

Cambridge: Growth Beyond Reason – An Update

David Plank

This report updates the account of growth beyond reason given in the report of that name published by The Cambridge Commons in June this year.¹ First, there is a reminder of the main points in that report.

REMINDER

Cambridge: Growth Beyond Reason voiced great concern about the high level of economic growth planned in and around Cambridge on top of decades-long high growth with which the infrastructure essential to a decent quality of life has not kept pace. High house prices and rents have driven middle-income and poor households out of the city, swelling traffic congestion as they commute back to work. Pollution levels remain stubbornly high in parts of the city, with harmful effects. Natural resources are under great strain, and in the case of water could run out. These adverse effects significantly outweigh the benefits of high value economic prosperity, with its more intense inequality between an echelon of high earners and other citizens.

Yet we are urged by powerful voices to increase our rate of growth – to double its product over the next thirty years – lest we fail to satisfy the demands of the digital and life sciences industries. With the threat of their departure abroad – seen by the government as a threat to national economic growth.^{2 3 4} This threat is very real and close to us - all of the “six key districts” where the Local Transport Plan expects this growth to be “disproportionately located”, are on our doorstep in Cambridge.

The powerful voices are led by the Government and Mayor James Palmer. All of our local councils are publicly committed to this high level of growth, including the two responsible for our new Local Plan which is under review. Cambridge Ahead, the strong and well-funded commercial pressure group, is another influential advocate.

The report went on to say that accelerated growth is not possible without great harm to Cambridge and our near neighbours. Harm through even higher housing costs, increased

¹ David Plank. *Cambridge: Growth Beyond Reason*. The Cambridge Commons. June 2020.

<https://www.thecambridgecommons.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/TCC-GBR-report-v2.pdf>

² Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority, Growth Ambition Statement, and Non-Statutory Spatial Framework Phase One.

³ Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Industrial Strategy. HM Government, July 2019, page 15

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/818886/Cambridge_SINGLE_PAGE.pdf

⁴ Report of the Independent Economic Commission. Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority. 2018.

traffic congestion and delay, even more unreliable public transport, environmental pollution exacerbating the climate emergency, yet more “densification” within Cambridge itself such as the threatened development of St Matthew’s Piece, destruction of large parts of the Green Belt which, according to our current Local Plan, is essential to the “special character” of Cambridge and our neighbouring villages, and excessive strain on our health, education and other social infrastructure. The least well off and able to cope would suffer most.

The report asked, “Is not this growth beyond reason” and “whose place is Cambridge anyway – does it belong to the people who live here or the powers that be?” Eleven recommendations were made to “get back some control over what we hold dear.”

UPDATE

Jobs growth

Because up to date forecasts of job numbers were not available at that time, *Growth Beyond Reason* highlighted the unacceptably high level of housing growth the Local Plan authorities anticipate. But in our fast-growing area this is driven primarily by the rate of jobs growth not by increased household formation or endogenous population growth. Therefore, information on recent jobs growth has been obtained to understand better what is going on.

This makes clear that the high level of economic growth demanded by its advocates, would be on top of an already remarkably high rate of growth. Jobs in Greater Cambridge increased by one third between 2000 and 2018 (from 162,000 to 216,000) and more rapidly by one quarter in the last six years of that period (from 174,000 in 2012). That is by an additional 7,000 jobs each year over the last six years. **If the average annual rate growth of the last six years was to be repeated up to 2040 – the end date of the new Local Plan – an additional 154,000 jobs would have been created since 2018, i.e. an increase to a total of 370,000 – or more than double the number of jobs in 2000** (an increase of 128%). This would be absurd were it not a logical consequence of where we are now. [See the table in **Annex One**]

AND, according to “The First Conversation”, the public consultation document which started the new Local Plan process last February, there are already another 135 hectares of land in Greater Cambridge allocated and available for economic development – including, for example the land in one of the “six key districts” off Hills Road on which the Flying Pig stands, currently the subject of a planning application for 580,000 square feet of office space, i.e. an 84 per cent increase on the space already provided and permitted in Station Road (690,000 square feet). 135 hectares is equivalent to 2,700,000 square metres, or 14,531,279 square feet.

It is this seemingly uncontrolled market induced economic growth which is driving the unsustainable pressure for growth in housing, physical and social infrastructure – and in traffic congestion and pollution.

