable”. The opposite is probable – with all its adverse consequences particularly for those on median and lower incomes. Vision 2050 offers no relief in this regard – rather the opposite with its avowed commitment to increase the rate of jobs growth substantially, and by the same token increase the real cost of housing.
44. The physical development proposed by the CBC In Vision 2050 is not coherent. It does not stand up to scrutiny and requires fundamental revision.

Is Vision 2050 the same as the “Cambridge South” development?

45. The unprovenanced estimates of need / demand, and the physical development proposed in Vision 2050 to the extent that it can be discerned, appear to be synonymous with the mega “Cambridge South” development proposed by the landowners to the Local Plan Call for Sites - and rejected subsequently by the two local planning authorities in the Greater Cambridge “Local Plan First Proposals”. This

is confirmed in the CBC’s letter of support¹⁰ for the Cambridge South development dated 19 April 2021. The letter states:

“We, the institutions comprising the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC), are delighted to write in support of the Cambridge South proposal submitted to Greater Cambridge Shared Planning. Unlocking the possibility for CBC to host important new healthcare, research, education and commercial facilities, as well as appropriate and sustainable housing and community development, is of fundamental importance to us. These proposals also provide the opportunity to offer the amenity and other support that the campus has not yet been able to provide, with work being done to align with development of the existing campus.

CBC was initially launched by the 2020 Vision and has met many of the objectives set out in that document, some better than others, but with the arrival of 2020 it was time to take stock of CBC’s progress and its future opportunities. To do this, the CBC has worked collectively to carefully assess the future of Life Sciences and healthcare and how Cambridge and CBC can secure both global leadership and ensure local relevance. This work has informed our Vision 2050, which is appended to the proposal...

We think our Vision 2050 addresses that conceptually, but the Cambridge South submission you have before you does so practically.” (Our emphasis)

46. This clearly indicates that CBC’s Vision 2050 and the “Cambridge South” development are one and the same. The letter of support’s signatories are now the members of CBC Ltd – together with Astra Zeneca which was not a signatory. As an aside, the quoted passage also claims that CBC “has met many of the objectives set out in” Vision 2020. As has been shown, this is not accurate.

47. According to the Local Plan First Proposals “Development Strategy Topic Paper”¹¹ (September 2021), the “Cambridge South” development would comprise:

“Two areas: Land immediately south of the CBC (with a development area of 73 hectares), and land between the M11, the A1301 south of Trumpington (with a development area of 95.6 hectares)
405,000 sq m of employment floorspace...
5,000 homes

¹⁰ Letter of support for the Cambridge South Development dated 19 April 2021 signed by the then Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge on behalf of the University, Cambridge University Health Partners, CUH NHS Trust, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust, Royal Papworth NHS Foundation Trust and Abcam PLC

¹¹ https://consultations.greatercambridgeplanning.org/sites/gcp/files/2021-11/TPStrategyAug21v3Nov21_0.pdf

20,900 sq m of hotel and conference space
17,200 sq m of Community uses
35 hectares of formal and informal green space embedded in wider green belt enhancements
The homes would be primarily on the land between the M11, and the A1301 south of Trumpington”
[Page 129]

48. To all intents and purposes this huge 169 hectare proposed development would be the “peri-urban quarter” Vision 2050 envisages. It would stretch from the A1307 Babraham Road in the east to the M11/A1309/River Cam in the west, and towards Hinton Way and the London King’s Cross railway line / Great Shelford in the south. This is no mere “urban extension”. It would obliterate the Greater Cambridge Green Belt between Cambridge and Great Shelford and surround the fragile Nine Wells chalk springs. No amount of “formal and informal green space” would offset the adverse effect of this. It would require significant community infrastructure including probably two primary and one secondary school – to which no funding commitment is made. Given the sheer size of what is proposed, it is surprising to say the least that Vision 2050 asserts, “CBC has a unique opportunity to accommodate more growth, *while limiting the impact such growth can have on nearby communities.*” (our emphasis) [Page 34] This is simply not true.

49. The Cambridge South development has been rejected by the Local Plan authorities for various reasons including –

”significant parts of the (existing CBC) site are still under construction or development has not yet commenced...
Large areas of the Campus... have yet to be built...
The rate of development on the Campus over the last 13 years ... would indicate a 21.8 year supply based on the available land...
It is important that the site is not considered in isolation from the operation of the life sciences cluster in the Greater Cambridge area. The Greater Cambridge Employment Land Review (2020) indicates a strong supply of land for development including for research and development...
Firms across a range of high technology research and development sectors are located in many locations across the Cambridge area...
Given the overall supply of employment land available, it is not considered that the case for release in this location can be made on the overall land supply...
Given the national importance of the site, it is considered there may be a case for Green Belt release in this location. However, the Councils do not consider that there is sufficient evidence of need to release land for the scale of development put forward in the promoter’s Cambridge South proposal...
In terms of need for residential development, the First Proposals consultation sets out a proposed development strategy which would respond to the residential needs identified to 2041 and beyond... Areas committed and

planned for development will have good access to the Campus by means other than the car. This includes the development proposed at North East Cambridge and Cambridge East.

