

# URS

## Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Cambridge Local Plan

Interim SA Report 2

Issues & Options 2  
Site Options

January 2013

United  
Kingdom &  
Ireland



Prepared for:



**Limitations**

URS Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited ("URS") has prepared this Report for the use of Cambridge City Council ("the Client") in accordance with the Agreement under which our services were performed. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report or any other services provided by URS.

The conclusions and recommendations contained in this Report are based upon information provided by others and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested and that such information is accurate. Information obtained by URS has not been independently verified by URS, unless otherwise stated in the Report.

The methodology adopted and the sources of information used by URS in providing its services are outlined in this Report. The work described in this Report was undertaken between August and October 2012 and is based on the conditions encountered and the information available during the said period of time. The scope of this Report and the services are accordingly factually limited by these circumstances.

URS disclaim any undertaking or obligation to advise any person of any change in any matter affecting the Report, which may come or be brought to URS' attention after the date of the Report.

Certain statements made in the Report that are not historical facts may constitute estimates, projections or other forward-looking statements and even though they are based on reasonable assumptions as of the date of the Report, such forward-looking statements by their nature involve risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from the results predicted. URS specifically does not guarantee or warrant any estimate or projections contained in this Report.

**Copyright**

© This Report is the copyright of URS Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited.

URS Infrastructure and Environment UK Limited  
6-8 Greencoat Place  
London, SW1P 1PL

Telephone: +44(0)20 7798 5000  
Fax: +44(0)20 7798 5001

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**INTRODUCTION..... 1**

**1 BACKGROUND .....2**

**2 THIS INTERIM SA REPORT.....2**

**3 SA EXPLAINED .....2**

**PART 1: WHAT’S THE SCOPE OF THE SA? .....4**

**4 INTRODUCTION (TO PART 1).....5**

**5 WHAT IS THE PLAN SEEKING TO ACHIEVE?.....5**

**6 WHAT’S THE SUSTAINABILITY CONTEXT?.....6**

**7 WHAT ARE THE KEY ISSUES THAT SHOULD BE A FOCUS OF THE APPRAISAL?.....7**

**PART 2: WHAT HAS PLAN-MAKING / SA INVOLVED UP TO THIS POINT?.....10**

**8 INTRODUCTION (TO PART 2).....11**

**9 SITE APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY .....11**

**10 DETERMINING REASONABLE SITE ALLOCATION OPTIONS .....12**

**PART 3: WHAT ARE THE APPRAISAL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AT THIS CURRENT STAGE? .....15**

**11 INTRODUCTION (TO PART 3).....16**

**12 APPRAISAL OF SITE OPTIONS.....17**

**PART 4: WHAT ARE THE NEXT STEPS?.....29**

**13 NEXT STEPS .....30**

**14 PREPARATION OF THE DRAFT PLAN .....30**

**APPENDIX I: SUSTAINABILITY CONTEXT IDENTIFIED IN THE SCOPING REPORT .....31**

**APPENDIX 2: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES AND THE SITE APPRAISAL CRITERIA.....36**

**APPENDIX 3: SITE APPRAISAL CRITERIA AND DECISION RULES.....48**

## **INTRODUCTION**

## 1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1.1 URS is commissioned to undertake Sustainability Appraisal (SA) in support of the emerging Cambridge Local Plan. This plan will set out policies to guide the future development of Cambridge to 2031. It will also identify land for specific uses such as housing, employment, open space, Green Belt etc. On adoption, it will replace the current Cambridge Local Plan (2006).
- 1.1.2 SA is a mechanism for considering and communicating the likely effects of a draft plan, and alternatives, in terms of sustainability issues, with a view to avoiding and mitigating adverse effects and maximising the positives. SA of Local Plans is a legal requirement.<sup>1</sup>

## 2 THIS INTERIM SA REPORT

- 2.1.1 At the current stage of plan-making the Council is consulting on site allocation options. As such, this Interim SA Report (voluntary) presents an appraisal of these. This appraisal is presented for the benefit of those who might wish to make representations through the consultation; and, equally, the findings of this report will be taken on-board (alongside representations on the consultation document) by the plan-makers prior to selecting preferred options / preparing the draft plan. The 'story' of how SA findings and recommendations have been taken into account will be told within the SA Report published alongside the draft plan.

## 3 SA EXPLAINED

- 3.1.1 SA must be undertaken in-line with the procedures prescribed by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, which were prepared in order to transpose into national law the EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive.<sup>2</sup>
- 3.1.2 The Regulations require that a report is published for consultation alongside the draft plan that *'identifies, describes and evaluates' the likely significant effects of implementing 'the plan, and reasonable alternatives'*.<sup>3</sup> The report must then be taken into account, alongside consultation responses, when finalising the plan.
- 3.1.3 The Regulations prescribe the information that must be contained within the report, which for the purposes of SA is known as the 'SA Report'. Essentially, there is a need for the SA Report to answer the following four questions:
1. What's the scope of the SA?
    - This question must be answered subsequent to a review of the sustainability context and baseline and consultation with the designated environmental authorities.
  2. What has Plan-making / SA involved up to this point?
    - Preparation of the draft plan must have been informed by at least one earlier plan-making / SA iteration at which point alternatives are assessed.
  3. What are the appraisal findings at this current stage?
    - I.e. what are the likely significant effects of the draft plan and what changes might be made to the plan in order to avoid or mitigate negative effects / enhance the positives.
  4. What happens next?
    - In particular, there is a need to present 'measures envisaged concerning monitoring'.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 require that an SA Report is published for consultation alongside the 'Proposed Submission' Plan document.

<sup>2</sup> Directive 2001/42/EC

<sup>3</sup> Regulation 12(2)

**3.2 Structure of this Interim SA Report**

3.2.1 This report is structured according to the following four SA questions::

- Part 1 answers the question 'What's the scope of the SA?'
- Part 2 answers the question 'What has Plan-making / SA involved up to this point?'
- Part 3 answers the question 'What are the appraisal findings at this current stage?'
- Part 4 answers the question 'What happens next?'

## PART 1: WHAT'S THE SCOPE OF THE SA?

## 4 INTRODUCTION (TO PART 1)

4.1.1 This is Part 1 of the SA Report, the aim of which is to introduce the reader to the scope of the SA. In particular, this Chapter answers the series of questions below:

- What's the Plan seeking to achieve?
- What's the sustainability 'context'?
- What's the sustainability 'baseline' at the current time?
- What's the baseline projection? (i.e. how will Cambridge change in the absence of the Plan)
- What are the key issues that should be a focus of SA?

### 4.2 Consultation on the scope

4.2.1 The Regulations require that: 'When deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information that must be included in the report, the responsible authority shall consult the consultation bodies'. In England, the consultation bodies are Natural England, The Environment Agency and English Heritage.<sup>4</sup> As such, these authorities were consulted on the scope of this SA in February 2012. This consultation was achieved by providing a 'Scoping Report' for their comment. A revised version of the Scoping Report was then published in June 2012 to reflect responses received and changes in Cambridge and the policy context.

4.2.2 The Scoping Report is available at: <http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/Sustainability-Appraisal-Scoping-Report-June2012.pdf>

## 5 WHAT IS THE PLAN SEEKING TO ACHIEVE?

### 5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 The Local Plan will set out policies to guide the future development of Cambridge to 2031. It will also identify land for specific uses such as housing, employment, open space, Green Belt etc. It will be the key document used to determine planning applications for new development in Cambridge. On adoption, it will replace the current Cambridge Local Plan (2006) which does not address some more current issues affecting the city.

### 5.2 Objectives of the Local Plan

5.2.1 The proposed strategic objectives of the emerging Local Plan, as were set out in the Issues and Options Report (June 2012), are as follows:

1. To ensure that all new development contributes to the vision of Cambridge as an environmentally sustainable city, where it is easy for people to make the transition to lifestyles that result in lower carbon dioxide emissions.
2. To ensure that all new developments have a neutral impact on water, contribute to an overall flood risk reduction and help improve the quality of the River Cam and other water features in the city.
3. To ensure that all building development is of the highest quality standard, both in terms of its design and any impact upon its surroundings.

<sup>4</sup> In-line with Article 6(3) of the SEA Directive, these consultation bodies were selected because 'by reason of their specific environmental responsibilities, [they] are likely to be concerned by the environmental effects of implementing plans and programme.'



4. To ensure that all new development contributes to the positive management of change in the historic environment, protecting, enhancing and maintaining the unique qualities and character of the city for the future.
5. To protect and, where appropriate, enhance the character and quality of the appearance of the Cambridge skyline.
6. To protect and enhance the landscape setting of the city and the green corridors penetrating the urban area.
7. To protect and enhance the network of green spaces in the city.
8. To provide new housing to meet the needs of the city and contribute to meeting the needs of the Cambridge Sub-region.
9. To provide an appropriate mix of housing types, sizes and tenures to meet existing and future needs.
10. To assist the creation and maintenance of environmentally sustainable communities, where everyone feels included.
11. To promote and support economic growth in environmentally sustainable and accessible locations.
12. To recognise innovation and enable Cambridge's role as a world leader in higher education, research, and knowledge-based industries.
13. To ensure that Cambridge is a vibrant and thriving city with a varied range of shopping facilities in accessible locations to meet the needs of people living, working and studying in, or visiting, the city.
14. To maintain a high quality of life by maintaining and enhancing provision for open space, sports and recreation as well as ensuring that the city has a broad range of community facilities and leisure activities, including arts and cultural venues that serve Cambridge and the Sub-region.
15. To minimise the distance people need to travel, and to make walking and cycling the first choices of travel.
16. To make it easy for everyone to move around the city, particularly to be able to access jobs and essential services.
17. To ensure adequate provision of environmentally sustainable forms of infrastructure to support the demands of the city.
18. To promote a safe and healthy environment, minimising the impacts of development.

## 6 WHAT'S THE SUSTAINABILITY CONTEXT?

- 6.1.1 An important step when seeking to establish the appropriate 'scope' of an SA involves reviewing 'sustainability context' messages (e.g. issues, objectives or aspirations) set out within relevant published plans, policies, strategies and initiatives (PPSIs). Sustainability context messages are important, as they aid the identification of the 'key sustainability issues' that should be a focus of the SA. Key messages from this review are included in Appendix 1.

## 7 WHAT ARE THE KEY ISSUES THAT SHOULD BE A FOCUS OF THE APPRAISAL?

### 7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 Drawing on the review of the sustainability context and baseline, the Scoping Report was able to identify a range of sustainability issues, included below. These include issues that are relevant across the whole of the City (Thematic Topic Issues), and that are specific to each of the five functional areas (Functional Area Issues). The issues provide a methodological framework for the appraisal, ensuring it remains focused on the important issues.

### 7.2 Thematic Topic Specific Sustainability Issues

- In terms of **communities and well-being**, there is a need to:
  - arrest the trend in increased deprivation particularly within wards to the north and east of Cambridge;
  - improve the health and well-being of Cambridge residents and reduce inequalities in health particularly in the north and east of Cambridge;
  - reduce inequalities in the educational achievement level of economically active adults and develop the opportunities for everyone to acquire the skills needed to find and remain in work;
  - capitalise on the ethnic diversity of the city and its contribution to vibrant and inclusive communities;
  - protect and enhance community, leisure and open space provision, particularly in wards anticipated to experience significant population growth including Trumpington, Castle and Abbey;
  - ensure the timely provision of primary and secondary education in the locations where it is needed;
  - increase delivery of affordable and intermediate housing, in particular one and two bedroom homes;
  - ensure that the design and size of new homes meet the needs of the existing and future population, including the elderly, disabled people and those in poor health; and
  - improve air quality in and around the Cambridge city centre AQMA and along routes to the City including the A14.
- In terms of the **economy**, there is a need to:
  - maintain and capitalise on Cambridge's position as one of the UK's most competitive cities;
  - address pockets of income and employment deprivation particularly in Abbey Ward and Kings Hedges;
  - capitalise on the value that language schools/specialist tutorial colleges contribute to the local economy, but balance this against the increased impact this may have on the housing market;
  - ensure provision of appropriate office space for small and growing high tech businesses and research sectors;
  - consider the need for high-tech headquarters and high-tech manufacturing;
  - consider whether and how to address the on-going loss of industrial floorspace;
  - encourage more sustainable growth of tourism which recognises the pressure it places on the City's transport infrastructure and accommodation need;
  - ensure the continued vitality and viability of the city centre and safeguard the diversity of independent shops in areas such as along Mill Road;
  - protect local shopping provision in district and local centres which provide for people's everyday needs; and
  - ensure adequate provision of convenience shopping in the north west of Cambridge.

