

24/09/2026

Summary of responses to Proposed Submission Greater Cambridge Local Plan

Cambridge Past, Present & Future is Cambridge's largest civic society. We are a charity run by local people who are passionate about where they live. We operate in the greater Cambridge area and working with our members, supporters and volunteers we:

- Are dedicated to protecting and enhancing the green setting of Cambridge for people and nature.
- Care about Cambridge and are an independent voice for quality of life in the strategic planning of Greater Cambridge.
- Are working to protect, celebrate and improve the important built heritage of the Cambridge area.
- Own and care for green spaces and historic buildings in and around the city for people and nature, including Wandlebury Country Park, Coton Countryside Reserve, Cambridge Leper Chapel & Barnwell Meadows, Bourn Windmill and Hinxton Watermill.

The following is a summary of the responses.

Development strategy

Vision: Object:

While commending the climate-led vision, CPPF considers it unsound for failing statutory tests. The Vision ignores severe cumulative growth impacts on Cambridge's historic capacity limits, skyline, public spaces, and landscape. It prioritises economic expansion over internationally valued heritage, failing to reconcile growth with critical constraints like water scarcity, healthcare deficits, and green infrastructure. Unclear mechanisms for managing trade-offs risk triggering unsustainable development. CPPF proposes modifications including elevated heritage protections, mandatory capacity limits, infrastructure prerequisites, explicit commitments to net-zero and biodiversity goals, and headline statements committing to protect the historic environment from irreparable harm.

Policy S/DS: Development strategy - Object

CPPF considers Policy S/DS unsound due to deliverability risks, missing transport strategies, and environmental limits. The Plan lacks capacity testing and relies heavily on water projects (Fens Reservoir), threatening irreversible ecological damage to chalk streams if delayed. It over-relies on unfinalised transport schemes without an adopted Combined Authority Transport Strategy, and ignores national policies favouring station-led rural rail growth. Crucially, it lacks an outer orbital road strategy. Proposed modifications mandate water and infrastructure tracking, pausing allocations if water lags, reallocating growth to rural rail corridors, assessing capacity, and requiring all-ways orbital junction upgrades.

Policy S/SH: Settlement hierarchy – Support

CPPF supports Policy S/SH as sound and legally compliant. Establishing a clear, evidence-based settlement hierarchy provides an essential spatial planning framework to manage growth sustainably, prevent unplanned urban sprawl, and protect the Green Belt and rural hinterlands. Defining explicit tiers protects village character and prevents coalescence. Aligning development scale with existing or committed public transport capacity supports climate mitigation and net-zero targets by reducing car reliance. Furthermore, concentrating strategic growth in higher-tier settlements ensures housing and employment are paired with necessary civic, commercial, and green infrastructure without overburdening smaller rural communities.

Policy S/GB: The Cambridge Green Belt – Object

CPPF finds Policy S/GB unsound and inconsistent with national policy. The 2026 technical assessment fails to evaluate cumulative spatial impacts of releases or assess exceptional circumstances for extending Green Belt boundaries. Omitting Paragraph 144 provisions to establish Green Belt buffers around new allocations leaves historic settings vulnerable to piecemeal erosion, sprawl, and coalescence. CPPF demands updating the evidence base to model cumulative Green Belt impacts, amending policy text to extend Green Belt protections around new settlements and strategic gaps, and incorporating an immediate review trigger if releases erode historic character.

Policy S/MO: Monitoring - Object

CPPF objects to the Policy S/MO monitoring framework regarding tree cover (Policy BG/TC). Following the removal of the 30% tree canopy target from the Regulation 18 Plan, the policy relies on general aims, creating a policy gap that threatens the Cambridge Urban Forest Strategy's 20% by 2050 target. Policy S/MO currently lacks dedicated indicators to measure delivered canopy cover, rendering the strategy ineffective and unsound. CPPF proposes either reinstating the 30% requirement or adding a specific monitoring indicator tracking net canopy changes against a target of 4 hectares per year, triggering a policy review if missed.