It is not considered that there is a need to release the land for development put forward in the Cambridge South proposal, as it is possible to achieve sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt...

The Greater Cambridge Green Belt Study (2021) identifies that release of both areas identified in the Cambridge South proposal would result in very high harm to Green Belt purposes.”

[Local Plan First Proposals Development Strategy Topic Paper, September 2021, pages 130 – 133]

50. So, in addition to the need / demand for Vision 2050 being invalid for the reasons we have given, its physical realization has also been comprehensively rejected on multiple grounds in the Local Plan process. As, clearly, little reliance can be placed upon it, surely fundamental revision and replacement of Vision 2050 is necessary. We so recommend.
51. Unfortunately, we hear that several CBC landowners are not willing to accept the democratic decision made by the two Local Plan authorities and may be lobbying “Cambridge 2040” ministers and the Head of the “Cambridge Delivery Group” to get the “Cambridge South” development back on the rails, with the heavy lifting to be done by a new “development corporation” accountable to Government bypassing the local democratic process. If true, this would be highly regrettable given the lack of any substantial case for the “Cambridge South” development. (The Secretary of State’s speech last December adds weight – and concern - to what we have heard.¹²)

The Green Belt and Vision 2050

52. Given the scale of the incursion envisaged, it is truly remarkable that the Green Belt and the “Very High Harm” Vision 2050 would cause it, is not assessed in the document. Indeed, *the Green Belt is not mentioned once* – as if it was a thing of no importance. Elsewhere we have described this unspoken CBC attitude to the Green Belt as one of “indifference”.
53. Significant amounts of land have already been taken out of the Green Belt for the CBC’s development – 77 hectares to date. It is imperative that further incursions are prevented to guarantee for future generations all the “re-creational” opportunities in the widest sense the Green Belt affords – and to ensure that the essential character of Cambridge is not despoiled by the internally incoherent “peri-urban quarter” which Vision 2050 advocates for the CBC. [See the two preceding sections] The Green Belt next to the CBC includes the fragile Nine Wells chalk springs (see Water Supply constraint below) which is part of the Hobson’s Brook/Vicar’s Brook green

¹² <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/falling-back-in-love-with-the-future>

corridor into the heart of Cambridge.¹³ Hobson’s Park which is also part of this Green Belt corridor has already suffered “significant harm” from the construction of Cambridge South Station, the primary purpose of which is to serve the CBC as currently approved in the Local Plan. [Secretary of State’s Transport & Works Act Order Decision Letter, 22 December 2022, paragraph 85]

54. The CBC in its forward vision needs to show respect for the Green Belt and its purposes - as demanded by The National Planning Policy Framework which “sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these should be applied”:

“13. Protecting Green Belt land

137. The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

138. Green Belt serves 5 purposes:

- (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- (c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- (d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns;
- and
- (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.”

[Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, National Planning Policy Framework, 2021, pages 4 & 41]

55. Four of these five purposes – (b) to (e) - are directly relevant to the CBC’s forward plans, and should be given due weight in those plans by the CBC rather than ignored as at present. Vision 2050 fails in this key regard and should be reconsidered and revised to put this right.

56. The replacement for Vision 2050 should also be guided by the provisions of the current Local Plan which it ignores at present:

“The Green Belt preserves the unique setting and special character of the city and includes green corridors that penetrate deep into the urban and historic heart of Cambridge. It is a key component in providing for active and passive sport and recreation, for amenity and biodiversity...The Green Belt is one of

¹³ See Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment, 2003, section 3.1.5, page 41
<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/media/5751/cambridge-landscape-character-assessment-2003.pdf>

the key elements that contribute to the symbiotic relationship between high quality of life, place and economic success of Cambridge...

Significant land was taken out of the Cambridge Green Belt in the 2006 Local Plan... the remaining areas of Green Belt have increased in value as they are now closer to the city's edge and less Green Belt land remains to perform the unique roles played by the Cambridge Green Belt...

... Growth should be targeted towards sustainable and less landscape sensitive locations as a part of the overall strategy, which should be seen as a whole across both Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire." [Cambridge Local Plan 2018, paragraphs 2.51, 2.53, 2.54 & 2.55]

57. Support for retention of the Green Belt is not "nimbyism." In significant part, it is recognition that life is not lived by bread alone. It is insupportable that the CBC's current forward vision ignores the Green Belt and its green corridors. This must be changed.

Constraints on development

58. Constraints do not feature in Vision 2050 which reads more like a bid / promotional document than a serious forward plan. Important constraints do exist. They cannot be wished away or ignored, and should be addressed explicitly in a replacement for Vision 2050. Three of these constraints are addressed briefly in the sections that follow.