- In terms of **transport**, there is a need to:
  - build on the high modal share of cycling in the city centre and encourage cycling for journeys over one mile;
  - reduce the use of the private car and ensure greater access to frequent public transport; and
  - capitalise on the opportunity of new development to discourage private car use and promote the use of more sustainable forms of transport.
- In terms of **water**, there is a need to:
  - ensure developments implement the highest standards of water efficiency and place no additional pressure on water scarcity in the region;
  - improve the water quality of Cambridge’s water courses in line with the Water Framework Directive requirements; and
  - ensure new development takes sewerage infrastructure into account.
- In terms of **flood risk including climate change adaptation**, there is a need to:
  - account for the potential environmental, economic and social cost of flooding for all development proposals;
  - protect and enhance existing natural flood risk management infrastructure and ensure all development incorporates sustainable drainage systems to minimise surface water flood risk; and
  - ensure that new and existing communities are capable of adapting to climate change with consideration given to the role of green and blue infrastructure as well as the layout and massing of new developments.
- In terms of **climate change mitigation and renewable energy**, there is a need to:
  - reduce transport emissions by encouraging cycling and promoting infrastructure for zero emissions vehicles;
  - reduce carbon emissions from all aspects of new developments and ensure development meets the highest standards in low carbon design;
  - account for the whole life carbon cost of new development and transport infrastructure; and
  - ensure greater deployment of energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies.
- In terms of **landscape, townscape and cultural heritage**, there is a need to:
  - ensure the protection and enhancement of the historic environment through appropriate design and scale of new development;
  - actively promote the character and distinctiveness of the Conservation Areas; and
  - ensure the scale of new development is sensitive to the existing key landmark buildings and low lying topography of the City.
- In terms of **biodiversity and green infrastructure**, there is a need to:
  - maintain and build on the success of positive conservation management on local wildlife sites and SSSIs;
  - maintain and improve connectivity between existing green infrastructure in order to provide improved habitats for biodiversity and ensure no further fragmentation of key habitats as a result of new or infill development;
  - capitalise on the opportunity for green infrastructure to help Cambridge adapt to the threats posed by climate change (particularly flooding), and to improve water quality; and
  - ensure new development does not impact on biodiversity including no further loss of biodiversity rich farmland to development.

### 7.3 Functional Area Specific Sustainability Issues

- In terms of **the city centre**, there is a need to:
  - ensure the centre capitalises on the opportunities from growing business sectors;
  - maintain and improve the quality of the Centre as a place to live, work and spend leisure time, while ensuring a safe and welcoming environment; and
  - ensure opportunities to reduce energy demand through renewable and low carbon technologies are maximised.
- In terms of **North Cambridge**, there is a need to:
  - address deprivation across quite expansive areas of the City's northern and north-eastern extents;
  - address flood risk issues;
  - capitalise on opportunities to encourage use of public transport and walking/cycling (including to access the Cambridge Science Park);
  - increase access to high quality open space, particularly within Arbury;
  - support the achievement of identified priorities within the Chesterton / Ferry Lane and De Freville Conservation Areas;
  - encourage high quality design and improve the quality of the public realm within some areas; and
  - develop a co-ordinated policy with South Cambridgeshire District Council for the development of Northern Fringe East.
- In terms of **South Cambridge**, there is a need to
  - address flood risk issues;
  - consider the potential to address deprivation associated with areas to the East;
  - work with developers to facilitate the achievement of successful new communities within the urban extensions;
  - maintain and enhance open spaces and green space within the urban area, and the Green Belt setting;
  - support the achievement of identified priorities within Conservation Areas; and
  - capitalise on opportunities to encourage use of public transport and walking/cycling.
- In terms of **East Cambridge**, there is a need to
  - maintain and enhance open spaces and green space within the urban area, and the Green Belt setting;
  - address deprivation issues across quite expansive areas;
  - maintain the character of particular neighbourhoods; and
  - capitalise on opportunities to encourage use of public transport and walking/cycling.
- In terms of **West Cambridge**, there is a need to
  - maintain and enhance open spaces and green space within the urban area, and the Green Belt setting;
  - maintain the exceptional character of the built environment and address priorities identified within the designated Conservation Areas; and
  - capitalise on opportunities to encourage use of public transport and walking/cycling.

## **PART 2: WHAT HAS PLAN-MAKING / SA INVOLVED UP TO THIS POINT?**

## 8 INTRODUCTION (TO PART 2)

- 8.1.1 The 'story' of plan-making / SA up to this point is told within this part of the SA Report. Specifically, this chapter explains how, as an interim plan-making / SA step:
- The site appraisal methodology was developed
  - The Council determined a list of 'reasonable' site options

### *What will be included within Part 2 of the SA Report?*

Part 2 of the final SA Report (which will be published for consultation alongside the Proposed Submission Plan), will tell the story of how the council determined reasonable site options (and reasonable alternatives for other plan issues), and will also explain why the Council selected the preferred approach. As part of this explanation, reference will be made to the influence of interim SA, including the interim SA findings presented within Part 3 of this Report.

## 9 SITE APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY

- 9.1.1 Two pro formas which incorporated a strict 'appraisal criteria' based methodology were developed to appraise the sites. One pro forma was developed jointly by the plan-making teams at Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council (with advice from URS) to appraise sites within the fringe locations (i.e. areas on the edge of Cambridge that straddle the boundary between the two authorities), and another was developed by plan-makers at Cambridge City Council / URS to appraise the sites within Cambridge City only. There was a need to develop two separate pro formas in order to account for differences between the sustainability issues, identified through scoping, for the two Council areas.
- 9.1.2 The fringe sites pro forma was designed to take into account the sustainability issues of both Councils, as far as possible, while the city sites pro forma was designed to reflect, as far as possible, only the sustainability issues for Cambridge City. However, it should be noted that data availability can limit the scope of what is possible to ask/answer in terms of the site appraisal criteria. This is due to the strategic nature of the appraisal process and the fact that detailed information on individual development proposals is unknown at the site allocation stage. Further information on individual developments will become available when development proposals are progressed and submitted as part of the planning application process.
- 9.1.3 The tables in Appendix 2 present the relationship between the sustainability issues and the site appraisal criteria. In addition to the inclusion of sustainability criteria, the pro formas contained a range of criteria that were included to assist the Council in assessing the sites against planning and deliverability issues. The pro formas were split into two parts with a 'Level 1' and 'Level 2'. Level 1 contained a combination of key sustainability criteria as well as planning and deliverability criteria, while Level 2 contained only sustainability criteria. As SA is concerned solely with sustainability issues, this SA presents the appraisal findings in relation to the SA issues only. The tables also identify the sustainability issues that were not addressed through the site appraisal criteria and provide an explanation as to why this was the case.
- 9.1.4 The pro formas contain a combination of quantitative and qualitative sustainability criteria. The quantitative criteria allows for the analysis of the sites to be undertaken using Geographical Information System (GIS) software, while the inclusion of qualitative criteria enables professional judgement to be drawn upon. For most criteria one of three potential scores was applied using a traffic light categorisation system of 'red/amber/green'. A red categorisation equates to the predication of a 'significant negative impact', an amber categorisation equates to the prediction of a 'moderate negative impact' and a green categorisation equates to the prediction of 'no negative impact or minor negative impact which could potentially be mitigated'. However, for some criteria the categorisation system was extended to five categories (with an additional red red and green green score) to give a finer grained assessment of impact.

- 9.1.5 Several of the criteria apply rules that are quantitative and distance related. The majority of these distances are “as the crow flies” as it was not possible to take account of routes / pathways. This is apart from the distances from district and local centres for the sites within the City, which were based upon existing information on walking catchments. Most distance rules have been developed internally by the plan-making / URS, following a review of thresholds applied as part of Site Allocation / SA processes elsewhere in England. A number of thresholds reflect the assumption that 400m is a distance that is easily walked by those with young children and the elderly.
- 9.1.6 Appendix 3 presents the site appraisal criteria and the decision rules that the city sites have been appraised against. The criteria presented in Appendix 3 include only those identified as relevant for the sustainability appraisal (see Appendix 2). The complete pro formas, including all site assessment criteria can be found within the ‘Issues & Options, Part 1 and Part 2’ reports which are available on Cambridge City Council’s website at: <http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/local-plan-review/>.

## 10 DETERMINING REASONABLE SITE ALLOCATION OPTIONS

- 10.1.1 Cambridge City Council is currently undertaking a second<sup>5</sup> ‘Issues and Options’ stage by consulting on site options. This includes both sites that are on the fringe of Cambridge in the Green Belt and sites that fall entirely within Cambridge City.
- 10.1.2 The site options in the ‘fringe’ area are presented in the report entitled ‘Issues & Options 2, Part 1 – Joint Consultation of Development Strategy & Site Options on the Edge of Cambridge’, and the site options that fall entirely within the Cambridge City Council area are presented in the report entitled ‘Issues & Options 2, Part 2 - Site Options within Cambridge’.
- 10.1.3 Issues & Options 2 – Part 1 and Part 2 present a range of sites including sites that the Council has determined as being ‘reasonable options’, and sites that the Council considers to be ‘unreasonable options’. As the Regulations state that the SA Report should present an appraisal of the ‘*plan and reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and geographical scope of the plan or programme*’, only the ‘reasonable site options’ are appraised within this Interim SA Report.

### 10.2 Approach to sites at the edge of Cambridge

- 10.2.1 Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council worked together to develop a long list of initial sites in the fringe area. An initial long list of 41 fringe sites was identified on the basis of:
- Developers’ site boundaries received from the ‘call for sites’ for the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAAs) carried out by both Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council; and
  - Additional sites identified through the 2012 Inner Green Belt Review as fulfilling Green Belt purposes to a lesser degree.

<sup>5</sup> In June and July 2012 the Council consulted on its first ‘Issues and Options’ document. The document set out for a range of issues, either a) a suggested policy approach or option, where there are no other reasonable alternatives or b) alternative policy approaches (options). An Interim SA Report was published alongside the document that presented an appraisal of all options presented, enabling consultees to draw on findings to inform their representations on the plan.

10.2.2 The long list of fringe sites was jointly assessed by the Councils using the fringe sites pro forma and those sites that scored either **amber** or **green** overall were taken forward as 'reasonable' options and those that scored **red** overall were considered 'unreasonable options'. Following this assessment, six sites were identified as having development potential. All six sites scored **amber** overall. The 'reasonable' site options include two housing sites, two employment sites, one site which could be developed for either housing or employment and one which could be potentially developed for housing, employment or a community stadium.

### 10.3 Approach to sites in the City

10.3.1 A number of sources were used to arrive at a list of sites to assess within Cambridge, including:

- Sites allocated in the existing adopted Cambridge Local Plan 2006, associated Area Action Plans, and Supplementary Planning Documents, which have not been developed.
- Sites identified in the following studies:
  - Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) May 2012
  - Employment Land Review 2007 and 2012 update
  - Cambridge Sub Region Retail Study 2008
  - Gypsy and Traveller Provision in Cambridge: Site Assessment
  - Cambridge Hotel Futures: Headline Findings Issues & Options Report April 2012
  - Inner Green Belt Boundary Study 2001; Green Belt Study 2002; 2012 Green Belt Reappraisal
  - Other documents e.g. those produced by Cambridgeshire Horizons
- Any sites and site boundaries identified by the Council within the Issues and Options Consultation (June 2012)
- Any sites subsequently submitted by landowners and developers or their agents in their responses to the Council's Issues and Options consultation June 2012
- Any sites identified by the Council's own internal directorates, other Councils, statutory government agencies, and statutory undertakers

10.3.2 Sites were assessed to see whether they were suitable for allocation for the following uses or a mix of these uses:

- Housing
- Employment
- Retail
- Leisure uses
- Community facilities
- Tourism uses
- Gypsy and Traveller sites



- 10.3.3 This long list of sites was initially reduced by removing those sites which had already been consulted upon in the Issues and Options 1 consultation in June/July 2012, those less than 0.5 hectares<sup>6</sup> (apart from a small number of residential sites which due to their location could be developed at a high density), and those where planning permission had been granted. This resulted in 28 residential sites, 10 employment sites, 11 mixed use sites, 4 sites for university use, 3 sites for hotels, 2 sites for residential moorings, and 1 site for gypsies and travellers (in some cases the same site was assessed in relation to it's potential for more than one use, so there is some double counting). All of these sites were then assessed by Cambridge City Council using the city sites pro forma. Officers within the City Council and at Cambridgeshire County Council with expertise in the different areas covered by the pro forma were consulted to fill in the relevant components.
- 10.3.4 All of the sites were assessed in relation to all of the criteria, in order to give the most comprehensive and robust assessment possible.
- 10.3.5 33 sites scored 'amber' or 'green' as the overall conclusion across the Level 1 and Level 2 criteria and are therefore considered by the Council to be 'reasonable' options. All of these sites have been subjected to sustainability appraisal, the findings of which are presented in Part 3 of this report. The sites which scored 'red' in the overall conclusion were considered to be 'unreasonable options' for potential allocation in the Plan. As such these sites have not been included as part of this appraisal.