Covid's reduction in the latter is temporary not permanent – many jobs in our area and elsewhere cannot be done wholly remotely, nor would that be healthy for workers. Also, witness the fact that “road traffic congestion in outer London is now far higher than it was last year”. [Fiona Harvey, Road congestion levels in outer London higher than before lockdown, The Guardian, 15.09.2020]⁵

Hopefully, Covid's reduction in our use of public transport in favour of the private car will be temporary. Whether or not this is the case, the sheer growth in jobs guarantees yet more cars on the road. On my doorstep, the Cambridge Biomedical Campus is already committed to increase the number of its staff from 17,250 now to 26,000 by 2031 and up to 30,000 beyond then – plus many more hospital patients and visitors, with two new hospitals planned on the site – including the recently funded Cambridge Cancer Research Hospital.⁶ And this is only one of the “six key districts” in Cambridge where, according to the Local Transport Plan, “Future growth is expected to be focused...” [Paragraph 3.53, page 95⁷]

In the immediate future, the number of jobs in Cambridge may not grow at the same high rate due to loss of some lower paid, insecure jobs in the hospitality sector in particular as a result of Covid. This requires careful mitigation of the great distress it is causing, but should not last. There is also the need to replace the high skills engineering jobs due to be lost on Marshall's relocation to Cranfield University's Global Research Airport.⁸ Nevertheless, the higher paid added value jobs in the ICT and life sciences are buoyant and continue to grow apace.

It is clear that the high rate of jobs growth over the last twenty years, particularly in the digital and life sciences sector, cannot be maintained let alone increased without unacceptable harm to our quality of life – including the loss forever of the “special character” of Cambridge and of our near neighbours. It must be restrained. This cannot be a question of whether but how.

Must jobs growth be located in Cambridge? The case for “Agglomeration”

High growth in Greater Cambridge at the level demanded by government and others would not only irreversibly harm our area but also add to the decades long neglect of the very areas in our county and country who rightly express strong resentment at their continued unfair exclusion from the high value-added economic growth they most need. It would act

⁵ <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/sep/15/road-congestion-levels-in-outer-london-higher-than-before-lockdown>

⁶ Cambridge Independent, 7-13 October 2020, pages 8-9.

⁷ <https://cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/assets/Transport/LTP.pdf>

⁸ Cambridge Independent, 7-13 October 2020, pages 54-55.

against the “levelling up” demanded by the government – allowing it to remain the mere rhetoric voiced by so many governments since the dynamic postwar new towns’ movement.

Despite this, the high economic growth lobby assert as a matter of fact that all of the growth must be in Cambridge or nearby on the ground of “agglomeration”. This is stated most audibly by the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Independent Economic Commission set up and selected by Mayor James Palmer and the Combined Authority. The Commission’s Report, which astonishingly makes no mention of the environment, states boldly:

“Cambridge is at a decisive moment in its history where it must choose whether it wants to once again reshape itself for growth, or let itself stagnate and wither... a dispersal strategy is unlikely to be successful, as it is ‘agglomeration’ that attracts companies to the area.”

I have searched for evidence to support this assertion and have found nothing conclusive so far.

Wikipedia’s entry on agglomeration denotes the lack of agreement on the assertion when it says “This article has multiple issues. Please help improve it...” Nonetheless, its summary of benefits and disadvantages is useful:

Benefits:

- Low transport costs
- A great (local) market
- A large supply of labour and thus the increased chance of supply and demand for labour, particularly for specialists to compensate for fast matching, lower search costs
- The accumulation of knowledge and human capital leads to “knowledge spillovers” between firms.

Note that all of these benefits are for companies.

Disadvantages:

- Strong environmental pressures
- High land prices
- Bottlenecks in public goods (e.g. poor/overburdened infrastructure)
- Corruption
- High competitive pressure
- Lack of reserve areas
- Economic inequality

[Wikipedia entry, Economies of agglomeration⁹]

Note that all of the disadvantages are for communities, i.e. us.