Water Supply

59. It is now widely understood that Greater Cambridge does not have sufficient drinking water for its existing population, let alone for the increased population contemplated by Cambridge City and South Cambridge District Council's 2018 adopted Local Plans or the First Proposals. This point is acknowledged in the First Proposals (Policy CC/WE "why is this policy needed?"), which is supported by a detailed Greater Cambridge Integrated Water Management Study (November 2020) and supplement (August 2021).
60. Cambridgeshire County Council's website is more explicit about why this –

"... holistic water management is essential to ensure efficient and long-lasting mechanisms are put in place. One example is the management of chalk rivers and streams, recognised as a priory habitat under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. While England's chalk rivers are ecologically important, they also have very high cultural and economic value leading them to have many demands placed on them from abstraction, irrigation, fisheries management, energy provision and navigation... In Cambridgeshire, the Council, water companies, the Environment Agency and communities are seeking ways to best manage

the cumulative impacts of groundwater abstractions on flows in chalk streams under low flow stress, to supply a growing Greater Cambridge area with drinking water.”

CBC’s fragile neighbour, Nine Wells, is an important part of this network.

61. The Environment Agency has intervened in individual planning applications due to its concern on this critical issue, including applications for housing development such as the 3,500 approx. houses proposed at Bourn Airfield, a key site for housing development in the current South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan. A letter dated 16 December 2022 to the Head of GCSP makes clear that until Cambridge Water satisfies the Agency otherwise, it may be necessary to restrict development to ensure water supply to “support the existing population and new developments that are already being implemented (built-out and occupied).” The letter makes the critical point that –

“Cambridge Water is a single resource zone with multiple abstraction points, so it’s not easy to link a particular development to a single abstraction point. Any abstraction borehole in the zone could supply a development in Greater Cambridge. Therefore, any growth above the capped limits within Cambridge Water supply zone could be linked to risking deterioration of WFD (Water Framework Directive) waterbodies...

The impact of Bourn Airfield must be considered in combination with all the other developments that Cambridge Water are being asked to supply over the same time period.”

This application validated in September 2018, is still “awaiting decision.”

62. Subsequently, in March 2023, the Environment Agency issued a “Greater Cambridge external guidance note for planning applications”.¹⁴ This -

“provides advice for major planning applications which are accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) under the 2017 Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, including those which have been submitted and are in the process of being determined. The advice focuses on water resources and potential impacts on water bodies in the area... The Environment Agency has evidence that water bodies in the Greater Cambridge (GC) area are being affected by the abstraction of groundwater which is needed to supply existing homes, business and agriculture. We have conducted investigations that identified a number of water bodies have flows that are failing to meet their ecological flow targets due to abstraction. Further assessment concluded that the ecology was sensitive to flow and abstraction in some water bodies, for example the River Granta and River Cam. There is also wider evidence of abstraction pressure on Chalk streams,

¹⁴ <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/media/23730/cd1303-ea-appendix-2-gcp-draft-briefing-note.pdf>

river headwaters and spring flows, groundwater dependent wetlands and reduced resilience to dry weather and drought events. There is a risk of compounding these abstraction pressures and potentially ecological deterioration if abstraction increases. Action is needed to prevent environmental deterioration occurring by ensuring abstraction does not increase.”

63. The guidance note goes on to explain that –

“Abstraction licence reductions will mean that there is less water available than that reflected in the [Water Resources Management Plan 2019] WRMP19 for Cambridge Water Company (CWC). *Consequently, some of the growth included in the adopted 2018 Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire local plans based on WRMP19 may be reliant on unsustainable sources of water, because the water used for growth risks causing environmental harm.* CWC draft WRMP24 was published for consultation on 24 February 2023. Our review of the draft WRMP24 will allow us to assess if the required changes to licences have been included and sufficient water supplies are available for growth and the environment. The assessment of cumulative impacts required for projects falling within the EIA regime should consider the impact on water resources for this development combined with other development coming forward at the same time...It is likely we will object to current and future planning applications for major development accompanied by an Environmental Statement unless the applicant has undertaken this assessment and demonstrated the risks can be mitigated or removed.” (Our emphasis)

64. This guidance note remains current. A letter from the Environment Agency dated 21 November 2023 to GCSP objected to the outline planning application for the Beehive Centre.¹⁵ The letter of objection shows that the Environment Agency’s concerns have not been met by Cambridge Water Company’s draft WRMP24. It states “The Environment Agency will maintain its objection until we have sufficient confidence in CWCs ability to sustainably supply growth without an unacceptable risk of deterioration of water bodies, or the applicant demonstrates that the risks can be mitigated or removed.”

65. CUH NHS Trust’s own recent experience emphasizes the importance of this issue. On 13 July 2023, GCSP wrote in relation to the planning application for the Cancer Research Hospital requiring an Environment Impact Assessment “... in the light of the potable water supply issue.” Prior to receipt of the Environment Agency’s letter, the Shared Planning Service had not thought it necessary to require an EIA. The Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities gave a supporting screening

¹⁵ https://applications.greatercambridgeplanning.org/online-applications/files/8C643449105FE10FAD209242FECE72E0/pdf/23_03204_OUT-ENVIRONMENT_AGENCY_UPDATED_RESPONSE_-6319823.pdf

direction on 19 October 2023. The planning application has not been determined as at the date of this report.