---

<sup>6</sup> Sites of less than 0.5ha in size have been assessed as part of the City Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), but will not be allocated in the Local Plan because they are not of a strategic size. The contribution that these sites can make to the City's housing provision will be assessed as part of the Council's forthcoming SHLAA update.

## **PART 3: WHAT ARE THE APPRAISAL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AT THIS CURRENT STAGE?**

## 11 INTRODUCTION (TO PART 3)

11.1.1 This section presents the SA findings in relation to the sites that the Council has identified as being ‘reasonable’ options. The findings of the full site assessments that the Council undertook to enable the identification of the ‘reasonable’ options are presented in the Council’s ‘Issues and Options 2, Part 1 and 2’ reports that are published for consultation alongside this report.

The following section presents:

- the SA findings of the reasonable site options; and
- the SA findings of the cumulative effects of the sites by functional area

### 11.2 SA Findings of the reasonable site options

11.2.1 The tables in the section below present the first part of the SA which involved an appraisal of the performance of the individual sites, which are grouped by functional area, against the sustainability appraisal issues as they relate to the site appraisal criteria. Please note that the site appraisal criteria have been re-ordered from the site pro formas to align with the topics for the sustainability appraisal. The column down the right hand side of each of the tables presents the SA findings of the individual sites against the key sustainability issues that were identified through scoping.

11.2.2 As noted above in addition to the inclusion of sustainability criteria, the pro formas contained a range of criteria that were included to assist the Council in assessing the sites against planning and deliverability issues. As SA is concerned solely with sustainability issues, this SA presents the appraisal findings in relation to these issues only.

11.2.3 The six fringe sites fall within only two of the functional areas; five sites are located in functional area south and one site is located in functional area north. Due to the different criteria for the city and fringe sites pro formas the SA findings for functional area south and north are presented across two tables; the first presents the SA findings for the city sites, and the second presents the SA findings for the fringe sites.

11.2.4 Appendix 3 presents the site appraisal criteria and the red/red/amber/green/green decision rules that the city and fringe sites have been appraised against.

### 11.3 SA findings of the cumulative effects of the sites by functional area

11.3.1 In addition to the appraisal of the individual sites the second part of the SA involved carrying out an appraisal of the cumulative effects of the ‘reasonable’ site options within each functional area against the functional area specific sustainability issues.

11.3.2 The SA findings of the cumulative effects, which include recommendations for mitigating against potential adverse effects, where appropriate, are presented below each of the tables in the following section.

**12 APPRAISAL OF SITE OPTIONS**
**12.1 City Centre**

	Health Fac.	Noise & Vib.	Light Pollution	Odour	Contamination	PDL	Comm. Facilities	Protected Space	Replace Space	Space Standards	Outdoor Sports	Play Space	Green Space	Secondary Sch.	Primary Sch.	AQMA	Air Quality	Emp. Centre	Deprived Area	Loss Emp. Land	Cycle Routes	Public Transport	Train Station	City Edge	Dist/local centre	Source PZ	Fluvial Flooding	Surface Flooding	SAM	Listed buildings	Historic Park	Cons. Area	Local Interest	Green Belt Loss	SSSI	Local Wildlife	Green Infra.	Imp. Biodiversity	TPOs									
<b>R19</b>																																																
<b>E5</b>																																																
<b>M4</b>																																																
<b>M5</b>																																																
<b>U1</b>																																																

**Sustainability Appraisal**
**64 – 68 Newmarket Road: Residential**

The site is relatively unconstrained across many of the sustainability areas, most notably in terms of the communities and well-being issues. This is due to its location within the city centre where many key facilities are located and its proximity to accessible natural greenspace. It should however be noted that the site is constrained due to its location within an AQMA. Although the site is located more than 800m from the train station it performs well in terms of promoting sustainable transport options due to its proximity to the City's bus services.

**1 & 7-11 Hills Road: Employment**

This site performs well across a broad range of sustainability issues and is relatively unconstrained in terms of landscape, townscape and cultural heritage issues, the transport related issues and many of the communities and well-being issues due to its proximity to key services including schools and health facilities and proximity to accessible natural greenspace. There is one potentially significant negative constraint identified in the communities and well-being category, this being the site's location within an AQMA. The site is also potentially significantly constrained in terms of flood risk in that it is known to experience fairly significant amounts of surface water flooding. Development of the site would require mitigation which could present the opportunity for improvements to be made to existing green infrastructure provision in the area.

**Police Station, Parkside: Mixed use**

The site is relatively free of constraints across the majority of the sustainability issues, which is largely due to its location within the city centre and its proximity to a number of facilities and services within the City Centre and Mill Road West. The only two notable significant constraints facing the site are its location within an AQMA and that it is located more than 800m from the train station. It should, however, be noted that as well as having good access to local cycle routes it is within 400m of bus services that link the site to other parts of the city centre and beyond.

**82 - 90 Hills Road and 57 - 63 Bateman Street: Mixed use**

The site performs well across the majority of sustainability issues and performs particularly well against many of the community and well-being issues due to its proximity to key services such as schools and health facilities. Its greatest constraints are that it is within an AQMA and in proximity to a historic park/garden, a conservation area and buildings of local importance, although any adverse impacts could potentially be mitigated. There are also narrow cycle lanes and high traffic volumes. Also its distance from any accessible natural green space (the closest is more than 400m from the site).

**Old Press, Mill Lane: University use**

The site performs well against a number of the community and well-being issues due in large part to its proximity to key services and accessible natural green space. It could however be potentially significantly constrained in relation to the townscape and cultural heritage issues due to the presence of listed buildings on the site, though requiring future development on the site to be of high quality design could help ensure the protection and enhancement of the surrounding environment. The site could also be potentially significantly constrained in terms

U2		<p>of the flood related issues due to its susceptibility to surface water flooding.</p> <p><i>New Museums Site: University use</i></p> <p>The site is relatively free from significant constraints across many of the sustainability issues. The site broadly performs well against the communities and well-being issues due to its proximity to key facilities, though it should be noted that development of the site would not result in the loss of the Whipple Museum, an important local community facility. The site is also significantly constrained in terms of its location within an AQMA. Although the site is over 800m from the train station other sustainable transport options, such as cycle and bus routes, are in close proximity.</p>
----	--	--

- 12.1.1 The proposed allocations for the City area include one site for solely residential use, one employment site, two mixed-use sites and two sites for university-uses. If all are built out, this combination of different uses could have positive benefits in terms of helping the city centre maintain a mix of uses.
- 12.1.2 The allocations proposed for the City area could bring about some benefits in terms of capitalising on the opportunities that growing business sectors present. For instance, there is some potential for growth to be encouraged through the allocation of two mixed use sites and one fully employment related site. It should be noted however, that both mixed use sites and the proposed fully residential site will result in the loss of some existing employment space, although it is believed that this can be mitigated through allocations elsewhere. The allocation of two sites for university uses may help to create and maintain profitable relationships between businesses and academic researchers.
- 12.1.3 The proximity of all sites to employment centres, combined with their relatively good access to public transport, may help residents to gain easy access to their work places. In addition, those sites including employment space may benefit from this proximity through the clustering of industries, so creating opportunities to harness the synergistic benefits, such as cooperation and shared services, which such clusters can bring.
- 12.1.4 The effect of these allocations on the quality of life in the City Area will on the most part be positive. All of the sites under consideration are close to health facilities and will result in no loss of community facilities, whilst most sites are also close to outdoor sports facilities and the leisure opportunities they can offer. The majority of the allocations are close to primary and secondary schools and near to play spaces and natural green space. There are also no obvious constraints preventing any of the sites providing minimum on-site provision of public open space.
- 12.1.5 The effect of the allocations on air quality is a matter of some concern. All of the sites are within or adjacent to an AQMA. Of these sites, all could have an adverse effect of air quality, with one of these sites potentially resulting in a significant adverse effect. The effect of these allocations on the health and wellbeing of residents and visitors to the City Area could be significant.
- 12.1.6 One manner in which air quality issues and other environmental and health concerns can be tackled is through the uptake of low carbon technologies for travel. Most of the sites perform well to moderately well in terms of access to good quality cycle routes. The majority of the sites also have good to moderate access to public transport. Distance from a train station tends to be high, apart from the sites on Hills Road, as the train station is at the edge of the city centre area. Proximity to local centres, services and employment and open spaces, plus the allocation of mixed use sites should help to reduce the need to travel and encourage the use of walking and cycling.



12.2 North Cambridge

Cambridge City Sites Appraisal

	Health Fac.	Noise & Vib.	Light Pollution	Odour	Contamination	PDL	Comm. Facilities	Protected Space	Replace Space	Space Standards	Outdoor Sports	Play Space	Green Space	Secondary Sch.	Primary Sch.	AQMA	Air Quality	Emp. Centre	Deprived Area	Loss Emp. Land	Cycle Routes	Public Transport	Train Station	City Edge	Dist/local centre	Source PZ	Fluvial Flooding	Surface Flooding	SAM	Listed buildings	Historic Park	Cons. Area	Local Interest	Green Belt Loss	SSSI	Local Wildlife	Green Infra.	Imp. Biodiversity	TPOs	Sustainability Appraisal				
R1	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	295 Histon Road: Residential The site is relatively unconstrained in terms of landscape, townscape and cultural heritage and biodiversity and green infrastructure issues. The site is more than 800m from the edge of the city centre, the nearest health centre or GP services; and more than 400 m from the nearest area of accessible natural greenspace of 2ha. The site is also not within walking distance of an existing or new train station and has poor cycle infrastructure. Development at this site may result in continued dependence on the private car unless suitable sustainable transport modes are brought forward. The site is at medium risk of surface water flooding and mitigation could affect the built form area. The site is unlikely to provide opportunities to enhance existing natural flood risk management infrastructure.	
R2	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Willowcroft, Histon Road: Residential The site is unconstrained in relation to flood risk and land use and performs well against the landscape, townscape and cultural heritage and biodiversity and green infrastructure issues. However, there are tree preservation orders on site and mitigation would be required. The site is over 800m from the city centre and the existing or proposed train station. High traffic volumes on Histon Road and limited facilities for cyclists will act as a barrier to the uptake of cycling and the continued dependence on the private car. Histon Road Local Centre is within close proximity which may help reduce dependency on private cars for daily needs.	
R3	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	City Football Ground: Residential Development of the site would result in the loss of the Cambridge City Football Club, which would need to be satisfactorily provided in a similarly accessible location. The loss of this site would impact on a number of community and well-being related sustainability issues including the need to protect and enhance community leisure and open space provision. In mitigation, there are six other outdoor facilities within 1km of the site. There is currently poor cycle infrastructure and pedestrian and cycling connectivity near the site. This is unfortunate given the site's close proximity to the city centre and Mitcham's Corner district centre. Opportunities to improve cycling and pedestrian infrastructure could mitigate this.	
R4	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Henry Giles House, Chesterton Road: Residential The site is largely unconstrained and performs well across the majority of sustainability topics and issues. The site is located within 400m of a local bus stop linking the site to the city centre and is located such that it would favour walking and cycling. It is also in close proximity to Jesus Green. These site attributes should help contribute to improving the health and wellbeing of the local community and contribute to reducing transport related emissions, particularly important given the location of the site within an AQMA.	
E1	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Orwell House, Orwell Furlong: Employment This proposed employment site performs well across the majority of sustainability topic issues. Located on previously developed land it will contribute to protecting existing community leisure and open space provision. Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant impacts on sustainability issues relating to protecting townscape and biodiversity and green infrastructure. However, one potential constraint is the hedgerow which is a City Wildlife Site; however this could potentially be mitigated. The site is located over 800m from the City Centre and is not currently well served by bus or train. It is noted that the area will be subject to significant public transport improvement in the future with the new railway station, links to the guided bus and improvements to cycling infrastructure. Existing cycling infrastructure may still help reduce reliance on the private car to access work helping contribute to positive health outcomes. The site is within 1000m of the A14 AQMA and any increase in traffic would contribute to worsening air quality. Surface water flooding is identified as an issue on the site. Appropriate mitigation through green infrastructure could help enhance existing natural flood risk management, improve connectivity between green infrastructure and provide co-benefits for Cambridge to adapt to climate