Site allocations

Cambridge urban area

Policy S/C/OPM: Old Press / Mill Lane - Object

Policy S/COPM is unsound as drafted due to what appears to be a drafting error. The policy appears to incorrectly include requirements for an all-weather astro pitch, four tennis courts, a MUGA, Community Use Agreements, and school privacy/noise mitigations. These criteria do not relate to the dense, historic Old Press / Mill Lane site in central Cambridge and have clearly been erroneously copied over from another policy. The policy is not justified or effective. Sub-clauses b–e must be deleted and replaced with site-appropriate parameters focusing on heritage, university redevelopment, and public realm.

Public Realm Improvement Areas (PRIA)

Policy S/PRIA/OPML: Old Press/Mill Lane - Object.

CPPF objects to Policy S/PRIA/OPML due to internal policy conflict regarding the non-designated heritage asset (the historic mill/warehouse building) on the eastern side of Mill Pond. While Clauses 1a and 1b rightly support heritage-led enhancement, Clause 1d is ambiguously drafted and could be interpreted to justify the demolition of the mill/warehouse to create open space. This building is a vital reminder of Cambridge's waterborne trading history, groups with the Anchor PH, and contributes significantly to the setting of Queen's College, King's College Chapel, and Coe Fen. The policy is unsound as it is not justified or effective.

Edge of Cambridge

Policy S/CE: Cambridge East - Object.

CPPF objects to Policy S/CE as unsound, unjustified, and ineffective for prematurely fixing the Cambridge East station location via Figure 53 and delegating design to rail industry bodies before masterplanning. This makes place-making subservient to rail engineering, violating NPPF principles on high-density land use, active travel, and station catchment. CPPF proposes amending Figure 53 to remove the fixed station location, engaging rail bodies as formal masterplan stakeholders, and requiring the final station alignment to be determined through a comprehensive options assessment within the site-wide masterplan to prioritise spatial and active-travel objectives.

Policy S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) - Object

CPPF objects to Policy S/CBC as unsound, unjustified, and ineffective due to flawed transport baseline assumptions and reliance on unconsented infrastructure. The policy relies on an unevidenced 69% car mode share contradicting actual campus data, while Clause 22c improperly requires contributions toward CSET Phase 2, which lacks consent. Additionally, unmanaged traffic at the new Southern Gateway risks delaying emergency blue-light vehicles and buses. CPPF proposes deleting Clause 22c, requiring realistic transport modelling based on empirical data, and mandating access controls on the Southern Gateway to protect bus and emergency vehicle movements.

New settlements

Introduction - Object

CPPF objects to the New Settlements section and Figure 65 as unsound, ineffective, and unjustified due to designating Strategic Enhancement Policy Areas (S/SEA/CBN, S/SEA/GF, S/SEA/WNT) on the Policies Map without supporting written policy text, criteria, or guidance in the Local Plan. Furthermore, interactive map layers suffer from broken hyperlinks, rendering designations unexplainable and legally ambiguous. CPPF proposes incorporating formal policy criteria and spatial framework updates for these areas, resolving mapping broken links, or completely removing designations lacking written policy backing to ensure legal clarity.

Policy S/CBN: Cambourne North - Object –

CPPF objects to Policy S/CBN as unsound, ineffective, and unjustified for failing to prevent physical and social severance across the A428, omitting employment allocations, and lacking TCPA Garden Town governance. Standard transit bridges are insufficient to unify the town. CPPF proposes mandating landscape-led green bridges or covered deck structures across the A428, reintroducing minimum employment land targets to prevent a commuter-town model, and updating the "Place Book" framework to enforce physical, functional, and civic integration with existing Cambourne alongside long-term community land stewardship mechanisms.

Policy S/GF: Land adjacent to A11 and A1307 at Grange Farm - Object –

The representation considers Policy S/GF unsound, ineffective, and unjustified due to an infrastructure funding deficit over £100m, reliance on unconsented CSET2 transport infrastructure, and acute water stress during active abstraction curtailment. Furthermore, development on elevated topography risks visual intrusion, alongside unmitigated recreational pressure on nearby heritage sites like Wandlebury Country Park. Proposed modifications include re-testing viability with realistic costs, removing reliance on CSET2 in favour of local bus priority and Whittlesford links, verifying water supply deliverability prior to allocation, restricting development to low-rise forms, and explicitly mitigating recreational impacts on Wandlebury, Magog Down, and the Roman Road.