66. Vision 2050 must be updated to address this fundamental issue. We are aware that the Spatial Framework includes a “Utilities Strategy Option Paper” dated 29 November 2022. The section on water supply is not adequate and pre-dates the Environment Agency’s March 2023 guidance referred to above (paragraphs 59 to 61).

The Environment

67. Although Vision 2050 talks about “Growing sustainably” (page 34), by this is meant market viability not environmental sustainability. Surprisingly, the document does not address the key environmental issues inevitably raised by development of the sheer scale envisaged in Vision 2050, and even more so in the demand and deliverability assessment carried out for the CBC’s proposed Spatial Framework. (See paragraph 11 above) This is not acceptable and must be addressed. In addition to the strategic issue of water supply covered in the preceding section, key issues of biodiversity, flood risk, waste water and climate change in the local context need to be addressed. It is not enough to say, as the CBC does, that Vision 2050 is the concept and the Spatial Framework is the delivery, the concept should be fully informed by its environmental implications before not after it is decided. This on its own requires thoroughgoing review and replacement of Vision 2050, let alone all the other issues that Vision 2050 does not address or does not address adequately.
68. The adverse environmental impact of the CBC’s development plans should not be underestimated. A current indication of this is the impact of the construction of Cambridge South Station on Hobson’s Park; the prime purpose of the station is to support the CBC’s travel needs. The biodiversity net gain assessment accompanying a planning application to discharge the hard and soft landscape condition estimates that the station’s construction will reduce the biodiversity of the area concerned by 25 per cent.¹⁶ The bulk of this is occurring in Hobson’s Park. That it is proposed to offset this with an “offsite” biodiversity gain 6.5 kilometres away from the Park is of little comfort to local residents who took at face value the Clay Farm Green Corridor mitigation of the major housing development which the station’s construction undermines. The necessary review of Vision 2050 should include a thorough outline Environmental Impact Assessment.¹⁷

¹⁶ https://applications.greatercambridgeplanning.org/online-applications/files/FAB8225406EAD007DC7318FC2B564976/pdf/21_02957_COND29A-BIODIVERSITY_NET_GAIN_ASSESSMENT-6341315.pdf

¹⁷ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/environmental-impact-assessment>

Transport

69. While the CBC accepts some responsibility for its employees' mode of travel, it is notable that Vision 2050 appears to regard the public transport provision which inevitably arises from its forward vision as a "free good" – as something which will be provided free of charge to the CBC other than through comparatively minor planning gain sums. [For example, "Growing sustainably, Transport & accessibility" on page 34] And this in an area where transport infrastructure has not been able to keep pace with the rate of growth, and often struggles in consequence. Business Rate income is of course relevant but it helps to fund many other public costs, including other local authority services funded in part from the 50 per cent of its income retained locally.

70. This reliance on the public purse has been brought into sharp relief recently by the Greater Cambridge Partnership which due to increasing construction costs, no longer has sufficient City Deal funding for a critical CBC transport link, Cambridge South East Transport (CSET), which has had to be "paused". The CBC's reliance on delivery of this project is explicit in Vision 2050:

"CBC already benefits from access to the Cambridge Guided Bus network and will soon be able to enjoy increased connectivity as that network is extended south" (by CSET) [Page 34]

This reliance is also evident in the "Movement and Transport Strategy" which forms part of the CBC Spatial Framework proposed to GCSP.¹⁸

71. This highlights the underlying need for the CBC – and others seeking development – to meet more of the transport cost of the development it seeks through, for example, land value transfer. In our view this should be addressed in the CBC's forward vision itself. The CBC should not assume that all or most of these costs will be met automatically by the public purse. More of these costs should be met from the value which the development delivers to the CBC developer - a key commitment which Vision 2050 does not - and needs to make. [The TRA and GSPC have different views on how CSET should be delivered but agree that the public transport need it represents should be met.]

72. The scale of development envisaged in Vision 2050 also appears to rely in part on delivery of the central section of East West Rail (EWR):

"The Cambridge South station will provide connections to the city centre, to London and to the East West Railway line (the Varsity Line) to Oxford. CBC is the only location with such a variety and reach of sustainable transport services. CBC has a unique opportunity to accommodate more growth, while limiting the impact such growth can have on nearby communities." [Transport and accessibility, page 34]

¹⁸ KMC Transport Planning, November 2022, "Committed Transport investments", 4.10.11, page 24.