Sustainability Appraisal		Health Fac.	Noise & Vib.	Light Pollution	Odour	Contamination	PDL	Comm. Facilities	Protected Space	Replace Space	Space Standards	Outdoor Sports	Play Space	Green Space	Secondary Sch.	Primary Sch.	AQMA	Air Quality	Emp. Centre	Deprived Area	Loss Emp. Land	Cycle Routes	Public Transport	Train Station	City Edge	Dist/local centre	Source PZ	Fluvial Flooding	Surface Flooding	SAM	Listed buildings	Historic Park	Cons. Area	Local Interest	Green Belt Loss	SSSI	Local Wildlife	Green Infra.	Imp. Biodiversity	TPOS											
E2	<p>change.</p> <p><i>St Johns Innovation Park: Employment</i></p> <p>Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant impacts on flood risk, landscape or biodiversity and green infrastructure related sustainability issues. The site is 100% previously developed land. The site is over 800m from the city centre, its nearest local centre and the nearest health centre or GP service. The site is within 400m of local bus services and within 400-800m of the proposed train station at the Cambridge Science Park. Current cycling infrastructure is poor but would be improved with the new station. In the short to medium term there is likely to be continued dependency on the private car to access the site for both workers and visitors. Consequently this could lead to worsening air quality in the locality and for the nearby AQMA. Development of the site could contribute to remediation of contaminated land in the locality. The site performs well against the biodiversity and green infrastructure SA issues with the potential to contribute positively to Milton Road Hedgerow City Wildlife Site and the management of existing hedgerows. This would help improve connectivity between existing green infrastructure in the city and beyond.</p> <p><i>Merlin Place: Employment</i></p> <p>The site performs well across the majority of sustainability topics and issues. It is relatively unconstrained in terms of potential impacts on landscape and townscape and biodiversity and green infrastructure related issues. However development at the site could exacerbate local surface water flooding if not carefully mitigated. The site is in close proximity to existing employment centres and within Chesterton Lower Super Output Area which may help address deprivation issues in this area (the area is within 40% of the most deprived areas in England). Potential site constraints include its distance from the city centre, the local centre at Kings Hedges Road and other local services, although it is a site for possible employment rather than residential. The site is currently not accessible via high quality public transport; however the area is expected to be subject to significant public transport improvement in the future with the new railway station, links to the guided bus and improvements to cycling infrastructure. Notwithstanding, depending on the nature of employment at the site it is possible that development could result in worsening air quality over and above the current situation.</p> <p><i>379-381 Milton Road: Mixed use</i></p> <p>It is likely that this allocation will have little or no impact on the landscape, townscape and cultural heritage of the local area. The allocation would not have significant impacts on identified key biodiversity and green infrastructure issues and may provide the opportunity for improving connectivity between existing green infrastructure. The site is at risk of surface water flooding but this could be mitigated. The site is not accessible by high quality public transport, but is only just over 800m from the proposed railway station. The site is currently poorly served by existing cycling infrastructure; however, this may be improved with the proposed station. The site is within 800m of the nearest primary school and within 3km of the nearest secondary school however, these distances are likely to prove a barrier to residents accessing the schools by walking and cycling and reinforce the use of the private car. The local highway capacity is already identified as having insufficient capacity. The site is close to the existing Kings Hedges Road local centre. The allocation of this site would result in development in a deprived area of the City.</p> <p><i>Fen Road: Residential mooring</i></p> <p>This site would result in the change of use from green space to residential moorings. As a result it would have negative impacts on existing green infrastructure and biodiversity dependent on this, but conversely would provide opportunities to benefit aquatic dependent flora and fauna. The site is in an area known for its archaeology and development could provide opportunities for further finds. The site is not particularly well connected to existing local centres or services such as health centres and schools. The site is poorly served by existing public transport infrastructure and opportunities for cycling and walking are also currently limited. Depending on constraints on car ownership for the site, development could lead to a dependence on private car ownership and worsening air quality.</p>																																																		
E3																																																			
M1																																																			
RM 1																																																			



Fringe Site Appraisal

		Sustainability Appraisal																																											
	Health Fac.	Noise & Vib.	Light Pollution	Odour	Contamination	Comm. Facilities	Protected Space	Replace Space	Space Standards	PDL	Secondary Sch.	Primary Sch.	AQMA	Air Quality	Emp. Centre	Deprived Area	Loss Emp. Land	Shop Hierarchy	Cycle Routes	Public Transport	Train Station	Sust. Transport	Dist/local centre	Source PZ	Fluvial Flooding	Surface Flooding	SAM	Listed Buildings	Historic Park	Cons. Area	Local Interest	Greenbelt Overall	SSSI	Local Wildlife	Green Infra.	Imp. Biodiversity	TPOs	Best Ag. Land							
GB6																																													Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road (NIAB3): Residential, employment or community stadium and public open space (Site is within South Cambridgeshire District Council area) The proposal for this site includes substantial areas of new public open space, which may contribute to community well-being. The site is also within or adjacent to one of the 40% most deprived areas in Cambridge, potentially bringing economic benefits to this area. The site makes no use of previously developed land and will result in a loss of Grade 2 agricultural land, which covers the whole site. The majority of the site is within SDC's declared AQMA associated with the A14 and so development here will be within an area of existing poor air quality and has the potential to make this worse.

12.2.1 Nine sites are in North Cambridge and comprise four residential, three employment, one mixed use and one residential mooring site. One further site – Broad location 10: Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road – is also included within this appraisal and lies to the north west of the North Cambridge Functional Area boundary in South Cambridgeshire. This site is proposed for residential and commercial use or a community stadium. Should all four residential sites, in combination with the proposed site in the fringe, be built out for residential use, this area of Cambridge could gain up to 740 new homes.

12.2.2 Apart from one site, all sites perform well against the economic related sustainability issues. The mix of sites within this functional area, in particular the employment and commercial sites and the mixed use site will provide employment opportunities and should help address local deprivation issues. All sites are within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within Cambridge. Furthermore, with nearly 30% of all potential sites there is the opportunity in North Cambridge to capitalise on the inward investment that development of these sites would bring which may help trigger wider regeneration activities across the whole functional area.

12.2.3 In terms of the environmental related sustainability issues the sites perform well. In particular, no site is identified as at risk of fluvial flooding and although some sites are identified as at risk from surface water flooding there is the potential to mitigate this through careful design. While the majority of city sites are on previously developed land and will not result in impacts on the Green Belt, the fringe site is in the Green Belt and is predicted to have an adverse impact. On balance the sites perform well against the biodiversity and green infrastructure related sustainability issues which should help maintain access to leisure and open space provision and contribute to the high quality of the public realm. Only one significant constraint is identified relating to a tree preservation order on one site. Apart from the City Football Ground site all sites have the potential to increase onsite publicly accessible open space. All sites are also within easy access to sports facilities for adults and children.

12.2.4 All sites perform well and are largely unconstrained in relation to protecting Cambridge's townscape and historic environment and no impacts are identified for national nature conservation designations, national heritage assets, listed buildings, historic parks and gardens or buildings of local interest. Only two sites were identified to have potential impacts on the local conservation area - one site is located adjacent to, and one within the Central Conservation area. It is unlikely that the sites would support the achievement of identified priorities within the Chesterton / Ferry Lane and De Freville Conservation Areas. The extent to which development will encompass high quality design and improve the quality of the public realm is unclear at this stage.

12.2.5 Only two city sites (both residential) and the fringe site are identified to have access to high quality public transport; however North Cambridge is expected to benefit from significant public transport improvement in the future with the new Cambridge Science Park railway station, links to the guided bus and associated improvements to cycling infrastructure. Three of the residential sites are considered to have very poor cycling infrastructure provision. Furthermore, apart from the site at Fen Road, all sites are within or adjacent to, or less than 1000m, from an AQMA; and all sites would be expected to result in a worsening of air quality. In order to mitigate the potential reliance on private car and help improve local air quality significant targeted investment in public transport and walking and cycling infrastructure will be required.



12.3

South Cambridge

Cambridge City Sites Appraisal

	Health Fac.	Noise & Vib.	Light Pollution	Odour	Contamination	PDL	Comm. Facilities	Protected Space	Replace Space	Space Standards	Outdoor Sports	Play Space	Green Space	Secondary Sch.	Primary Sch.	AQMA	Air Quality	Emp. Centre	Deprived Area	Loss Emp. Land	Cycle Routes	Public Transport	Train Station	City Edge	Dist/local centre	Source PZ	Fluvial Flooding	Surface Flooding	SAM	Listed buildings	Historic Park	Cons. Area	Local Interest	Green Belt Loss	SSSI	Local Wildlife	Green Infra.	Imp. Biodiversity	TPOs	Sustainability Appraisal						
R13	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	78 And 80 Fulbourn Road: Residential The site is vulnerable to fairly significant levels of surface water flooding in the centre of the site. Mitigation through green infrastructure provision has been recommended, however opportunities for green infrastructure on the site have been assessed as low. Furthermore, the site is partially on greenfield land. Additional adverse impacts relate to the site's distance from the city centre, and poor access to an existing/proposed train station. This is compounded by poor cycle provision along the busy Fulbourn Road. The site does have good access to the bus network. Despite these adverse impacts, the site is relatively unconstrained in terms of landscape, townscape and cultural heritage. In addition, it is close to employment opportunities and is situated in a deprived area.			
R14	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	BT Telephone Exchange And Car Park, Long Road: Residential The site performs well against the majority of the sustainability issues. It is not vulnerable to flooding, doesn't use greenfield land and it is unlikely to have adverse impacts on biodiversity, the townscape, landscape or cultural heritage. The site scores less well in terms of accessibility; it is over 800 metres from the city centre, a district / local centre and Health Centre/GP; more than 400m from nearest area of accessible natural green space of 2ha; and more than 800m from an existing or proposed train station.		
R15	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Glebe Farm: Residential The site is on greenfield land but is part of an existing allocation. Originally set aside for the development of a household recycling centre, the site is now proposed for residential development. It has a number of constraints that relate to accessibility (city centre; health centre/GP and primary school). This is compounded by relatively poor access to sustainable transport modes. It may also have an impact on biodiversity as the site currently supports a declining population of farmland birds.		
R16	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Cambridge Professional Development Centre, Paget Road: Residential The site contains designated open space, however, at present it is proposed that the open space would be excluded from development. If this is the case, the development of the site would have largely positive or neutral impacts on biodiversity, flood risk, employment and cultural heritage related sustainability issues. The site scores relatively poorly in terms of accessibility to the city centre and green space; however this could be mitigated by opening up the retained open space to the public.		
E4	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Church End Industrial Estate: Employment Overall the site has only minor constraints or adverse impacts and on the whole performs well in relation to the sustainability criteria. It does not score well in relation to accessibility to the city centre and district centres and distance from train station. A lack of alternative transport modes could lead to increased reliance on and use of private cars.		
M3	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Michael Young Centre: Mixed use The site performs relatively poorly in terms of distance to the city centre; health centre/GP, primary school and green space. It does however have good access to public transport (with the exception of a train station) and good access to cycle routes. Other adverse impacts relate to air quality, pollution, contamination and noise. It performs well in terms of cultural heritage and proximity to open space helping support community and wellbeing related sustainability issues.

Fringe Sites Appraisal

	Health Fac.	Noise & Vib.	Light Pollution	Odour	Contamination	Comm. Facilities	Protected Space	Replace Space	Space Standards	PDL	Secondary Sch.	Primary Sch.	AQMA	Air Quality	Emp. Centre	Deprived Area	Loss Emp. Land	Shop Hierarchy	Cycle Routes	Public Transport	Train Station	Sust. Transport	Dist/local centre	Source PZ	Fluvial Flooding	Surface Flooding	SAM	Listed Buildings	Historic Park	Cons. Area	Local Interest	Greenbelt Overall	SSSI	Local Wildlife	Green Infra.	Imp. Biodiversity	TPOs	Best Ag. Land			
<b>GB2</b>	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	
<b>GB1</b>	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	
<b>GB4</b>	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
<b>GB3</b>	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
<b>GB5</b>	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow

Sustainability Appraisal

**Land South of Worts' Causeway: Residential**  
 The site is relatively unconstrained regarding landscape, townscape and cultural heritage issues and biodiversity issues. However, the site is adjacent to locally designated wildlife sites and on Grade 2 agricultural land. This allocation would not result in development in a deprived area of the City. The distance of the site to some transport links (bus and train) and to health and primary school services could be a significant constraint. However, the site does score well in terms of promoting sustainable transport choices. The potential size of the new population if the site was brought forward may merit a new local centre being provided in conjunction with site GB1.

