

I strongly object to this planning application, especially the plan to build B8 (storage and distribution) units on Parcel A that would function as a purpose-built last-mile logistics hub.

Details of my objection are as follows:

#### LACK OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND NOT TAKING ON BOARD RESIDENTS' MAIN CONCERN

---

Anderson Group have had no formal consultation meetings with the community prior to submission of their revised Planning Application 21/05476/FUL and prior to their related previous planning application 21/02326/FUL last year which are radically different from their original proposals that the community was consulted on over the years.

Prior to submission of 21/02326/FUL last year, after many years of consultations with Anderson Group we fully expected it to be similar to the proposals of a few years ago of low rise commercial units for light industry/office space in accordance with the adopted local plan. However, what they submitted last year was totally different from those original proposals in as much as they plan to build B8 storage units that would function as a 24/7 last-mile logistics hub

I would have thought that after over 610 objections were raised against their previous planning application 21/02326/FUL, it was essential that there was proper community engagement to listen to all our concerns before submitting their revised plan of this size and importance. The main concern raised in these objections is the building of B8 logistics hub in the middle of a growing residential area and the resulting problems with 24/7 HGV traffic congestion, noise, safety and air pollution.

After Anderson's previous application was withdrawn, Tim Chilvers (Anderson Group Land & Planning Manager) met a small group of affected neighbours on the grass area by Iver Close on 26 August 2021 to present their revised plans that they were working on. His revised plans still included B8 units on Parcel A that could function as a last-mile logistics hub. At that meeting, all the neighbours unanimously stated that we would not support any big B8 units for logistics at the site. In Anderson's STATEMENT\_OF\_COMMUNITY\_INVOLVEMENT document section 6.6 it mentions the meeting on 26 August 2021 but is incorrect when it states that there was "...residual concern related to B8 uses south of the Tins". We clearly stated that we would not support any B8 units at the site. Clearly they have not addressed our main concern since their latest Planning Application still contains 4 (out of 7) B8 storage and distribution units on Parcel A which their latest DAS document states "will function as a purpose-built last-mile logistics hub". A last-mile logistics hub typically operates 24/7 which in a predominantly residential area is totally unacceptable. There has been no formal public consultation prior to submission of this revised planning application.

The claim by Anderson Group in section 9 of their Design And Access Statement document that there has been extensive engagement with the community for their latest plans (as described in 21/02326/FUL and 21/05476/FUL) is simply not true as it bears little resemblance to their original plans that were discussed and exhibited in 2017, 2018 and 2019.

Also all the community engagement activities mentioned in the STATEMENT\_OF\_COMMUNITY\_INVOLVEMENT that were carried out prior to 2021 are irrelevant as the latest planning application is radically different from their original proposals that were presented over the years prior to 2021.

## INAPPROPRIATE LOCATION FOR A LAST-MILE LOGISTICS HUB WILL AFFECT RESIDENTS' HEALTH

---

It does not make sense to locate a last-mile logistic hub inside a predominantly residential area (that is rapidly expanding) and is two miles from the A14. The increased traffic congestion, noise and air pollution will not only affect the current Cherry Hinton residents but future residents and school children from the nearby 1200 homes planned to be built on the Land North Of Cherry Hinton and from the thousands of homes that will be built on the entire Airport land (once Cambridge Airport is relocated).

A study commissioned by the GCP (Greater Cambridge Planning) in 2021 asked logistic companies about their need for B8 storage in Cambridgeshire concluded "The regional operators prefer to service Cambridge from the north, using the A10 as the main arterial link into Cambridge. The national operators were looking for B8 space to the west / north-west of Cambridge due to proximity to the Strategic Road Network and the ability to service Cambridge via the A14 and A428." Hence it not ideal from a logistics point of view and it is not appropriate in a residential area that is reached via congested roads that are unsuitable for HGVs.

I question the feasibility of Anderson's proposal of lowering the road under the railway bridge to route the HGV traffic from the west via Barnwell Road. In addition to lowering the road, it would also have to be widened to allow HGV traffic to flow safely both ways and for the safety of cyclists. Also it would be liable to flooding so would also have to incorporate costly flood mitigation measures. Has the feasibility of this proposal been reviewed by Network Rail? I don't see any response from Network Rail regarding the feasibility of this proposal. Even if this could be done, how are they going to enforce HGV drivers to use this slightly longer and more congested route from the A14 when their Sat Navs tell them of a more quicker route via Taversham Drift and Cherry Hinton High Street past St Andrews Church (where the roads are totally unsuitable for HGVs)?

The ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT VOL 1 (PAGE 101-150) document gives a baseline figure of 80 Heavy Vehicles per 18hr day for Norman Way (which is the entry point into the Parcel A site) in Table 7.10. I don't agree with this baseline figure as that would imply 4 HGVs currently using Norman Way every hour which does not seem to be correct for this road. In their previous application the baseline figure was 8 Heavy Vehicles per day for this road which is more realistic. For their preferred scenario 2, in 2025 the figure for Heavy Vehicles for Norman Way in Table 7.15 is 455 per 18 hr day, which is nearly 6 fold increase (using their incorrect baseline figure of 80) but is a 56 fold increase if you use a more realistic baseline figure of 8. So clearly whichever figure you take there is a huge increase in HGV traffic flow compared to the baseline. Hence the statement in their ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY on Air Quality in section 8 that "It is concluded that the effect Development on air quality would be negligible" is clearly incorrect.

Last mile delivery vehicles may be electric but Heavy Goods Vehicles (that will be delivering to the Parcel A hub from outside Cambridge) for logistics companies will be running on diesel until at least 2040 and this level of exhaust emissions will expose all Cherry Hinton residents (current and future, especially children in the nearby schools) to excessive pollution leading to poor health.