73. Dependence in part on EWR, a project which has yet to produce a convincing business case, entails significant risk which should be acknowledged with a contingency were EWR not to proceed so that its implications for “nearby communities” can be assessed. It is not explained how EWR would “limit the impact” of CBC’s growth on “nearby communities” – an unlikely prospect given the large scale disruption its construction and operation would inflict on the communities through which it would pass. It is also not explained how this connection would be compatible with the proposal for a “20-minute neighbourhood” addressed above in the “Proposed development” section. Clearly, it is not compatible.
74. The fragility of EWR is underlined by the Government’s decision not to proceed with its strategic underpinning, the Oxford to Cambridge Arc regional plan. This means that there is no longer a regional housing plan and EWR is dependent upon local authorities for the housing growth that would be needed to support its weak business case. The significant housing developments which EWR envisages at Tempsford and north of Cambourne are not included in any existing or draft local authority Local Plan. Vision 2050 also placed some reliance on this cancelled regional plan: the “Cambridge Context” section states –
- “... the Oxford-Cambridge Arc prospectus sets out a strategy to build on the worldleading capability of the life sciences ecosystems around Oxford and Cambridge.” [Page 23]
75. Vision 2050 needs to be updated to take account of this significant strategic uncertainty.
76. The continued commitment to EWR in the Chancellor’s Autumn Statement might be a slender support in current circumstances, with another huge public sector austerity package in prospect and a recent National Audit Office investigation report sounding a strong note of caution in its conclusion.¹⁹

Points of significant detail

77. **Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust:** Although not visible to the naked eye, the CBC’s proposed Spatial Framework includes provision for a mental health treatment facility on the Green Belt land potentially allocated in the Local Plan. No explanation has been given of the need this facility would meet or how it would be funded. [Page 64, “healthcare”] Vision 2050 does not provide for this and needs to be updated accordingly.

¹⁹ <https://www.nao.org.uk/reports/investigation-into-the-east-west-rail-project-oxford-cambridge/>

78. **Community Fund:** Vision 2050 includes provision in the “medium term” for a community fund “to support local initiatives.” [Page 33] There is no evidence that this exists or is a firm intention. This needs to be addressed.
79. **Research institutes:** In contrast with the role of research institutes in the CBC’s development to date and the importance attached to them in Vision 2020 - and in the recent report cited above (see footnote 8) - Vision 2050 pays them scant attention. It is not until page 35 that it says –

“To stay competitive in this fast growing global sector, CBC must advocate and plan for more advanced research centres...”

80. However, it neglects to specify which kind of research institutes it prioritizes, nor is there a clear plan to achieve delivery of this generalized aim. This significant gap in Vision 2050 needs to be corrected.

Overall Assessment

81. For all the reasons given above, Vision 2050 is not fit for purpose and needs to be replaced. Its failings are fundamental. It cannot and should not be relied upon by the CBC as its forward vision, nor should it be relied on by Government and other bodies. The deeply adverse effects on its neighbours were it to be taken forward without fundamental change should not be contemplated. Its replacement should bring together the CBC’s forward vision and its proposed Spatial Framework so that the concept is backed up and tested by the reality. Replacement would also afford the CBC the opportunity to consult the public on its future, something which despite our encouragement, the CBC has resisted to date. It is important for its reputation that it does consult the public on a draft replacement and is seen to take account of our views in its final form.

Prepared by David Plank

On behalf of Trumpington Residents’ Association and Great Shelford Parish Council
31 January 2024



A Company Limited by Guarantee. Company Number 6729377. Registered in England.
Registered Office: Trumpington Pavilion, Paget Road, Trumpington, Cambridge CB2 9JF.
www.trumpingtonresidentsassociation.org Contact: David Plank

By Email:
Tony Taylorson
Communications Manager
Cambridge University Health Partners
Cambridge Biomedical Campus

31st May 2021

Dear Tony,

CBC Vision

We feel that the Association has been misled.

When the Campus engaged with us on 22nd April, it was in the context of the Vision Summary, Counter Context's presentation and publicly reported statements that the Campus wished to "grow sensibly" and "sustainably" and its plans represented "modest growth". We were told that the Campus was in discussion with landowners but in response to my question, you were not able to tell us who and what sites were under discussion. We made clear our oft repeated position that while we support the Campus's growth within the currently permitted area of development, we are strongly opposed to further growth beyond that given the harm it would cause the Green Belt, the Hobson's Brook/Vicar's Brook Green Corridor and the vital separation between the city and our necklace of villages which gives Cambridge its "special character" according to the Local Plan.

Little did we know that the full CBC Vision document, which it transpires was available before 22nd April when we met but was embargoed to 7th May, includes proposals, not presented in the Summary, to take another 70 acres¹ out of the Green Belt in addition to the 70 removed with our support in the 2006 Local Plan. Nor did we know that an unannounced

¹¹ Gross Internal Area only excluding external space. Product of “a development pipeline” of 150,000 square feet GIA per annum for research and development focused businesses over the next 20 years. [CBC Vision (full), Projected need, page 35]

bid had been made on 19th April at the Campus’s invitation to the Local Plan “Call for Sites” for development of 400 hectares (988 acres) in Green Belt land stretching towards Great Shelford, between Addenbrooke’s Road, Hauxton Road, Cambridge Road, Babraham Road and the King’s Cross railway line. This bid, made three days before our meeting, for a development almost the same size as Northstowe (490 hectares), is not modest, sensible or sustainable and will be vigorously opposed by the Association. Nor is the case for the proposal substantiated given the fragility of the co-location argument at this mature stage of the cluster’s development and the bid’s failure to respond creatively to the pressing need to share the success of Cambridge’s life sciences development with other more deprived parts of our county and country. This bid has not been shared directly with us and at the date of writing is not available on the CBC Vision web page.