**Land North of Worts' Causeway: Residential**  
 The site is likely to have little to no impact on the landscape, townscape and cultural heritage of the area. It may help to support the nearest local centre, although this is over 800m away. The potential size of the new population if the site was brought forward may merit a new local centre being provided in conjunction with site GB2. This allocation would not result in development in a deprived area of the City. This site could have an impact on open space provision. There is approximately 0.5ha of semi-natural green space on site which could not be replaced. The site does not make use of previously developed land

**Fulbourn Road West (2): Employment**  
 This site could potentially be significantly constrained in relation to a number of the community and wellbeing issues. The site is on the edge of an area identified as being of strategic importance for green infrastructure which is proposed for grassland restoration. Cycling provision is poor, with high traffic speeds and the need to cross a busy junction in order to join cycle routes, however there may be opportunities for this to be mitigated. Around 80% of the site is on urban land with the remainder split between Grade 2 and Grade 3 agricultural land.

**Fulbourn Road West (1): Residential or Employment (Site is within South Cambridgeshire District Council area)**  
 This site is on the edge of an area that has been identified as being of strategic importance for green infrastructure which is proposed for chalk grassland restoration. There are no protected trees on the site. This site could potentially be significantly constrained in relation to a number of the community and wellbeing issues. It is greater than 800m from either an existing or proposed train station. Cycling provision is poor, with high traffic speeds and the need to cross a busy junction in order to join cycle routes; however this could potentially be mitigated.

**Fulbourn Road East: Employment**  
 This allocation would not result in development in a deprived area of the City. This site is considered to be particularly constrained in terms of cycling, with no existing provision and high traffic speeds, although this could be potentially mitigated. This site could potentially be significantly constrained in relation to a number of the community and wellbeing issues.

- 12.3.1 A key issue in the Southern area is that this part of the city will experience the greatest development at the fringes, with potential for residential development on five sites in the Green Belt. If all of the residential sites proposed in the Southern area are built out, this would result in 700 new homes in the southern part of the city. The cumulative impacts of this are likely to include increased pressure on the transport network and on community facilities, particularly schools.
- 12.3.2 The sites selected for the Southern area can help contribute to a number of sustainability issues. One such issue is the need to tackle deprivation. Three of the sites are in areas amongst the most deprived in the City. One of these sites will deliver employment space; another will provide housing or employment, and one site will be for housing alone; such developments may help to boost the local economy. All are located in the Cherry Hinton area to the east of the city.

- 12.3.3 In terms of the creation of successful communities, the sites perform well in some respects. For instance, all of the sites are located in close proximity to employment centres and all will result in no loss of community facilities. There are some issues however. One site is near to an AQMA and could result in worsening air quality with implications for health in communities. This could be a particular concern given the moderate to poor access to health facilities available to most of the sites.
- 12.3.4 In terms of reaching services and employment, accessible public transport is within easy to moderately easy reach of all but one site. However, all of the sites are regarded as being distant from a train station. In addition, all five of the proposed residential sites are located more than 800m from the nearest primary school. The results for access to suitable cycle routes are also mixed, with many performing only moderately well, and four of the fringe sites performing particularly badly. It will be important that any new development schemes that come forward on these sites provide investment in new cycle routes and help improve access to existing cycle routes in the area in order to encourage the use of more sustainable travel options. Proximity to employment areas may help to encourage sustainable transport choices. However, the distance of many of the sites from health care facilities may result in a greater use of less sustainable means of transport.
- 12.3.5 The protection and enhancement of open space is a key concern in this area. All of the sites are capable of delivering the minimum standards of onsite public open space provision, with no obvious constraints identified. In addition, all of the sites result in no impact on the Green Belt, or a low impact which could potentially be mitigated. It is worth noting however that six of the sites fail to make use of previously developed land. In addition, two sites will result in the loss of protected open space that cannot be replaced.
- 12.3.6 Finally, in relation to flood risk the sites on the whole perform well. All are considered to be at low risk of fluvial flooding. The majority of sites are also in areas of low risk of surface water flooding, apart from three sites, all of which are residential, are in areas at medium risk.



12.4 East Cambridge

Cambridge City Sites Appraisal

	Health Fac.	Noise & Vib.	Light Pollution	Odour	Contamination	PDL	Comm. Facilities	Protected Space	Replace Space	Space Standards	Outdoor Sports	Play Space	Green Space	Secondary Sch.	Primary Sch.	AQMA	Air Quality	Emp. Centre	Deprived Area	Loss Emp. Land	Cycle Routes	Public Transport	Train Station	City Edge	Dist/local centre	Source PZ	Fluvial Flooding	Surface Flooding	SAM	Listed buildings	Historic Park	Cons. Area	Local Interest	Green Belt Loss	SSSI	Local Wildlife	Green Infra.	Imp. Biodiversity	TPOs	Sustainability Appraisal		
R5																																										<p><b>Camfields Resource Centre And Oil Depot: Residential</b> The greatest constraints facing this site are in relation to aspects of the communities and well-being issues and transport issues. It is located more than 800m from the edge of the Cambridge city centre and more than 800m from the nearest primary school. The site does however benefit from being within 800m of the Barnwell Road local centre and is located within 400m of a high quality public transport service. The site also faces some constraints regarding flooding due to its susceptibility to surface water flooding.</p>
R6																																										<p><b>636-656 Newmarket Road, Holy Cross Church Hall, East Barnwell Community Centre And Meadowlands, Newmarket Road: Residential</b> This site performs well across a broad range of sustainability issues. In particular development of the site would result in more efficient use of the land as well enhancing the quality of provision of the existing community facilities. The site also performs well against economic issues in that it is located within 1km of the nearest employment centre and would result in development within one of Cambridge's most deprived areas (the Abbey Lower Super Output Area). The site's greatest constraints relate to aspects of the communities and well-being issues, for example it is more than 400m from the nearest accessible natural greenspace of 2ha. It is also relatively constrained against the transport issues in that it is more than 800m from the train station and cycling provision in the area is poor. It is however within 400m of bus services..</p>
R7																																										<p><b>The Paddocks, Cherry Hinton Road: Residential</b> This industrial site is relatively free from significant constraints, particularly in terms of landscape, townscape and cultural heritage issues and it performs well against many of the communities and well-being issues. In particular it benefits from being within close proximity to the Adkins Corner local centre which contains facilities including a doctor's surgery. It is also within 1km of the nearest secondary school. The site's greatest constraints are its distance from Cambridge city centre and the train station; however there is a high quality public transport service within close proximity to the site.</p>
R8																																										<p><b>149 Cherry Hinton Road: Residential</b> This site performs well across a broad range of the sustainability issues with its only significant constraint being its distance from Cambridge city centre. It performs well against the majority of the communities and well-being issues as well as the transport issues due to its proximity to the Cherry Hinton Road East and West local centres where a number of key facilities are located, and its proximity to both secondary and primary schools in the area. It is also within 400m of the Coleridge Community College Playing Fields. Development on the site could potentially result in beneficial impacts against the biodiversity and green infrastructure issues through protection of existing habitats and enhancement of landscaping schemes.</p>
R9																																										<p><b>Travis Perkins, Devorshire Road: Residential</b> This site is unconstrained against the majority of the sustainability issues. In particular it performs well against many of the community and well-being issues; for example it is located within 400m of accessible natural green space and is close to a number of local centres and key facilities. The greatest constraints faced by the site are that it is located within an AQMA and the majority of the site is more than 800m away from the closest primary schools, though 40% of the site falls between 400-800m of two local primary schools.</p>

Sustainability Appraisal		Health Fac.	Noise & Vib.	Light Pollution	Odour	Contamination	PDL	Comm. Facilities	Protected Space	Replace Space	Space Standards	Outdoor Sports	Play Space	Green Space	Secondary Sch.	Primary Sch.	AQMA	Air Quality	Emp. Centre	Deprived Area	Loss Emp. Land	Cycle Routes	Public Transport	Train Station	City Edge	Dist/local centre	Source PZ	Fluvial Flooding	Surface Flooding	SAM	Listed buildings	Historic Park	Cons. Area	Local Interest	Green Belt Loss	SSSI	Local Wildlife	Green Infra.	Imp. Biodiversity	TPOs								
R10	<p><i>Mill Road Depot And Adjoining Properties: Residential</i></p> <p>The site has a number of potential constraints across many of the sustainability issues although it faces very few significant constraints - the exceptions are that it is located within an AQMA and there is a lack of cycling provision in the area at present. The site benefits from being located within 400m of bus services and is within 800m of the train station. The site performs relatively well against the biodiversity related sustainability issues as development on the site could potentially offer protection of existing habitats and enhancement in landscaping schemes. The site presents none or limited constraints in terms of the flood risk related issues.</p>																																															
R11	<p><i>Horizons Resource Centre, Coldhams Lane: Residential</i></p> <p>This site has a number of potential constraints across many of the sustainability issues but is particularly constrained in relation to transport. It is more than 800m from the train station, more than 500m from any bus services and has poor cycling provision. The site does however perform well against the communities and well-being issues due to its proximity to local facilities and open space and it would result in development within one of Cambridge's most deprived areas (the Romsey Lower Super Output Area). The site has none or few constraints on landscape, townscape and cultural heritage issues.</p>																																															
R12	<p><i>Ridgeons, 75 Cromwell Road: Residential</i></p> <p>This site has few very significant constraints and performs particularly well against the issues relating to landscape, biodiversity and communities and well-being. The site is within 400m of a number of natural green spaces including the Romsey Recreation ground and Coldhams Common. Development on the site has the potential to make a positive impact on the biodiversity issues through protection of existing habitats and enhancement in landscaping schemes. Although the site is more than 800m from the train station there is good cycling provision close to the site. The site is constrained by its location in an AQMA.</p>																																															
R20	<p><i>Abbey Football Stadium: Residential</i></p> <p>This allocation will result in an area of the City suffering from relative deprivation receiving development. The site is close to an employment centre and will not result in any loss of employment land. As such, it may contribute positively to the local economy. The site is also free from flood risk and is likely to have no impact on the historic setting, landscape or townscape of the City given suitable mitigation. A serious constraint facing the site is the presence of a protected open space of recreational importance. Any future development here would have to ensure that such facilities are re-provided elsewhere in an appropriate manner if significant negative effects are to be avoided.</p>																																															
R21	<p><i>315-349 Mill Road: Residential</i></p> <p>This site performs well against a broad range of issues, particularly the communities and well-being and economy issues. The site is not identified as vulnerable to flooding, it is a brownfield site and it would not result in loss of community facilities or employment land. The site benefits from being within 400m of the Mill Road West District Centre which means that the site has good accessibility to a number of services including health facilities and schools. The greatest constraints facing the site are its distance from the edge of Cambridge City Centre and the train station; however the site benefits from being within 400m of a number of bus services that provide links to the city centre and other areas and also has good cycle links via Madras Road.</p>																																															
M2	<p><i>Clifton Road Industrial Estate: Mixed use</i></p> <p>This site performs well against the communities and well-being and transport issues due to its proximity to key services including schools and the Woodlands GP practice. It also has good links with open and green space due to the Coleridge recreation ground being within 400m of the site, and benefits from good connectivity to the rest of the city as a result of its proximity to a high quality public transport service and cycle routes. The site is potentially constrained with regards to the townscape and cultural heritage issues in that there are a number of listed buildings close to the site, however high quality design could help to mitigate this constraint.</p>																																															

- 12.4.1 The proposed site allocations in the east functional area could result in significant levels of residential development in this part of Cambridge. Should all ten residential sites be built out the result will be the development of more than 800 new houses in the eastern part of the city. This is likely to result in significant impacts on the transport network to the east of the city.
- 12.4.2 When considered collectively against the issues set out for the East area of Cambridge, these sites perform well in a number of respects. In terms of maintaining and enhancing open and green spaces, and the Green Belt setting the sites perform particularly well. The sites considered result in no loss of Green Belt, this is in large part due to the location of the proposed denser residential sites which are located in areas that are already surrounded by housing and are some distance away from the Green Belt. In addition, all sites make use of previously developed land, so ensuring minimal impact on green areas. The majority of the sites are regarded as having no obvious constraints that prevent the site providing minimum onsite provision of public open space and most sites have convenient access to natural green space. One site however would result in the loss of protected open space which is of recreational importance. This could not be incorporated into any new development and so new open space would have to be provided elsewhere in an appropriate manner if significant negative effects are to be avoided.
- 12.4.3 In relation to addressing deprivation, half of the sites are in areas considered to be deprived. Whilst the number of sites in such areas would ideally be greater, those that may be brought forward are spread across the Abbey and Romsey Wards, with two sites in Romney and three in Abbey. As such, these allocations may help to address deprivation across East Cambridge through the development and associated economic activity they bring.
- 12.4.4 The sites mostly perform well in preserving the character of neighbourhoods. However, there is the potential for adverse effects should mitigation measures not be put in place appropriately. Potential effects are numerous and include four sites which could impact upon historic parks and gardens unless development height is restricted; one site adjacent to a Grade 2 listed library; plus one site that is within a conservation area, with two others adjacent. None of the developments proposed appear to be of a size that would affect the character of the neighbourhoods they would become a part of.
- 12.4.5 With the exception of one site which is distant from key bus services, the sites score moderately well to good in relation to public transport access. Scoring for access to rail transport and good quality cycle routes is generally moderate to poor. However, the sites are mostly in close proximity to open space, outdoor sports facilities, play spaces and employment centres, which may itself help to encourage walking and cycling.