The government announced on 17<sup>th</sup> June 2021 that much tougher standards for air quality will be introduced before the end of 2022 following the death of nine-year-old Ella Kissi-Debrah who suffered a fatal asthma attack after being exposed to excessive pollution from vehicle exhausts. The British Safety Council has said that we need to deal with the causes of poor air quality, as well as the impacts. "Everyone has a role in reducing emissions. Unsafe air is not something that society should simply accept".

There is overwhelming community-wide opposition to this application as can be seen from the over 610 objections raised against their previous application and over 190 objections against their latest one so far. If this application is approved in the current form, we as a community will highlight this nationally and do whatever it takes to fight the decision, including taking it to the courts for a Judicial Review.

#### HEALTH RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH BUILDING ON CONTAMINATED LAND

---

The OUTLINE REMEDIATION IMPLEMENTATION PLAN PAGE 1-50 document section 1 states that "elevated concentrations of hydrocarbons are present in localised areas of the waste deposits. Asbestos containing materials (ACMs) and free asbestos fibres have also been confirmed to be present in some parts of the waste deposits". The MASTERPLAN DOCUMENT section 4.1.7 also refers to the problems of "long term contamination risk arising from the historic use of the site for landfill".

The proposal in their latest plan to simply add a capping layer cannot be carried out on Parcel A (especially the land south of the Tins) without significant disturbance of waste deposits because this land is very uneven. Residents who have lived on Wolsey Way since the 1970s have said that since then, this land has sunk at least 12 feet (and is still sinking) because of unstable decomposing waste buried underneath and methane escape. This land is noticeably uneven and does not uniformly slope north to south as shown in their diagrams. This means that it will first need levelling and any cut and fill activities as described in the Remediation plan will lead to significant disturbance of existing contaminated waste that is buried there not far from the surface.

It would be unethical for the Council to expose residents to any risk whatsoever from the asbestos contamination at this site. Exposure to contaminated dust (including asbestos fibres) is a very serious health risk for people living nearby (include children in the nearby primary schools) during the 4 years construction phase and the general local air quality will also be very poor due to the exhaust emissions from construction vehicles. If this development goes ahead, Anderson Group will be held responsible for any above normal increase in the incidence of illnesses related to Asbestos or exhaust emissions in and around the areas near the site.

The noise and vibration during construction will be a nuisance and stressful for nearby residents and the vibrations are likely to cause minor damage to properties. When Anderson Group originally cleared the land on Parcel A by removing most of the trees, it caused many small cracks to appear on my property for which I was never compensated.

#### SIZE, SCALE AND PURPOSE OF PARCEL A INCOMPATIBLE WITH LOCAL PLAN POLICY 16

---

The Cambridge City Council Local Plan Policy 16 clarifies that "Parcel A could provide for the relocation of 'space intensive' uses such as builders' merchant, sales and storage facilities which are

currently located on land elsewhere in the City" presumably to free up this land for building homes there. This Anderson application for four B8 Storage Warehouses (that are between 14M and 16M high according to the latest plan) are intended for a NEW last-mile distribution hub and hence does not allow for relocation of any existing businesses in the City. This application is therefore clearly not in accordance with the expected uses described in the Cambridge City Council Adopted Local Plan Policy 16 and hence should be rejected in its current form.

Anderson Group have proposed to move units E, F and G further away from the houses in Orchard Estate and Wolsey Way and made them lower, however the plans still include four B8 units on Parcel A that will overshadow this predominantly residential area. Some homes will feel blocked in by the industrial area and overlooked, losing any views due to these extraordinarily high buildings and suffer the constant 24 hour noise of large HGVs coming and going. The huge unit A B8 class warehouse sits adjacent to Kathleen Elliot Way which will be 16M high and only 30M from the front doors of these residential properties making them feel blocked in.

#### DESTRUCTION OF PREVIOUS CITY WILDLIFE SITE AT PARCEL A

-----

We have evidence of Anderson Group repeatedly destroying this Wildlife Site by annual spraying (presumably herbicide) and mechanical flattening since 2013 resulting in a significant net loss of biodiversity. You can see in this news article (see link below) from the archive satellite photos where this land goes from verdant green loveliness to scraped flat brown lifeless land:

<https://www.cambridge-news.co.uk/news/cambridge-news/outrage-cambridge-wildlife-destroyed-warehouse-21042343>

After destruction of this wildlife site, Anderson claim in their ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT VOL 1: MAIN TEXT PAGE 201-250 in section 11.55 that on Parcel A "However, the land now has limited vegetation being cleared some time ago and now retains very little biodiversity value and would not now meet the criteria for selection as a CiWS". This is a very disingenuous statement since it is Anderson Group itself that has cleared the land annually since 2013.

Unlike the previous application, this application has considered and taken into account the 2005 survey based on the site prior to the clearance by Anderson of Parcel A in 2013. However, even then the applicant's own figures actually show a negligible biodiversity net gain of 2.14%. This is considerably short of the biodiversity net gain of at least 10 percent as per the Environment Bill in England that is due to become law in 2023:

<https://www.local.gov.uk/pas/topics/environment/biodiversity-net-gain>

Note that this is also well short of the 20% aspiration set out in the most recent Greater Cambridge Local Plan documents as pointed out by the BCN Wildlife Trusts objection.

I understand that by law a developer is not allowed to build and profit from land that has first been degraded in this way (for which we have ample evidence) and where the development results in negligible biodiversity net gain.

In February 2019, Cambridge City Council declared a 'climate emergency' and in May 2019 it declared a 'biodiversity emergency'. If these declarations are important to Cambridge City Council

(not just words), then this application should be rejected as it does not offer anything positive on both of these global issues.