When these developments were reported to our recent Members’ meeting, there was a very negative reaction, the proposal being described as a monstrous “land grab” without justification and with little or no care for the Campus’s neighbours. It is fair to say that members were appalled. This is no knee jerk reaction. The full CBC Vision document has been carefully assessed before making these remarks. On this basis, we see no case whatsoever for the Campus’s proposed “peri-urban quarter”, which accurately describes the “dispersive urban growth” it would represent, destroying vital Green Belt land which we cherish, and replacing it with a “hybrid landscape of fragmented urban and rural characteristics”²⁰.

We ask that this proposal is withdrawn and that engagement with the Campus’s neighbours is reset on a more sensible basis. As you know, the Association is not given to hyperbole. On this rare occasion, we believe its use is justified.

Best wishes

David

For Trumpington Residents’ Association
Copy to: Harriet Knowles, Counter Context

²⁰ CBC Vision (full), page 30; & Wikipedia.

Presentation to Queen Edith’s Community Forum, 30 March 2023 – feedback

From: David Plank

Sent: 12 April 2023 13:00

To: Andy Williams

Cc: ‘Laurel Powers-Freeling’; Kristin-Anne Rutter; Malcolm Watson; Annabel Sykes; Barrie Hunt; Sam Davies

Subject: Presentation to Queen Edith’s Community Forum, 30 March 2023 – feedback

Dear Andy,

Presentation to Queen Edith’s Community Forum, 30 March 2023 – feedback

Good afternoon. I hope you are well.

The recording of your presentation on You Tube has been drawn to our attention, some points in which could be open to misinterpretation. Hence this feedback which also draws on a transcript.

Vision 2050 – consultation

Andy W: “We passed that 2050 Vision around our local communities, our local councillors, most of the feedback was generally positive.”

Feedback: This gives the impression that there was community consultation which there was not – it was a fait accompli. The “Vision Summary” shared with the Association on 22 April 2021 excluded virtually all the information needed to assess Vision 2050, which was embargoed until it was announced publicly as a fact on 7 May. This is evidenced in the *attached TRA letter* sent to Tony Taylorson on 31 May 2021, which gave feedback that was not positive. It is important that CBC Ltd and other parties to Vision 2050 avoid giving the impression that there was community consultation on a full draft of Vision 2050 when there was not and makes clear that there was negative feedback when the full version of Vision 2050 was announced. As far as we are aware, there was also no formal consultation with councillors.

For the record, it should be noted that the representative bodies which participate in the CBC Liaison Group, Great Shelford Parish Council and Trumpington Residents’ Association, do not accept Vision 2050 as the basis for the future of the CBC. (As you know, the other community organization attending meetings of the CBC Liaison Group, Queen Edith’s Community Forum, is not a representative body and is, therefore, not able to adopt a formal position.)

Observer at Board meetings of CBC Ltd

Andy W: "... the main Campus occupants have now formed a new organization called CBC Ltd... to deliver the 2050 Vision. In addition to them, there is a community representative there. The community representative is David Plank from the Trumpington residents, but will rotate over time... David sits in all the meetings, so he can see the challenges we face. How we get to where we want to get to."

"... the Board of CBC Ltd, including the residents' rep..."

Feedback: This is open to misinterpretation by the uninformed listener as essential context is not given. It is not made clear that I attend meetings of CBC Limited's Board, not all CBC meetings, and do so as the community organizations' appointed observer, not as a Board member, and do not have a vote in the Board's decisions. The community organizations' observer can of course participate in the Board's discussions to express community organizations' points of view, which I do, but when it comes to making decisions, the observer does not take part. It is also helpful to make clear that the Board's proceedings are confidential to CBC Limited and its constituent bodies, and the community organizations' observer presence at Board meetings is contingent on our respecting this.

Spatial Framework – community organizations' views

Andy W: "What I would say, and I understand there is reservations, is that when this was presented to the community forum and David Plank his first view was "there no justification for going into the Green Belt, why can't you do it in other ways why haven't you identified the existing site, you can't demonstrate the need for this". What we said when we put our first plans in the 2050 Vision, saying which is what a holistic plan looks like, we put in all those objections at the same time, within the same document. So this is what we think should be done, but the community have told us this."

"And so we are in the interesting position... where on the one hand the campus, CBC Ltd, have a long term plan 2050 Vision have a long term vision including a lot of space and the Board of CBC Ltd, including the residents' rep, who is vehemently opposed to it on behalf of residents."

Feedback: The unwitting impression given is that the community organizations' opposition to the Spatial Framework holistic plan is a "first view" expressed by David Plank, which it is not. It is the carefully considered view of the Trumpington Residents' Association and Great Shelford Parish Council as stated in "CBC Proposed Spatial Framework: Where we do not and do agree with CBC – summary" dated 2 December 2022 (*copy attached*), which has been presented to the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service as a free-standing document within the overall submission on which we are seeking to make our own representations independently to the Head of that Service prior to the next stage in the Local Plan process. It is also the considered view of the Trumpington Residents' Association as stated in the Association's supplementary Local Plan First Proposals submission to the Shared Planning Service, "Cambridge Biomedical Campus – Policy S/CBC, Note & Comment" dated 11 March 2022 (*copy attached*), and of Great Shelford Parish Council as stated in its letter of formal support for the TRA Note & Comment dated 29 April 2022.