## 12.5 West Cambridge

## Cambridge City Sites Appraisal

	Health Fac.	Noise & Vib.	Light Pollution	Odour	Contamination	PDL	Comm. Facilities	Protected Space	Replace Space	Space Standards	Outdoor Sports	Play Space	Green Space	Secondary Sch.	Primary Sch.	AQMA	Air Quality	Emp. Centre	Deprived Area	Loss Emp. Land	Cycle Routes	Public Transport	Train Station	City Edge	Dist/local centre	Source PZ	Fluvial Flooding	Surface Flooding	SAM	Listed buildings	Historic Park	Cons. Area	Local Interest	Green Belt Loss	SSSI	Local Wildlife	Green Infra	Imp. Biodiversity	TPOs	Sustainability Appraisal			
<b>R17</b>																																											<p><i>Mount Pleasant House: Residential</i></p> <p>The site is significantly constrained in terms of access to an existing or proposed train station, and has limited cycle infrastructure. The site is also within an AQMA and continued reliance on private car could contribute to worsening air quality. However, the site is within 400m of bus services. It is not certain the extent to which development would impact landscape, townscape and cultural heritage issues, however good design could potentially mitigate any adverse impacts. This site would result in the loss of employment land and job opportunities. It is not clear the effects this would have on the local economy. Potential contamination on site could limit the nature of residential development or provide justification for remediation.</p>
<b>R18</b>																																											<p><i>21-29 Barton Road: Residential</i></p> <p>Overall the site performs relatively well in terms of the sustainability criteria, for example in relation to flooding, national nature designations, and using previously developed land. However there are a number of potential adverse impacts and a couple of significant constraints. Most notably the site is constrained in terms of accessibility to public transport and consequent reliance on private cars. A potentially significant issue is that the current buildings are described as 'positive unlisted buildings' in the Cambridge Conservation Area and re-development could adversely impact the townscape.</p>

12.5.1 Both site options within West Cambridge, Mount Pleasant House and 21-29 Barton Road, propose residential developments with a combined capacity of 65 units. 21-29 Barton Road is currently in residential use whereas Mount Pleasant House is currently an office block.

12.5.2 Both sites are expected to have either neutral or positive impacts for the environment related sustainability issues. The sites are at relatively low risk of flooding and unlikely to have any impact on national or locally designated wildlife sites. Both sites capitalise on the use of previously developed land, and in doing so will help maintain open spaces and green space within the City. However, neither site provides significant opportunities for enhancing green infrastructure and there are a number of TPOs on each site, the loss of which would impact on local biodiversity.

12.5.3 Allocation of Mount Pleasant House has the potential to impact on a nearby historic town and garden, a building of local interest (itself) and local archaeology. It is also located in the West Cambridge Conservation Area. Barton Road is also a 'positive unlisted building' that has a positive impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It is also in the vicinity of local archaeology interests. The extent to which development at these sites would impact on the local character and Conservation Areas is unclear. However, there is the potential that mitigation measures could be implemented to eliminate or minimise detrimental impacts and enhance positive ones. Due to the distance between the sites no cumulative impacts of development would be expected.

12.5.4 The extent to which the allocations would encourage the use of public transport and walking/cycling is uncertain. Each site is constrained to varying degrees regarding distances to the city centre, a district/local centre, a health centre of primary or secondary schools. While Mount Pleasant House benefits from good access to public transport, cycling conditions would be poor due to the proximity of a busy junction. The opposite is true for Barton Road, which has poor access to public transport but better cycling infrastructure.

12.5.5 Mount Pleasant House is in an AQMA and exposed to poor air quality; however, the loss of the car park at this location may help contribute to improving air quality.

**PART 4: WHAT ARE THE NEXT STEPS?**



**13 NEXT STEPS**

- 13.1.1 This part of the SA Report explains the next steps that will be taken as part of the plan-making / SA process.

**14 PREPARATION OF THE DRAFT PLAN**

- 14.1.1 Once the council plan-makers have had the opportunity to take on-board the implications of the representations made through the 'Issues and Options 2' consultation and the SA findings in this Interim SA report, they will be in a position to prepare the final draft version of the Local Plan, known as the 'Draft Local Plan'. Once the Draft Local Plan has been prepared it will be subjected to SA, with findings set out in an **SA Report**.
- 14.1.2 As well as presenting appraisal findings in relation to the draft plan, the SA Report will also present an explanation of why the Council has selected the preferred approach. As part of this explanation, reference will be made to the findings of Sustainability Appraisal (i.e. the findings set out within this, as well as the first, Interim SA report).
- 14.1.3 The Draft Local Plan will then be published for consultation, with the SA Report published alongside it.

## APPENDIX 1: SUSTAINABILITY CONTEXT IDENTIFIED IN THE SCOPING REPORT

### 15 KEY MESSAGES FROM THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)<sup>7</sup>

15.1.1 In March 2012 the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published. The NPPF, read as a whole, constitutes 'the Government's view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system. The NPPF supersedes most PPSs and PPGs. The following is a summary of the new guidance included in the NPPF that is of relevance to this SA.

#### Biodiversity and open space

15.1.2 Impacts on biodiversity should be minimised, with net gains in biodiversity to be provided wherever possible. To contribute to national and local targets on biodiversity, planning should promote the 'preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks' and the 'protection and recovery of priority species'. High quality open spaces should be protected or their loss mitigated, unless a lack of need is established.

#### Landscape

15.1.3 The planning system should protect and enhance valued landscapes. In designated areas, planning permission should be refused for major development, unless it can be demonstrated to be 'in the public interest'. 'Great weight' should be given to the conservation of the landscape and scenic beauty of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the 'highest level of protection' in this regard.

15.1.4 Planning policies and decisions should 'encourage effective use of land' through the reuse of land which is previously developed, 'provided that this is not of high environmental value'. The value of best and most versatile agricultural land should also be taken into account.

#### Cultural heritage

15.1.5 Heritage assets should be recognised as an 'irreplaceable resource' that should be conserved in a 'manner appropriate to their significance', taking account of 'the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits' of conservation, whilst also recognising the positive contribution new development can make to local character and distinctiveness.

#### Air quality

15.1.6 New and existing developments should be prevented from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of air pollution. This includes taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and cumulative impacts on air quality.

#### Soil and contamination

15.1.7 The planning system prevent new or existing development from being 'adversely affected' by the presence of 'unacceptable levels' of soil pollution or land instability and be willing to remediate and mitigate 'despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land' wherever appropriate.

#### Climate change mitigation

<sup>7</sup> CLG (2012) National Planning Policy Framework [online] available at: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/2116950.pdf> (accessed 08/2012)

15.1.8 Supporting the ‘transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate’ is regarded as a ‘core planning principle’. A key role for planning in securing reduced GHG emissions is envisioned, with specific reference made to meeting the targets set out in the Climate Change Act 2008<sup>8</sup>. Specifically, planning policy should support the move to a low carbon future through:

- planning for new development in locations and ways which reduce GHG emissions; and
- Positively promoting renewable energy technologies and considering identifying suitable areas for their construction.

#### Climate change adaptation

15.1.9 Planning authorities should take account of the long term effects of climate and ‘adopt proactive strategies’ to adaptation, with new developments planned to avoid increased vulnerability to climate change impacts.

15.1.10 In terms of flooding, development should be directed away from areas highest at risk and should not be allocated if there are ‘reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding’. The NPPF states that local planning authorities should avoid ‘inappropriate development in vulnerable areas’.

#### Economy & Employment

15.1.11 The contribution the planning system can make to building a strong, responsive economy is highlighted. This should include ‘identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure’. There is a need to support new and emerging business sectors, including positively planning for ‘clusters or networks of knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries’.

#### Housing

15.1.12 Local planning authorities should meet the ‘full, objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing’ in their area. To create ‘sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities’ authorities should ensure affordable housing is provided. Whilst there is no longer a national requirement to build at a minimum density, there is a need to ensure that effective and efficient use of available land is made when permitting residential development.

#### Education

15.1.13 Ensuring that there is a ‘sufficient choice of school places’ is of ‘great importance’. Local planning authorities must ‘work with other authorities and providers’ in order to access the current ‘quality and capacity’ of infrastructure for education, plus its capability of meeting ‘forecast demand’.

#### Community: Population, Health, Crime and Social Equity

15.1.14 The social role of the planning system is defined as ‘supporting vibrant and healthy communities’, with a ‘core planning principle’ being to ‘take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all’.

#### Transport and Accessibility

15.1.15 Planning for transport and travel will have an important role in ‘contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives’. To minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure and other activities, planning policies should aim for ‘a balance of land uses’. Wherever practical, key facilities should be located within walking distance of most properties.

<sup>8</sup> The Climate Change Act 2008 sets targets for greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions through action in the UK of at least 80% by 2050, and reductions in CO2 emissions of at least 26% by 2020, against a 1990 baseline.

## 16 WHAT'S THE SUSTAINABILITY 'BASELINE' AT THE CURRENT TIME?

### 16.1 Introduction

16.1.1 Another important step when seeking to establish the appropriate 'scope' of an SA involves reviewing the situation now for a range of sustainability issues. Doing so helps to enable identification of those key sustainability issues that should be a particular focus of the appraisal, and also helps to provide 'benchmarks' for the appraisal of significant effects.

16.1.2 A review of the sustainability baseline is presented within the SA Scoping Report. This section presents a summary.

### 16.2 Key findings of the baseline review

- Cambridge is a prosperous City but it still has areas of deprivation, mainly to the east and north of the City with some areas identified within the 20% most deprived in the country<sup>9</sup>. Although many people living and working in Cambridge are amongst the most highly qualified in the country a significant proportion of economically active adults (16%) do not hold any qualifications at all.
- Housing affordability is an important issue for many groups; in particular, for key workers and those on lower incomes. In 2010 the ratio of wages to average house prices in the City was around 9.2; and the ratio of lower quartile earnings against the cheapest housing available was around 9.5 in 2010, up from 8.2 in 2009. Many people who work in the city cannot afford to live there<sup>10</sup>. As a result large numbers of the employed population have to travel long distances from home to work, promoting unsustainable travel patterns with a high modal share of private car use, and placing increased pressure on the City's transport infrastructure.
- In 2009 there were 7,362 applicants on the Council's Housing Register for Social Housing, an increase of 18% from 2008. With regards to the acute need for more affordable houses in Cambridge, it has been identified that 1,910 more affordable houses are needed per year; an increase of 220 since 2010. 82% of the need for affordable housing is estimated as being for social rented and 18% for intermediate tenures.
- Cambridge has four important sectors that contribute to the local economy - higher and further education and the related research institutes, high-tech business, retail and tourism. These four sectors have proved relatively resilient to the recession and are recognised to have significant growth potential. Given the strong performance of the Cambridge economy, there is a need to ensure sufficient land is available for employment and for housing a growing labour force.
- The levels of cycling within Cambridge are amongst the highest in Europe. A large proportion of those that work and live in Cambridge cycle (36%) or walk (19%). The high proportion of cycling in Cambridge is encouraged by the compact and flat nature of the urban environment as well as the high proportion of 'young and active' and 'financially constrained' individuals within the City, who are more likely to cycle than other groups<sup>11</sup>.
- Cambridgeshire, along with the majority of the south east and east of England, is categorised as an area of severe water stress. Cambridge has an average per capita water use of 151 litres per day which is significantly above the 80 litres per day recommended in the Water Cycle Strategies.
- The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2010) identifies the main areas of fluvial flooding in Cambridge as adjacent to the River Cam, Cherry Hinton/Coldham's Brook and East Cambridge Main Drain. The SFRA evaluates the current (2010) and future flood risk

<sup>9</sup> Source: <http://map1.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/observe/Flash/Profiles/WardProfiles/atlas.html> (accessed January 2012)

<sup>10</sup> Source: Cambridgeshire County Council (2011) Cambridgeshire Local transport Plan 2011- 2026 [online] available at:

[http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/81A57E02-48D8-4C24-862F-B42A900F70D8/0/LTP3PoliciesandStrategy.pdf?bcsi\\_scan\\_E956BCBE8ADBC89F=0&bcsi\\_scan\\_filename=LTP3PoliciesandStrategy.p](http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/81A57E02-48D8-4C24-862F-B42A900F70D8/0/LTP3PoliciesandStrategy.pdf?bcsi_scan_E956BCBE8ADBC89F=0&bcsi_scan_filename=LTP3PoliciesandStrategy.pdf)

<sup>11</sup> Source: Steer Davies Gleave – Access to and around Greater Cambridge

situations over a 105 year timeframe (2115), incorporating the impacts of climate change. The key message of the SFRA is that the majority of the rivers and watercourses in Cambridge currently pose a risk of flooding and that this risk will be exacerbated in the future due to climate change.