The rural southern cluster

Policy S/RSC/BRC: Babraham Research Campus - Object:

CPPF considers Policy S/RSC/BRC unsound, unjustified, and ineffective due to Clause 19c requiring developer contributions toward the unconsented, off-road Cambridge South East Transport busway (CSET2). CPPF argues that tying campus growth to an off-road scheme fails to resolve everyday bottlenecks along the A1307 corridor. Effective, direct bus access can be achieved far more sustainably through targeted highway management. CPPF proposes amending the policy to remove CSET2 contribution requirements, replacing them with A1307 bus priority measures, westbound bus lanes, signal controls, and improved active travel/bus links across the A11 interchange.

Climate change

Policy CC/CE: Supporting a circular economy and sustainable resource use – Support

CPPF strongly supports Policy CC/CE as sound and legally compliant. The policy aligns with national Net Zero goals by requiring major developments to embed circular economy principles, prioritise building retention and retrofit over demolition, and reduce whole-life carbon. CPPF supports mandatory Circular Economy Statements, which provide practical, deliverable standards for managing embodied carbon, minimising waste, and utilising local supply chains. By setting clear requirements for sustainable resource use from the design stage, the policy ensures that growth is accommodated without compromising resource capacity or social wellbeing.

Policy CC/SR: Sustainable retrofit - Support

CPPF strongly supports Policy CC/SR as a sound, essential strategy for reaching Net Zero, reducing operational carbon, and conserving embodied carbon across Greater Cambridge. Given that existing buildings far outnumber new developments, establishing a supportive planning framework for sensitive adaptation is fully justified. The policy proactively facilitates residential and commercial retrofits, improving thermal efficiency, lowering energy bills, and protecting residents against energy costs. Crucially, it extends building lifespans and aligns with national policies while safeguarding heritage and local character through sensitive, long-term adaptation.

Biodiversity and green spaces

Policy BG/BG: Biodiversity and geodiversity – Support

CPPF strongly supports Policy BG/BG as sound, positively prepared, justified, effective, and consistent with NPPF Paragraphs 187 and 192. It endorses the 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirement for major developments to address severe local nature depletion and align with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. The policy is backed by viability evidence. CPPF commends targeted protections for Natural England Impact Risk Zones and Important Invertebrate Areas, alongside mandatory integrated nesting features (swift bricks/bat boxes) and long-term management regimes to secure enduring ecological restoration across Greater Cambridge.

Policy BG/GI: Green infrastructure – Object

CPPF considers Policy BG/GI unsound due to failing the effectiveness test. It relies on delivering 14 strategic green infrastructure (GI) initiatives—including the Cambridge Nature Network—without securing necessary land via allocations or policy mechanisms. Off-site developer contributions fail when land is unavailable due to inflated speculative values. Delivering major growth without precursor GI risks over-burdening existing protected sites. CPPF proposes allocating strategic GI land, introducing enabling development policies,

establishing a dedicated land acquisition fund, and publishing an evidence-based GI Delivery Strategy demonstrating landowner willingness and realistic delivery timelines.

Policy BG/UGF: Urban Greening Factor - Object:

CPPF supports introducing an Urban Greening Factor (UGF) but considers Policy BG/UGF unsound due to an unevidenced exemption in Clause 1c. Waiving the 0.5 UGF standard for major developments outside Cambridge where accessible greenspace exceeds 50% creates an ambiguous loophole. Large open spaces do not replace integrating nature-based solutions—such as green roofs, rain gardens, and street trees—within built residential fabric. Bypassing urban greening risks increased surface water run-off and heat stress. CPPF proposes removing Clause 1c's exemption and applying UGF targets directly to built areas regardless of adjoining open space.

Policy BG/TC: Tree cover and the tree population - Object: -

CPPF objects to Policy BG/TC as unsound. Removing the quantitative 30% tree canopy target from earlier drafts leaves no reliable mechanism to guarantee canopy delivery, directly conflicting with the Cambridge Urban Forest Strategy. Metrics like UGF measure surface area rather than mature canopy structure. Additionally, Clause 2 defines "no net loss" by raw tree counts rather than mature canopy volume or value, allowing mature trees to be replaced by saplings. CPPF proposes reintroducing the 30% canopy target and requiring replacement calculations based on the mature canopy area and value of lost trees.