Phase 4 land

Andy W: “Let me come backward. CBC Ltd do not own any land and will have no decision on whether the land is allocated in the Local Plan... So we are now in a very strange world where... there is a developer promoting a piece of land that the campus now needs to try and influence so that if it is agreed it will be developed in the right way, so that it becomes an integrated plan within the campus.”

Feedback: This comment will not be understood by most people and is open to misinterpretation. The reality is that no matter who owns the land, phase 4 will not happen unless it has the support of a critical mass within the CBC including the key bodies which are the members of CBC Ltd, viz. “its Members as owners and occupiers of the CBC”. [Certificate of Incorporation] Without this support the Shared Planning Service and the two councils will not include phase 4 in the Local Plan – as is implicit in the Local Plan First Proposals Policy S/CBC. [See in particular “Development Strategy Topic Paper, pages 124-136]

As always, the intention of this feedback is constructive – to avoid misunderstanding where it can be avoided in the knowledge that sometimes it is difficult to avoid.

As the presentation was made in a public forum this feedback is being circulated to those who may need to know it has been given.

Best wishes

David

For Trumpington Residents’ Association & the community organizations

EXTRACTS from “**Where we do not and do agree with CBC – summary**”, December 2022, community organizations’ independent submission to the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service on the CBC’s proposed Spatial Framework

*Need, “need to be there”,
“exceptional circumstances” &
“other reasonable options”*

4. We do not believe that an imperative need has been demonstrated to further extend the CBC at “Very High Harm” to the Greater Cambridge Green Belt²¹ or that the claimed benefits would outweigh the harm it would cause. Therefore, we remain opposed to the proposed extension and its new road link to Granham’s Road.
5. There is not an agreed definition of what uses “need to be located there”²² (on the CBC) at the level of detail necessary to make this judgement. For this reason alone, estimation of demand that needs to be on-site is problematic. We have given the CBC an example of the kind of detailed criteria that are required as adopted by the Wellcome Genome Campus. Nowhere in the updated presentation or in the documents that preceded and followed it, is there a robust definition of need to be on the Campus. This is a fundamental deficiency.
6. We do not believe that “evidenced... exceptional circumstances” which would justify the possible release of land from the Green Belt have been demonstrated, *nor* do we believe that “all other reasonable options” to meet the development needs of the CBC have been assessed.²³ We believe there are other reasonable options and have suggested what these are – suggestions which have not been objectively assessed by the CBC.²⁴

Demand

7. The estimates of demand in Vision 2050 which inform the CBC’s initiative to further extend the Campus are unprovenanced and not reliable. As evidenced in correspondence with the CBC, the estimates derive from the “Cambridge South” bid to the Local Plan Call for Sites. While the CBC has these projections, it does not have

²¹ Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment Final Report. August 2021.

²² “After its original Green Belt release, successive policies have sought to reserve the campus for uses that need to be located there.” [Local Plan, Development Strategy Topic Paper, page 130]

²³ Requirements of the “National Planning Policy Framework”, Ministry of Housing, communities and Local Government, 2021

²⁴ The TRA’s paper of 11 March 2022 sent to the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service best explains the rationale – “Greater Cambridge Local Plan First proposals – CBC – Policy S/CBC, TRA Note & Comment”. Fully supported by the GSPC in its letter of 29 April 2022. These do not cover the July 2022 new and amended site submissions, some of which may also be suitable/relevant.

Within that range fall a number of “other reasonable options”, including those we have drawn to the CBC’s attention, which include “Cambridge East” and “North East Cambridge”. [See footnote 7, Part Two – “other reasonable options”, page 21 et seq] We have suggested that rather than taking land at Very High Harm out of the Green Belt, the CBC could develop a twin site Campus relying on these options to the benefit of Greater Cambridge as a whole, and in the instance of Cambridge East, with the possibility of a “legacy site” development as Marshall’s leaves Cambridge for Cranfield. There has not been a response to date.

10. In this context it is also worth noting the following observation:

“Whilst there are benefits of connecting directly or being located close to research centres, there is also evidence of businesses operating successfully in new, accessible locations”. [Greater Cambridge Employment Land and Economic Development Evidence Study, November 2020, paragraph 1.13, page 6]²⁸

END of EXTRACTS

²⁸ See also: “Firms across a range of high technology research and development sectors are located in many locations across the Cambridge area, from central or edge of Cambridge sites, rural business parks, to village locations. Indeed, *the biotech and pharmaceutical cluster* stretches from Cambridge...south into South Cambridgeshire, Uttlesford District and beyond...” [Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Proposals, Development Strategy Topic Paper, page 132]

Demand estimates in Vision 2050 and Cambridge South – Lack of Provenance

Correspondence

(in reverse chronological order)

Re: Masterplan and Economic Modelling

From: David Plank

Sent: 20 May 2022 13:34

To: Kristin-Anne Rutter; Williams, Andrew (Cambridge)

Cc: Malcolm Watson; Annabel Sykes; Barrie Hunt; Morgan, Launce; Tony Taylorson

Subject: Re: Masterplan and Economic Modelling

Thank you, Kristin-Anne, for your amendments.