- The Council's adopted Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan sets the City a target to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 89% by 2050. This has now been replaced by the national target of 80% by 2050. Under the previous target, per capita emissions of 0.7 tonnes would need to be achieved by 2050. In 2009 per capita emissions were 5.8 tonnes. New data indicates the total carbon emissions for Cambridge including those from homes and businesses reduced by 9% between 2005 and 2009 (from 763,600 tonnes to 706,100 tonnes). Per capita emissions in this period reduced by 16% from 6.9 tonnes per person to 5.8 tonnes per person.
- Cambridge has an installed renewable energy capacity of 0.4 MW. More widely 7% of Cambridgeshire's energy demand is already met by renewable energy installations<sup>12</sup> which compares to about 6% nationally. Decarbonising Cambridge<sup>13</sup> (2010), a renewable and low carbon energy study completed for Cambridge City Council assessed the opportunities for low carbon and renewable energy projects. It identified potential opportunities for District Heating, Biomass, Waste to energy and Wind energy.
- The long history of settlement in Cambridge has resulted in a varied and rich townscape which contains a high concentration of historic assets. The varied character of Cambridge is evident in the large number of Conservation Areas that have been established to protect the distinctive character of different parts of the City.
- Cambridge city centre is the historic and commercial core of the City. This core is surrounded by colleges, university and residential buildings, beyond which lie the River Cam and a number of open spaces.

## 17 WHAT'S THE BASELINE PROJECTION?

17.1.1 Just as it is important for the scope of SA to be informed by an understanding of current baseline conditions, it is also important to ensure that thought is given to how baseline conditions might 'evolve' in the future under the 'no plan' / 'business as usual' scenario. Doing so helps to enable identification of those key sustainability issues that should be a particular focus of the appraisal, and also helps to provide 'benchmarks' for the appraisal of significant effects.

17.1.2 The following is a summary:

- Looking forward to 2031, Cambridge's population is expected to grow by 28%. Previously housing development has been concentrated on sites within the existing areas of the City; however, several housing development sites on the fringes of the City have been released from the Green Belt by the 2006 Local Plan.
- There is an identified trend of increasing deprivation that may continue if not effectively addressed.
- The trend towards an ageing population means that there may be an increased shortage of housing appropriate for elderly and disabled people.
- Although the Local Plan (2006) aims to protect and enhance existing and new community facilities it is likely they will face greater competition for more profitable uses, such as commerce or housing. The investment in social and community development infrastructure is important to the creation of sustainable communities and it will be important to ensure adequate provision is provided.

<sup>12</sup> Cambridgeshire Renewables Infrastructure Framework – Baseline Data, Opportunities and Constraints (2012)

<sup>13</sup> Decarbonising Cambridge 2010 [www.cambridge.gov.uk](http://www.cambridge.gov.uk) [accessed January 2012]

- The Local Plan (2006) contains a number of policies to protect and enhance the local economy. However, in light of more recent evidence such as the Cambridge Cluster at 50 report, it is possible that the Local Plan (2006) would not capitalise fully on the strengths of the local economy.
- While the Local Plan (2006) should reduce the need to travel, there will still be increased pressure on the transport network (already acknowledged to be 'seriously constrained' in many areas) as a result of planned growth.
- The Water Cycle Strategy suggests that under a business as usual scenario the new housing development across Cambridge could increase the demand for water by 33% on 2006 levels by 2031. It is likely that without the new Local Plan, new development will have an adverse effect on water resources and water quality, reducing the volume of water in groundwater aquifers and having an adverse impact on progress towards achieving good status by 2027 as required by Water Framework Directive.
- The Local Plan (2006) contained a policy on development and flooding but this was not 'saved' as it repeated national guidance in PPS25. The NPPF is less detailed in its regard to flooding than PPS25 and there will be a need for more detailed flooding (both fluvial and pluvial) and SuDS policies in the new Local Plan. In addition, the Local Plan (2006) does not give due consideration to the impacts of climate change, which is predicted to significantly increase flood risk by 2050.
- The designated Conservation Areas will continue to help protect the character of these areas and ensure development is appropriate and strictly controlled. Although the Local Plan (2006) provides good protection to these areas there may be wider opportunities to better protect the special character and landscape features of Cambridge, particularly in light of planned new development in the urban extensions.
- Without a new Local Plan the protection and enhancement of biodiversity may not be pursued at the strategic level. While sites of local nature conservation importance, open space and features of nature conservation will be protected, the opportunity to contribute to a healthy and functioning natural environment through reconnecting fragmented habitats as recommended by Government.
- The city centre benefits from excellent open space provision and excellent civic environment but the number of visitors and a growing population will increase pressures on maintaining the high quality public realm.

## APPENDIX 2: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES AND THE SITE APPRAISAL CRITERIA

Table 1: City Sites

SA Issues	Site appraisal criteria
<p><b>Communities and wellbeing</b></p>	<p>Arrest the trend in increased deprivation particularly within wards to the north and east of Cambridge</p>
<p>Improve the health and well-being of Cambridge residents and reduce inequalities in health particularly in the north and east of Cambridge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would allocation result in development in deprived areas?</li> <li>• How far is the nearest health centre or GP service?</li> <li>• What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?</li> <li>• Would the development of the sites result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?</li> <li>• Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</li> <li>• Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</li> <li>• Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</li> <li>• Is there possible contamination on the site?</li> </ul>
<p>Reduce inequalities in the educational achievement level of economically active adults and develop the opportunities for everyone to acquire the skills needed to find and remain in work</p>	<p>No criteria have been developed to assess this issue. This information is not available at the site allocation stage and there is no readily determinable link between allocation of housing and employment sites and improvement in education/skills.</p>



SA Issues		Site appraisal criteria
	<p>Capitalise on the ethnic diversity of the city and its contribution to vibrant and inclusive communities</p>	<p>No criteria have been developed to assess this issue. This information is not available at the site allocation stage and there is no readily determinable link between this issue and the allocation of housing and employment sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would development make use of previously developed land?</li> <li>• Would development lead to a loss of community facilities?</li> <li>• Is the site defined as protected open space or have the potential to be protected?</li> <li>• If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space?</li> <li>• If the site does not involve any protected open space would the development increase the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space /outdoor sports facilities and achieve minimum standards of onsite public open space provision?</li> <li>• How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?</li> <li>• How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?</li> <li>• How far is the nearest accessible natural greenspace of 2ha?</li> </ul>
	<p>Protect and enhance community, leisure and open space provision, particularly in wards anticipated to experience significant population growth including Trumpington, Castle and Abbey</p>	
	<p>Ensure the timely provision of primary and secondary education in the locations where it is needed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How far is the nearest secondary school?</li> <li>• How far is the nearest primary school?</li> </ul>



SA Issues		Site appraisal criteria
	<p>Increase delivery of affordable and intermediate housing, in particular one and two bedroom homes</p> <p>Ensure that the design and size of new homes meet the needs of the existing and future population, including the elderly, disabled people and those in poor health</p> <p>Improve air quality in and around the Cambridge city centre AQMA and along routes to the City including the A14</p>	<p>No criteria have been developed to assess this issue, and that below. At site allocation stage it is not possible to determine what tenure mix, dwelling size and design will be delivered on each site. This issue will be addressed in the Local Plan in relation to the Code for Sustainable Homes and affordable housing requirements. These policies will apply to all strategic housing sites. The Local Plan will also address the issue in relation to housing requirements for elderly/disabled people.</p> <p>See above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?</li> <li>• Will the allocation result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?</li> </ul>
<b>Economy</b>	<p>Maintain and capitalise on Cambridge's position as one of the UK's most competitive cities</p> <p>Address pockets of income and employment deprivation particularly in Abbey Ward and Kings Hedges</p> <p>Capitalise on the value that language schools/specialist tutorial colleges contribute to the local economy, but balance this against the increased impact this may have on the housing market</p> <p>Ensure provision of appropriate office space for small and growing high tech businesses and research sectors</p> <p>Consider the need for high-tech headquarters and high-tech manufacturing</p> <p>Consider whether and how to address the on-going loss of industrial floorspace</p>	<p>No criteria have been developed to assess this issue. This information is not available at the site allocation stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How far is the nearest main employment centre?</li> <li>• Would allocation result in development in deprived areas?</li> <li>• Would development result in the loss of employment land identified in the Employment Land Review (ELR)?</li> </ul> <p>No criteria have been developed to assess this issue. This information is not available at the site allocation stage but the Local Plan will include a policy that specifically addresses the needs of language schools/specialist tutorial colleges.</p> <p>No criteria have been developed to assess this issue. This information is not available at the site allocation stage.</p> <p>See above.</p> <p>See above.</p>

SA Issues		Site appraisal criteria
	Encourage more sustainable growth of tourism which recognises the pressure it places on the City's transport infrastructure and accommodation need	No criteria have been developed to assess this issue. However this issue will be addressed in the Local Plan with the inclusion of a policy that specifically deals with tourism.
	Ensure the continued vitality and viability of the city centre and safeguard the diversity of independent shops in areas such as along Mill Road	No criteria have been developed to assess this issue. This information is not available at the site allocation stage.
	Protect local shopping provision in district and local centres which provide for people's everyday needs	No criteria have been developed to assess this issue. This information is not available at the site allocation stage.
	Ensure adequate provision of convenience shopping in the north west of Cambridge	No criteria have been developed to assess this issue. This information is not available at the site allocation stage.
<b>Transport</b>	Build on the high modal share of cycling in the city centre and encourage cycling for journeys over one mile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?</li> </ul>
	Reduce the use of the private car and ensure greater access to frequent public transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site?</li> <li>• How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?</li> </ul>
	Capitalise on the opportunity of new development to discourage private car use and promote the use of more sustainable forms of transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How far is the site from the edge of the defined Cambridge city centre?</li> <li>• What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site?</li> <li>• How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?</li> <li>• How far is the site from the nearest district or local centre?</li> </ul>
<b>Water</b>	Ensure developments implement the highest standards of water efficiency and place no additional pressure on water scarcity in the region	No criteria have been developed for this issue as the information is not available at site allocation stage. However development management policies in the Local Plan will assist with mitigating the impacts associated with development on the site, including promoting greater water efficiency.
	Improve the water quality of Cambridge's water courses in line with the Water Framework Directive requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would development be within a Source Protection Zone?</li> </ul>

SA Issues		Site appraisal criteria
	Ensure new development takes sewerage infrastructure into account	No criteria have been developed for this issue as the information is not available at site allocation stage. However development management policies in the Local Plan will assist with mitigating the impacts associated with development on the site.
<b>Flood risk</b> (inc. climate change adaptation)	Account for the potential environmental, economic and social cost of flooding for all development proposals	No criteria have been developed for this issue as the information is not available at the site allocation stage. The issue is partly addressed by considering whether the allocation is within a flood zone and whether the site is at risk from surface water flooding.
	Protect and enhance existing natural flood risk management infrastructure and ensure all development incorporates sustainable drainage systems to minimise surface water flood risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is site within a flood zone?</li> <li>• Is site at risk from surface water flooding?</li> </ul>
	Ensure that new and existing communities are capable of adapting to climate change with consideration given to the role of green and blue infrastructure as well as the layout and massing of new developments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?</li> </ul>
<b>Climate change mitigation and renewable energy</b>	Reduce transport emissions by encouraging cycling and promoting infrastructure for zero emissions vehicles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?</li> </ul>
	Reduce carbon emissions from all aspects of new developments and ensure development meets the highest standards in low carbon design	No criteria have been developed for this, and the subsequent two issues, as the information is not available at site allocation stage. These issues will be addressed through the development and inclusion of policies in the Local Plan relating to sustainable construction standards and on-site carbon emissions reductions. The Local Plan may also include a separate policy on car free developments with electric vehicle charging points being embedded within it, or an alteration may be made to the Council's existing policy on car parking to incorporate car free development. These policies will apply to all strategic housing sites.
	Account for the whole life carbon cost of new development and transport infrastructure	See above.
	Ensure greater deployment of energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies	See above.