Policy BG/RC: River corridors – Support

CPPF strongly supports Policy BG/RC as sound. It commends the policy's recognition of the cultural and historic significance of river corridors, particularly the River Cam from Byron's Pool to Baits Bite Lock. CPPF endorses Paragraph 5.74's clarification that the proposed Cam Valley Trail will not continuously follow the riverbank or floodplain. Carefully routing access routes away from delicate wildlife habitats successfully balances public access ambitions with essential environmental protection, safeguarding sensitive riverbank ecosystems and floodplain habitats from excessive recreational disturbance while enhancing community access.

Policy BG/EO: Providing and enhancing open spaces - Object:

CPPF finds Policy BG/EO unsound, unjustified, and ineffective. Key terms like "Accessible Greenspace" are undefined, accessibility mapping ignores physical barriers, and Coton Countryside Reserve's accessible area is overstated (~17 ha vs. 121 ha). Merely maintaining per capita provision entrenches existing deficiencies, while 30-year management obligations leave stewardship charities with unfunded perpetual liabilities. CPPF proposes defining "Accessible Greenspace" (excluding SuDS/private land), correcting site data, setting a net-gain per capita target, naming key receptor sites under Clause 7, requiring perpetual management funding via capitalised endowments, and clarifying employment thresholds and open space standards.

Wellbeing and social inclusion

Policy WS/PH: Public houses – Support

CPPF strongly supports Policy SW/PH for its robust protection of public houses across Greater Cambridge. Public houses act as essential social, historical, and architectural anchors in urban and rural communities. They preserve tangible links to local land-use history and heritage while serving as landmark structures that define streetscape character and distinctiveness. Beyond their architectural value, pub spaces foster critical community interaction and local identity. CPPF endorses the policy's strict criteria, which prevent unjustified loss or insensitive redevelopment by requiring rigorous justification and proof of non-viability before any public house can be lost.

Great places

Policy GP/ST: Skyline and tall buildings – Object

CPPF welcomes the June 2026 Baseline Study but considers Policy GP/ST unsound, ineffective, unjustified, and inconsistent with national policy. It lacks legal mechanisms to enforce updated height guidelines against legacy masterplans and major allocations, risking city-wide height inflation through precedent. Carrying forward legacy height limits lacks evidential backing regarding functional necessity versus density optimisation. Furthermore, relying on vague language fails NPPF design mandates to explicitly refuse mediocre proposals. CPPF demands clarifying policy primacy over legacy masterplans, mandating updated strategic masterplans, strengthening Appendix H design criteria, and adding a mandatory refusal clause for sub-standard proposals.

Policy GP/QP: Establishing high quality landscape and public realm – Object

CPPF considers Policy GP/QP unsound due to drafting ambiguities, unnecessary repetition, and a critical failure to establish a financial mechanism for long-term monitoring and enforcement. Given the role of public realm in climate mitigation and nature recovery, policy clarity is essential. CPPF highlights a long-standing resource gap that leaves landscape schemes, public realm, and tree planting unmonitored, risking management failure. Proposed modifications include removing repetitive lighting text, clarifying ambiguous parking, street design, and flexible space clauses, prioritising large-scale street trees for shade, reconsidering drought-prone interactive water features, and introducing a dedicated monitoring and enforcement financial mechanism.

Policy GP/LC: Protection, conservation and enhancement of landscape character - Object

CPPF considers Policy GP/LC unsound, ineffective, and inconsistent with national policy for failing to safeguard non-designated working countryside or ensure landscape character shapes early scheme design. Developers frequently undervalue agricultural landscapes and their relationship with historic built environments. CPPF argues landscape assessments are currently submitted retrospectively to justify finalised layouts. Proposed modifications mandate that development responds directly to specific Landscape Character Types, requires landscape character evidence during pre-application and feasibility stages, explicitly references baseline landscape and skyline studies, and requires developers to identify compensatory landscape features for nearby environmental loss or degradation.

Policy GP/HE: Historic environment – Object

CPPF considers Policy GP/HE unsound, ineffective, unjustified, and inconsistent with national policy, arguing it acts as a reactive control rather than a proactive framework. The Plan fails to recognise Cambridge's global, landscape-scale heritage significance or assess the cumulative impacts of 100,000+ new residents on the historic core and rural landscapes. Visitor pressures on historic countryside sites (e.g., Wimpole) remain unmitigated due to missing strategic parklands and unadopted planning frameworks. CPPF proposes recognising global heritage value, requiring Cumulative Heritage Impact Assessments, adopting the Making Space for People SPD, and delivering expanded strategic green infrastructure.