The disadvantages are familiar to us in Cambridge and to our South Cambridgeshire neighbours. And is it really the case that “knowledge spill-over” depends fundamentally on physical proximity? It is clearly important to have some physical proximity, as reported from the recent annual Berlin ICT Conference (BBC World Service), but surely not all day every day. Home or remote working is also supportive of spill-over as long as there are occasions for human beings to relate to each other in person as well as online. Indeed, the Wikipedia entry supports the view that knowledge spill-over occurs between individuals who are remote from each other as well as those in close proximity. [Wikipedia entry, Knowledge spill-over¹⁰]

A relevant South Korean study does not establish a strong case for industry agglomeration at our stage of the ICT life cycle. The study:

“...investigated knowledge production in the Information and Communication Technology (ICT) industry in the capital area around Seoul, South Korea and found that distinct patterns can be found depending on the industry life cycle. Leadership by large firms has positive effects on knowledge production during the growth stage (2006–2009), while its effects become insignificant during the maturity stage (2009–2011). This is in line with the expectations of evolutionary agglomeration theory. *The effects of industrial diversity change from negative to insignificant as the ICT industry enters the maturity stage.* In the meantime, competition always has positive effects, while localization always has no significant effects.” (My emphasis)

[Gyu Hwan & In Kwon Park. Agglomeration economies in knowledge production over the industry life cycle in the Seoul Capital Area, South Korea. Published online: 13.10.2015¹¹]

My search of the scant literature left me unconvinced that the case for agglomeration asserted so confidently by our Independent Economic Commission and others has been made, far from it. It does not persuade me that we should accept that it must be Cambridge or bust, with no way in between – no matter how much social and environmental havoc it wreaks on the place where we live – and in the excluded areas deprived yet again of the growth they need and can accommodate with benefit to their quality of life.

⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economies_of_agglomeration

¹⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Knowledge_spillover

¹¹ <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/12265934.2015.1083461?scroll=top&needAccess=true>

Our Environment

Given the environmentally silent nature of much of the pressure on Cambridge to grow even more - witness in particular the Independent Economic Commission's complete silence on this existential matter - it is important to remind ourselves briefly how our environment is doing, using biodiversity as a critical indicator.¹²

At the same time as pressing hard for yet more jobs in Cambridge no matter what the consequences, the government is admitting, albeit in characteristically Panglossian manner, that it is falling behind its international environmental commitments. Most recently, it reported that our United Nations biodiversity targets are being missed left, right and centre – to be precise 85 per cent of them are. [Phoebe Weston, “Lost decade for nature”, as UK fails on 17 of 20 UN biodiversity targets, *Guardian*, 14.09.2020¹³] ¹⁴

Locally, Cambridge City Council declared a biodiversity emergency in May last year “to reverse the decline in biodiversity in and around Cambridge”, noting “with concern ... that Cambridgeshire & Peterborough ... has one of the lowest percentages of land cover of priority habitats, natural green spaces and designated nature conservation sites in England, with only 5.5% of the land surface having statutory or non-statutory nature conservation designations and only 6.5% being priority habitat.”¹⁵ As pointed out above, there is no guarantee that we will not run out of water. [Footnote 5, main report] And our biodiversity remains at severe risk from intensive agricultural methods and economic growth induced physical development such as the planned Cambridge South Station, Clare College's desire to build more houses, and the proposed southern portal for the Cambridge Autonomous Metro - all of which have a detrimental effect on Trumpington's “Green Corridor” – one of four into Cambridge.¹⁶

This is an existentially serious situation.

¹² Other than one sentence on page 22, the Government's Local Industrial Strategy for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough also does not mention the environment until page 80 - and then superficially without any appreciation of the critical environmental context.
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/818886/Cambridge_SINGLE_PAGE.pdf

¹³ <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2020/sep/14/lost-decade-for-nature-as-uk-fails-on-17-of-20-un-biodiversity-targets-aoe>

¹⁴ See also Damian Carrington, “Populations of UK's most important wildlife have plummeted since 1970”. The Guardian, 3 October 2019. Based on the 2019 State of Nature Report, National Biodiversity Network Trust.

¹⁵ <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/media/7485/motion-to-declare-a-biodiversity-emergency-2019-05.pdf>

¹⁶ Clay Farm, Cambridge, Green Corridor Strategic Landscape, October 2010
<https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/s2827/Appendix%204%20-%2020070620OUT%20Strategic%20Landscape%20Proposals.pdf>

Housing need

There is an impression on the part of some that making the case against high growth is letting down those who need good housing in Cambridge or close by – our daughters and sons who cannot afford to live here and are commuting at great financial, social and personal cost. While I understand this concern, it misses the point. *Unless jobs growth is curbed, the associated housing growth will NOT house those we care for.* Because housing supply is constantly playing catch up, purchase prices and rents continue to rise, including for more distant housing with its additional commuting costs. This makes it more difficult for local people not less - with even more straitened resources as housing and travel costs continue to outstrip median incomes.