The end result is the same - as expressed in the second paragraph of our 18 May email. We do of course accept that a clear definition of what must be on the Campus will not be absolute, and are pleased to note that work to define it is underway with initial discussions with existing occupiers. Is it intended to extend these to the community organizations? We are happy to contribute. In the meantime we wish to underline that we do not accept the Cambridge South "Projected Requirement for additional land (to support CBC growth to 2050)" as a valid basis on which to plan the Campus's development given its lack of provenance, undefined categories of uses and unclear/non-justified 2021-2050 projection basis - let alone its neglect of the Green Belt implications which are fundamental to us and inattention to "other reasonable options".

As I say, we are happy to contribute to a clear definition of what needs to be on the Campus - as well as the other matters in which we have expressed an interest.

Best wishes

David

For the community organizations

From: Kristin-Anne Rutter

Sent: 19 May 2022 22:30

To: David Plank; Williams, Andrew (Cambridge)

Cc: Malcolm Watson; Annabel Sykes; Barrie Hunt; Morgan, Launce; Tony Taylorson

Subject: RE: Masterplan and Economic Modelling

David at the risk of being pedantic I have made a couple of amendments to your statement below.

Kristin-Anne Rutter

Dr Kristin-Anne Rutter
Executive Director Cambridge University Health Partners and CBC Ltd

From: David Plank
Sent: 18 May 2022 14:48
To: Kristin-Anne Rutter; Williams, Andrew (Cambridge)
Cc: Malcolm Watson; Annabel Sykes; Barrie Hunt; Morgan, Launce; Tony Taylorson
Subject: Re: Masterplan and Economic Modelling

Dear Kristin-Anne,

Thank you again for your considered reply of 17 May to our letter of the 15th. From which we understand that the CBC implicitly acknowledges there is not at present a robust projection of the amount of land needed over the next 20 years for the Campus's development which can be met within its existing Local Plan allocation or might require additional land within the period of the new Local Plan up to 2041.

No what I have said is that I have the projections but not to hand the source data / calculations that sits behind them. The projections will have assumptions behind, As these are projections these assumptions will I imagine always be open to debate.

By existing allocation, we mean the 77.15 hectares which S/CBC/M15 and S/CBC/E2 comprise.

We also understand the CBC to acknowledge that to secure this robust projection it is essential to base it in a clear definition of what *must* be located on the Campus and what *can* be located elsewhere on suitable sites.

As in our previous exchange I point out that *must* is not an absolute term that can be defined. What we have done as CBC so far is discuss with existing occupiers for what they believe need to be on the campus.

In addition, we note the Campus's decision due to lack of necessary resources not to undertake a full revision of the Vision 2050 document to take account of the points in the preceding paragraph, and its intention instead to secure them through "the framing and objectives of the spatial plan" to be produced as a result of the "Masterplanning and economic modelling" project which is being carried out at present. We understand this to mean that the "spatial plan" will be informed by an updated projection of need as expressed in the preceding paragraph, or if this is not possible within available resources, a revised understanding of need based in a clear definition.

In the meantime, we will continue to challenge the "First Proposals" proposal for additional land within the period of the new Local Plan as represented in S/CBC/A (19.43 ha) while participating positively in the work to take forward the Vision 2050 objectives which we support as recorded on page 3 of our 15 May 2022 joint letter.

We look forward to further participation in the Masterplanning & economic modelling work including the special workshop for the community organizations which is to be arranged and will indeed take up your invitation to flag any points of interest in our 3 May note which are not fully covered then.

Best wishes

David

For the community organizations

From: Kristin-Anne Rutter

Sent: 17 May 2022 19:15

To: David Plank; Williams, Andrew (Cambridge); Malcolm Watson; Annabel Sykes <; Barrie Hunt <; Morgan, Launce; Tony Taylorson

Subject: RE: Masterplan and Economic Modelling

Thank you David for the expansion on the points regarding the link between Vision 2050 and Cambridge South proposals. That was helpful to me in understanding the point and how the Vision is currently perceived.

The points of feedback on the Vision around the necessity of the need and also the option to consider other ways to meet are noted; alongside the previously raised points on greater emphasis on sustainability and prominence of the importance of the healthcare institutions.

As previously stated I am not planning on updating the vision but rather taking these points into account in subsequent work e.g., as Annabel has suggested in the framing and objectives of the spatial plan. I suggest that we add as an agenda item to the next meeting a discussion around how best to achieve this.

I hope that the questions on the plan are addressed in the follow up session that is being arranged and if not please flag again.

Kristin-Anne Rutter

Dr Kristin-Anne Rutter

Executive Director Cambridge University Health Partners and CBC Ltd