Policy GP/HA: Designated Heritage Assets - Object

CPPF objects to Policy GP/HA as unsound, ineffective, and inconsistent with NPPF Paragraph 203. While addressing the national Heritage at Risk Register, the mechanism relies on Historic England data that excludes Grade II listed buildings outside London. Because Grade II assets comprise 90–92% of Greater Cambridge's statutory heritage, the policy creates a critical monitoring blind spot, leaving farmsteads, cottages, and shopfronts vulnerable to decay and neglect without proactive intervention frameworks. CPPF

requests establishing a local Greater Cambridge Grade II Buildings at Risk Register, formalising early statutory intervention measures, and partnering with community organisations for monitoring.

Policy GP/ND: Non-Designated Heritage Assets - support

CPPF strongly supports Policy GP/ND and Paragraph 7.81 as sound, positively prepared, justified, effective, and consistent with national policy (NPPF Paragraphs 192, 203, 209, and 216). Non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs) define local distinctiveness. Updating and expanding the Local List provides early certainty, protects locally valued character, and prevents unsympathetic alterations or demolitions. Furthermore, Policy GP/ND offers a structured mechanism to weigh heritage significance against public benefits while supporting climate goals through the sensitive reuse and retrofitting of unlisted historic buildings.

Policy GP/CC: Adapting heritage assets to climate change - support

Cambridge Past, Present and Future support the policy, and specifically the reference to BS EN 16883, ensuring the policy is sound.

Standard modern retrofit techniques often fail when applied to historic and traditional buildings due to differences in moisture movement and material breathability. BS EN 16883 provides an internationally recognised, step-by-step risk assessment methodology that identifies tailored, building-specific energy efficiency measures.

Incorporating this standard into Policy GP/CC provides clear technical guidance for applicants and officers, facilitating the necessary retrofitting of heritage assets to combat climate change while preventing technical failure, material damage, or loss of historic significance.

Policy GP/SF: Shopfronts - support

CPPF strongly supports Policy GP/SF as sound, positively prepared, justified, effective, and consistent with national policy (NPPF Paragraphs 135 and 203). Well-designed historic shopfronts are vital to the character and visual amenity of Cambridge's historic core, market towns, and village conservation areas. The policy establishes a firm presumption against removing historic joinery, pilasters, or fascias, while preventing unsympathetic corporate fascia boxes. By setting clear design parameters early, Policy GP/SF safeguards streetscape quality and civic pride while enabling modern commercial accessibility, security, and energy efficiency upgrades without sacrificing heritage value.

Jobs

Policy J/NE: New employment development proposals - support

CPPF strongly supports Clause 8 of Policy J/NE as sound, justified, effective, and consistent with NPPF Paragraphs 85 and 86. Restricting large-scale distribution centres and big-box warehousing preserves scarce employment land for high-value research, innovation, and local manufacturing serving the sub-regional economy. Furthermore, preventing expansive logistics structures protects the sensitive countryside, skyline, and historic village settings of Greater Cambridge from visually intrusive built form. Scaling warehousing strictly to local operational demand prevents unwanted regional freight traffic while balancing sub-regional economic growth with essential landscape and environmental stewardship.

Policy J/AL: Protecting the best agricultural land - support

CPPF strongly supports Policy J/AL as sound, positively prepared, justified, effective, and consistent with NPPF Paragraphs 180b and 181. Greater Cambridge contains a finite resource of high-grade soils. Protecting Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land is essential for domestic food security, soil health, carbon sequestration, and rural economic resilience against intense development pressures. The policy provides a balanced, criteria-based framework that allows planned strategic growth while directing necessary

development to lower-quality land or brownfield sites, preventing the incremental, irreversible loss of prime farmland.

Policy J/PB: Protecting existing business space - support

CPPF strongly supports Policy J/PB as sound, positively prepared, justified, effective, and consistent with NPPF Paragraphs 85 and 86. High land values for offices and life sciences pressure industrial estates. Safeguarding these spaces protects low-to-mid-skilled jobs, vocational trades, repair services, and light manufacturing. Maintaining employment space across villages and urban edges supports an inclusive local economy and reduces out-commuting and traffic congestion. The policy avoids rigidity by incorporating robust marketing and viability thresholds (12–24 months) before allowing transitions to alternative uses.