The current Local Plan already provides for housing growth of 33,500 new homes between 2011 and 2031 at a rate of 1,675 per year. [The First Conversation, page 60] But this will not solve the housing difficulties of our people unless the jobs nettle is grasped – jobs which are growing at a rate of 7,000 per year. *Better housing for our people in Greater Cambridge requires a significantly lower rate of jobs growth.*

It also requires radical change in the housing market. On its own, increasing the housing supply does not produce truly affordable, secure, good quality housing. Determined government intervention in the market is also required to change this – through, for example: rent controls related to what people can afford, large investment in social housing including a major mutualization programme in both sectors of the housing market, sponsorship of major housing co-operatives/public benefit housing associations, more security for private sector tenants, curbs on speculative investment in private sector housing, abolition of restrictive legislation such as the financial viability tests and presumption for development, and a statutory requirement on developers to build social housing, which they can well afford. Experience shows that without such measures the private sector will not deliver, given the incentives for shareholders to restrict housing supply and hold back land from development until prices rise and high profits can be extracted.¹⁷

However, these housing policy measures are not available to us at present, and we are obliged to act in the world as it is by taking what small steps we can such as the funding for 500 new council houses Cambridge City Council secured from the devolution deal. But it is only 500 and the right to buy still applies - as it does to the increased supply of social

¹⁷ Steve Howell - <https://www.bigissue.com/latest/landbanking-construction-companies-still-hoarding-land/> 30.07.2019

Oliver Wainwright - <https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2017/jan/31/britain-land-housing-crisis-developers-not-building-land-banking> 31.01.2017

housing which will hopefully flow from the welcome decision to lift the borrowing caps from local authority Housing Revenue Accounts with effect from 29 October 2018.¹⁸

No matter what the national housing policy position is, in our area it is clear that unless the rate of jobs growth is cut substantially, decent housing which our people can afford will continue be way out of reach. Increasing the supply of housing on its own with all its collateral damage, will not make it easier for those we hold dear. This would be the worst of all possible worlds.

Greater Cambridge Local Plan

Clearly, at the more fundamental level, as a society we need to move rapidly away from the deep-seated view within most of us, almost as part of our DNA, that economic growth is necessarily an unmitigated good because clearly it is not. In our circumstances, it causes harm for the many as well as benefit, particularly for the few. However, if a new direction is taken, it will take time.

More immediately, there is an opportunity to change for the better away from the remorseless push for boundless growth with its existential threat to our area – an opportunity through the Greater Cambridge Local Plan which is under review. It allocates land for development over the next 20 years – strongly influences our surroundings – the place we live in and experience daily – things that are very important to us as individuals and communities.

Local Plans are governed by restrictive national policy, but there **is** scope to shape the content of the new Plan– **if** there is the political will to do so in Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Councils - which is in part down to us.

YET the “First Conversation” document which started the review process, anticipates growth of *at least* 41,000 additional homes by 2040, and if economic growth continues, up to 66,700. [See footnote 5] **This could mean as many new homes in the next 20 years as were achieved in the previous 2,000.** This is entirely unacceptable and must change. The Councils say they are not working to these figures but their public commitment to high economic growth is seen by many to bely this.

The “Call for Sites” – part of the statutory Local Plan process – has produced an unorderedly queue of developers vying to get land designated for development in the new Local Plan – much of it in the Green Belt. There are over 600 bids, many for large jobs and housing growth in both Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. This is alarming.

For example, in my area Trumpington, Grosvenor has bid to build more than 700 additional houses on Green Belt land which would completely close the precious green space between

¹⁸ <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/sn06416/>

the yet to be completed Trumpington Meadows housing development and the M11; and alongside it across Hauxton Road also on Green Belt land, Jesus College plans to build an 85,000 square metre research/science park and 1,250 additional homes on 170 hectares of Green Belt land between Hauxton Road, Addenbrooke's Road and alongside the River Cam stretching towards Great Shelford - with the obligatory new "country park" of course!

It is imperative that the Local Plan restricts economic growth in our area, in particular the growth in jobs that requires yet more housing and infrastructure to the detriment of our commonwealth. It is possible that there are forms of beneficial economic growth which do not entail yet more jobs; opportunities for this should be explored. It is also highly desirable that economic growth creating high added value jobs in unfairly deprived parts of our county and country should be led and inspired by Cambridge's success. The Greater Cambridge Local Plan should take full account of this opportunity. To the same end, as urged in the eleventh recommendation in *Cambridge: Growth Beyond Reason*, concerted effort should be made now to form an alliance between the advocates of high economic growth and our public authorities to drive a joint diversification initiative forward.

[Reproduced in **Annex Two**]

Restraining the rate of jobs growth is crucial if we are not to end up with the worst of all possible worlds, in which yet more Cambridge people are driven out of the place in which we work but cannot afford to live, or are crowded into the hutches for which planning applications are being made within Cambridge - and Cambridge's "special character" (as prioritized in the current Local Plan) is destroyed with major loss of areas in Greater Cambridge's Green Belt.

All eleven of the recommendations made in *Cambridge: Growth Beyond Reason* relate in one way or another to the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. If they are taken seriously and acted upon by the two Local Plan authorities, the "perfect storm" it anticipates may be averted. However, to ensure the two authorities' intervention is incisive enough, it is imperative that they commit themselves at an early date to a level of jobs growth which is significantly lower than provided for in the current Local Plan. In practice if not intention, this growth is predominantly market determined as there are already 135 hectares of land allocated and available for economic growth.

In reality, there is no need for the authorities to increase this allocation to accommodate annual increases in the number of jobs at or above the annual rate of the last six years. Therefore, it is essential that a significant proportion of this land is "de-designated" so that it is no longer available for economic development. Our planners may say that a proportion of this land will never be developed as its location is not attractive in market/developer terms. But unless the total amount of designated land is reduced there will be strong pressure to designate other areas for economic development in substitution for designated land that is less attractive to the market. It is probable that the new areas would be in and around Cambridge, many in the Green Belt.

Therefore, a **twelfth recommendation** is made that: *Urges the Local Plan authorities to reduce significantly the level of jobs growth in our area for which provision is made in the Local Plan - and to this end to reduce significantly the total amount of land currently designated for economic development and to reject bids to bring currently non-designated land into the total available for economic development.*

This recommendation should be addressed in tandem with the last of the current recommendations “to develop an agglomeration transfer/sharing model ... to ensure that the less favoured/excluded parts of our county and country ... benefit equally with others from the high added value industry so successfully created in Cambridge.” [Annex Two]

A Perfect Storm

Cambridge: Growth Beyond Reason predicted that unless there is a significant change of direction in our area, “...a perfect storm is brewing, with S.S. Greater Cambridge at full steam ahead, with a pilot apparently determined to plot a course towards the gathering clouds just over the horizon, no matter what the size of the cresting waves ahead.” [Pages 20-21] The engine in the ship’s boiler room, is jobs growth.

The authorities are planning over the next 20 years to increase the existing number of houses in Greater Cambridge by between one third and one half to support a high ambition level of economic growth which aims over the next 30 years to double Gross Added Value from £22 billion to more than £40 billion a year across the Combined Authority’s area, a disproportionate part of which would take place in “six key districts”, all of which are in Cambridge. Jobs have already grown by one-third since 2000 and by one quarter in the last six years at the rate of 7,000 additional jobs each year - with every sign that unless control is exerted this rate will continue or increase. We are already struggling not to fall even further behind remorselessly increasing traffic, congestion, delays and journey lengths – our place’s special character is beginning to be eroded before our eyes – and a Climate Emergency has been declared by the City Council. Yet we are told we are not doing our bit for the country and need to pull our socks up to accommodate even more jobs growth.

A better future is possible for Cambridge and our neighbours - **if** we act to secure it. If taken seriously and acted on, my recommendations with the crucial addition made in this update, will help us to get back some control over what we hold dear – to help prevent the imminent climate catastrophe, restrict out of control economic development while creating good secure jobs elsewhere in more deprived areas as well as here, and provide decent and sustainable housing which we can afford, not too far away from work on affordable public transport – while also nurturing a sense of place and identity for the future which values what we are fortunate enough to have inherited from the past, and is at great risk.