Policy J/EP: Supporting a range of facilities in employment parks - Object

CPPF objects to Clause 1(c) of Policy J/EP, rendering it unsound. Restricting amenities strictly to workers creates isolated commercial enclaves and leads to off-peak facility underutilisation. In edge-of-settlement, rural, or suburban locations lacking infrastructure, allowing shared, scaled facilities—like nurseries, cafes, and sports hubs—benefits nearby residents, supports healthy communities (NPPF Paragraph 96), and optimises trip patterns by encouraging walking and cycling. CPPF proposes amending Clause 1(c) to permit facilities serving local residents where appropriate, reflecting what is found on existing employment parks, provided they do not attract unmanaged external traffic or impact nearby town centres.

Policy J/MS: Markets and street trading - Object

Paragraph 11.6 of the Jobs Topic Paper states that “The first paragraph of the supporting information has been amended to acknowledge the historic legacy of Cambridge’s traditional market.”

This change has not been implemented.

Cambridge’s traditional market possesses a unique historical legacy, having served as a vital community hub since before the founding of the University. The daily and Sunday stalls providing fresh food and produce represent a living connection to the city's medieval heritage and its enduring relationship with the surrounding agricultural landscape, as well as a sustainable low carbon economy. This must be recognised in the policy.

Policy J/VA: Visitor accommodation, attractions and facilities - Object

CPPF finds Policy J/VA unsound, ineffective, unjustified, and inconsistent with national policy. It lacks a comprehensive tourism strategy, day-visitor forecasts, or carrying-capacity evaluations for central Cambridge. Unmanaged tourism and day-visitor traffic exacerbate city centre congestion, degrading the public realm, community well-being, and overall liveability necessary to attract global innovation talent. CPPF proposes commissioning a visitor capacity study, requiring pedestrian management and spatial routing, investigating local funding tools like visitor levies for street maintenance, and reframing policy criteria to protect town centre liveability and residential amenity.

Infrastructure

Policy I/ST: Sustainable transport and connectivity - Object

CPPF considers Policy I/ST unsound, ineffective, unjustified, and inconsistent with national policy. The policy references vehicular trip budgets without operational mechanics, monitoring frameworks, or legal enforcement. Subjective terminology creates developer uncertainty and land overvaluation, risking sustainable infrastructure delivery during viability assessments. Furthermore, the policy fails to mandate mode-shifting ahead of road capacity expansion and uses disjunctive phrasing ("or") instead of combining sustainable measures. CPPF proposes establishing a standardised trip budget and monitoring framework,

defining objective standards (e.g., 400m walking distance to transit), citing Healthy Streets Indicators, enforcing combined transport packages, and prioritising mode-shift over road expansion.

Policy I/MH: Mobility Hub facilities - Object –

CPPF considers Policy I/MH unsound, unjustified, and ineffective due to internal policy contradictions and loose parking criteria. A conflict exists between the Glossary—which explicitly excludes private car parking from mobility hubs—and Policy I/MH's supporting text, which conflates hubs with major Park & Ride car parks. Furthermore, allowing parking "only as necessary" lacks scale limits or thresholds, permitting unbounded surface parking under the guise of modal interchange. CPPF proposes aligning the Glossary with policy text, distinguishing local hubs from strategic Park & Rides, clarifying drop-off terminology, and requiring car parking to reflect a demonstrated, assessed transportation need.

Policy I/EI: Energy infrastructure Masterplanning - Object

CPPF finds Policy I/IE unsound, ineffective, and not positively prepared for failing to make spatial provision for high-voltage grid connections required by the region's academic and commercial R&D sectors. Rapid AI integration, data centres, and advanced laboratories exponentially increase baseline energy demands. Heavy reliance on a single connection at Burwell creates network capacity constraints and severe single-point-of-failure risks for mission-critical research. CPPF proposes amending Policy I/IE to explicitly acknowledge the high power density demands of AI and R&D clusters, and providing explicit policy support and criteria for delivering an additional National Grid connection point in South Cambridgeshire.