David Plank
October 2020

Jobs in Greater Cambridge 2000 - 2018

Year	Jobs		
	Cambridge	South Cambridgeshire	Greater Cambridge
2000	93,000	69,000	162,000
2012	100,000	74,000	174,000
2018	122,000	94,000	216,000

Office for National Statistics, Labour Market Statistics (Source: Nomis)

Percentage increase:

Years	Cambridge %	South Cambridgeshire %	Greater Cambridge %
2000- 2018	31	36	33
2012- 2018	22	27	24

Cambridge: Growth Beyond Reason – Report

Recommendations

Individually and collectively we should:

- Express great concern at the social, climate emergency, environmental, place and other serious implications for our City and for Greater Cambridge more widely, of the unsustainably high levels of economic growth urged on us by the government in its Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Industrial Strategy of July 2019 – and in the “higher level of ambition for economic growth and development” planned for the Greater Cambridge area by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority/ Mayor in their “Strategic Spatial Framework” and “Growth Ambition Statement”; a level to which, in the “The First Conversation”, our Local Plan authorities, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, state they are committed.
- Urge the Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council to replace their commitment to this level of economic growth and development with a different commitment which facilitates truly sustainable growth for the commonweal – economic, social, place and environmental – which will deliver a net zero carbon near future, to which we understand Cambridge City Council to be committed - while also nurturing a sense of place and identity for the future which values what we are fortunate enough to have inherited from the past.
- Note with alarm the incompatibility of the higher level of ambition for economic growth and development with the Intergovernmental Climate Change Panel’s call to cut global emissions in half by 2030 to have a chance of keeping global heating within safe limits; the Combined Authority’s less precise commitment “... to significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 2050”; and Cambridge City Council’s Declaration of a Climate Emergency;
- Urge that the Greater Cambridge Local Plan now in preparation, rejects as its basis the level of economic growth and development pressed upon us by the government and the Combined Authority, and mirrored in “The First Conversation’s” suggestion that “flexibility” may need to be included in the Plan through the provision of an additional 66,700 new homes during this period (2017 – 2040) should the recent high level of growth in the number of jobs continue;
- While noting the ultimate power central government has to determine economic and housing growth in Local Plans, and seeking to support Cambridge City Council in its Declaration of a Climate Emergency – Urge Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council to keep economic growth and housing development in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan at the very least to the lower end of the number possible –

and, preferably, well below the level of housing growth set as a minimum by the Government's new "standard method";

Demand that as a next step in the development of the Local Plan, serious and active consideration be given to lower level growth options for alternative futures including: (i) capping jobs and housing growth at the already considerable level planned by 2031 in the currently approved Local Plan (33,500 additional homes between 2011 and 2031 and no more beyond that); and (ii) the government's minimum housing growth target identified through its new "standard method" of around 41,000 additional homes between 2017 and 2040 ("The First Conversation", pages 4 & 60/61);

Recommend that alternative futures to the higher ambition level of economic growth and development in and around Cambridge envisaged in the Strategic Spatial Framework, are assessed and the findings made public before this keystone to the new Greater Cambridge Local Plan is put in place - including the options specified in the preceding recommendation. This assessment to be at whole option level to allow informed comparison between them, and to include a full environment/climate change impact assessment;

Recommend that full assessments are made of the economic, social, traffic/transport, climate emergency, environmental and place implications of the higher level of ambition for economic growth and development for each of the six "key districts" in Cambridge as an important element in the assessments proposed in the two preceding recommendations;

Urge the two Local Plan authorities to include growth as an explicit and distinct theme in the forthcoming draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan, alongside the four themes adopted in "The first conversation", so that it gets the dedicated attention and scrutiny it warrants;

Ask that the Local Plan authorities create more opportunities and allow more time for consultation and interactive engagement with the public during the preparation of the new Plan, including a 12-week consultation period on the draft Plan this autumn;

Last but not least, urge the Local Plan authorities and those who represent the high economic growth school of thought, locally and nationally, to develop an "agglomeration transfer/sharing model" which rejects the easy way out and replaces it with creative and practical determination to ensure that the less favoured/excluded parts of our county and country in the North and Midlands in particular, benefit equally with others from the high added value industry so successfully created in Cambridge.