SA Issues	Site appraisal criteria
<p><b>Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?</li> <li>Would development impact upon Listed Buildings?</li> <li>Would allocation impact upon a historic park/garden?</li> <li>Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?</li> <li>Would development impact upon buildings of local interest?</li> <li>Will allocation lead to a loss of land within the Green Belt?</li> <li>Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?</li> </ul> <p>No criteria have been developed for this issue as the information is not available at site allocation stage.</p>
<p><b>Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)?</li> <li>Would development impact upon a locally designated wildlife site i.e. (Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site)</li> <li>Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?</li> <li>Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)</li> <li>Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?</li> <li>Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?</li> <li>Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)</li> </ul>

**Table 2: Fringe Sites**

SA Issues		Site appraisal criteria
<p><b>Communities and wellbeing</b></p>	<p>Arrest the trend in increased deprivation particularly within wards to the north and east of Cambridge</p> <p>Improve the health and well-being of Cambridge residents and reduce inequalities in health particularly in the north and east of Cambridge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the allocation result in development in deprived areas?</li> <li>• How far is the nearest health centre or GP service?</li> <li>• Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</li> <li>• Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</li> <li>• Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</li> <li>• Is there possible contamination on the site?</li> </ul>
	<p>Reduce inequalities in the educational achievement level of economically active adults and develop the opportunities for everyone to acquire the skills needed to find and remain in work</p>	<p>No criteria have been developed to assess this issue. This information is not available at the site allocation stage and there is no readily determinable link between allocation of housing and employment sites and improvement in education/skills.</p>
	<p>Capitalise on the ethnic diversity of the city and its contribution to vibrant and inclusive communities</p>	<p>No criteria have been developed to assess this issue. This information is not available at the site allocation stage and there is no readily determinable link between this issue and the allocation of housing and employment sites.</p>

SA Issues		Site appraisal criteria
	<p>Protect and enhance community, leisure and open space provision, particularly in wards anticipated to experience significant population growth including Trumpington, Castle and Abbey</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would development lead to a loss of community facilities?</li> <li>• Would development result in the loss of land protected by policy?<sup>14</sup></li> <li>• If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced?<sup>15</sup></li> <li>• If the site does not involve any protected open space would the development increase the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space /outdoor sports facilities and achieve minimum standards of onsite public open space provision?</li> <li>• Would development make use of previously developed land?</li> </ul>
	<p>Ensure the timely provision of primary and secondary education in the locations where it is needed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How far is the nearest secondary school?</li> <li>• How far is the nearest primary school?</li> </ul>
	<p>Increase delivery of affordable and intermediate housing, in particular one and two bedroom homes</p>	<p>No criteria have been developed to assess this issue, and that below. At site allocation stage it is not possible to determine what tenure mix, dwelling size and design will be delivered on each site. This issue will be addressed in the Local Plan in relation to the Code for Sustainable Homes and affordable housing requirements. These policies will apply to all strategic housing sites. The Local Plan will also address the issue in relation to housing requirements for elderly/disabled people.</p>
	<p>Ensure that the design and size of new homes meet the needs of the existing and future population, including the elderly, disabled people and those in poor health</p>	<p>See above.</p>
	<p>Improve air quality in and around the Cambridge city centre AQMA and along routes to the City including the A14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?</li> <li>• Will the allocation result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Economy</b></p>	<p>Maintain and capitalise on Cambridge's position as one of the UK's most competitive cities</p>	<p>No criteria have been developed to assess this issue. This information is not available at the site allocation stage.</p>

<sup>14</sup> i.e. the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9 (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status)

<sup>15</sup> Replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space

SA Issues		Site appraisal criteria
	Address pockets of income and employment deprivation particularly in Abbey Ward and Kings Hedges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How far is the nearest main employment centre?</li> <li>Will allocation result in development in deprived areas?</li> <li>Would development result in the loss of employment land identified in the Employment Land Review (ELR)?</li> </ul>
	Capitalise on the value that language schools/specialist tutorial colleges contribute to the local economy, but balance this against the increased impact this may have on the housing market	No criteria have been developed to assess this issue. This information is not available at the site allocation stage but the Local Plan will include a policy that specifically addresses the needs of language schools/specialist tutorial colleges.
	Ensure provision of appropriate office space for small and growing high tech businesses and research sectors	No criteria have been developed to assess this issue. This information is not available at the site allocation stage.
	Consider the need for high-tech headquarters and high-tech manufacturing	No criteria have been developed to assess this issue. This information is not available at the site allocation stage.
	Consider whether and how to address the on-going loss of industrial floorspace	No criteria have been developed to assess this issue. This information is not available at the site allocation stage.
	Encourage more sustainable growth of tourism which recognises the pressure it places on the City's transport infrastructure and accommodation need	No criteria have been developed to assess this issue. However this issue will be addressed in the Local Plan with the inclusion of a policy that specifically deals with tourism.
	Ensure the continued vitality and viability of the city centre and safeguard the diversity of independent shops in areas such as along Mill Road	No criteria have been developed to assess this issue. This information is not available at the site allocation stage.
	Protect local shopping provision in district and local centres which provide for people's everyday needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would development protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, Town, district and local centres?</li> </ul>
	Ensure adequate provision of convenience shopping in the north west of Cambridge	No criteria have been developed to assess this issue. This information is not available at the site allocation stage.
<b>Transport</b>	Build on the high modal share of cycling in the city centre and encourage cycling for journeys over one mile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?</li> </ul>
	Reduce the use of the private car and ensure greater access to frequent public transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site?</li> <li>How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?</li> <li>Would development reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable transport choices?</li> </ul>



SA Issues		Site appraisal criteria
	<p>Capitalise on the opportunity of new development to discourage private car use and promote the use of more sustainable forms of transport</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How far is the site from the nearest district or local centre?</li> <li>• What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site?</li> <li>• How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?</li> <li>• Would development reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable transport choices?</li> </ul>
<b>Water</b>	<p>Ensure developments implement the highest standards of water efficiency and place no additional pressure on water scarcity in the region</p> <p>Improve the water quality of Cambridge's water courses in line with the Water Framework Directive requirements</p> <p>Ensure new development takes sewerage infrastructure into account</p>	<p>No criteria have been developed for this issue as the information is not available at site allocation stage. However development management policies in the Local Plan will assist with mitigating the impacts associated with development on the site, including promoting greater water efficiency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would development be within a Source Protection Zone?</li> </ul> <p>No criteria have been developed for this issue as the information is not available at site allocation stage. However development management policies in the Local Plan will assist with mitigating the impacts associated with development on the site.</p>
<b>Flood risk</b> (inc. climate change adaptation)	<p>Account for the potential environmental, economic and social cost of flooding for all development proposals</p> <p>Protect and enhance existing natural flood risk management infrastructure and ensure all development incorporates sustainable drainage systems to minimise surface water flood risk</p> <p>Ensure that new and existing communities are capable of adapting to climate change with consideration given to the role of green and blue infrastructure as well as the layout and massing of new developments</p> <p>Reduce transport emissions by encouraging cycling and promoting infrastructure for zero emissions vehicles</p>	<p>No criteria have been developed for this issue as the information is not available at the site allocation stage. The issue is partly addressed by considering whether the allocation is within a flood zone and whether the site is at risk from surface water flooding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is site within a flood zone?</li> <li>• Is site at risk from surface water flooding?</li> <li>• Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?</li> <li>• What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?</li> </ul>
<b>Climate change mitigation and</b>		



SA Issues	Site appraisal criteria
<p><b>Mitigation and renewable energy</b></p>	<p>No criteria have been developed for this, and the subsequent two issues, as the information is not available at site allocation stage. These issues will be addressed through the development and inclusion of policies in the Local Plan relating to sustainable construction standards and on-site carbon emissions reductions. The Local Plan may also include a separate policy on car free developments with electric vehicle charging points being embedded within it, or an alteration may be made to the Council's existing policy on car parking to incorporate car free development. These policies will apply to all strategic housing sites.</p> <p>See above.</p> <p>See above.</p>
<p><b>Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?</li> <li>• Would development impact upon Listed Buildings?</li> <li>• Would allocation impact upon a historic park/garden?</li> <li>• Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?</li> <li>• Would development impact upon buildings of local interest?</li> <li>• What is the overall effect of development on the Green Belt?</li> <li>• Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?</li> </ul> <p>No criteria have been developed for this issue as the information is not available at site allocation stage.</p>
<p><b>Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)?</li> <li>• Would development impact upon a locally designated wildlife site i.e. (Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site)</li> </ul> <p>No criteria have been developed for this issue as the information is not available at site allocation stage.</p>

SA Issues		Site appraisal criteria
	<p>Maintain and improve connectivity between existing green infrastructure in order to provide improved habitats for biodiversity and ensure no further fragmentation of key habitats as a result of new or infill development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?</li> <li>• Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)</li> <li>• Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?</li> </ul>
	<p>Capitalise on the opportunity for green infrastructure to help Cambridge adapt to the threats posed by climate change (particularly flooding), and to improve water quality</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?</li> </ul>
	<p>Ensure new development does not impact on biodiversity including no further loss of biodiversity rich farmland to development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 3: SITE APPRAISAL CRITERIA AND DECISION RULES

Table 3: City sites

Communities and wellbeing	
Criteria codes	Site appraisal criteria
<b>Health Fac.</b>	How far is the nearest health centre or GP service?
	<b>Decision rules</b> R = >800m A = 400 - 800m G = <400m
<b>Noise &amp; Vib.</b>	Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?
	<b>Decision rules</b> R = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation A = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation
<b>Light Pollution</b>	Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?
	<b>Decision rules</b> R = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation A = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation
<b>Odour</b>	Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?
	<b>Decision rules</b> R = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation A = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation
<b>Contamination</b>	Is there possible contamination on the site?
	<b>Decision rules</b> R = All or a significant part of the site within an area with a history of contamination which, due to physical constraints or economic viability, is incapable of appropriate mitigation during the plan period A = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development G = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination

<b>PDL</b>	Would development make use of previously developed land?	<p><b>R</b> = Not on PDL  <b>A</b> = Partially on PDL  <b>G</b> = Entirely on PDL</p>
<b>Comm Facilities</b>	Would development lead to a loss of community facilities?	<p><b>R</b> = Allocation would lead to loss of community facilities  <b>G</b> = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement /appropriate mitigation possible</p>
<b>Protected Space</b>	Is the site defined as protected open space or have the potential to be protected?	<p><b>R</b> = Yes  <b>G</b> = No</p>
<b>Replace Space</b>	If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space?	<p><b>R</b> = No  <b>G</b> = Yes</p>
<b>Space Standards</b>	If the site does not involve any protected open space would development of the site be able to increase the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space /outdoor sports facilities and achieve the minimum standards of onsite public open space provision?	<p><b>RR</b> = No, the site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of OS and is located in a ward or parish with identified deficiency.  <b>R</b> = No, the site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of OS.  <b>G</b> = Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite  <b>GG</b> = Development would create the opportunity to deliver significantly enhanced provision of new public open spaces in excess of adopted plan standards</p>
<b>Outdoor Sports</b>	How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;3km  <b>A</b> = 1 - 3km  <b>G</b> = &lt;1km; or allocation is not housing</p>
<b>Play Space</b>	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?	<p><b>A</b> = &gt;400m from children and teenager's play space  <b>G</b> = &lt;400m; or allocation is not housing</p>
<b>Green Space</b>	How far is the nearest accessible natural green space of 2ha?	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;400m  <b>G</b> = &lt;400m; or allocation is not housing or employment</p>

<b>Secondary School</b>	How far is the nearest secondary school?	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;3km  <b>A</b> = 1-3km  <b>G</b> = &lt;1km or non-housing allocation</p>
<b>Primary School</b>	How far is the nearest primary school?	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;800m  <b>A</b> = 400-800m  <b>G</b> = &lt;400m or non-housing allocation</p>
<b>AQMA</b>	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?	<p><b>R</b> = Within or adjacent to an AQMA, M11 or A14  <b>A</b> = &lt;1000m of an AQMA, M11 or A14  <b>G</b> = &gt;1000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14</p>
<b>Air Quality</b>	Will development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?	<p><b>R</b> = Significant adverse impact  <b>A</b> = Adverse impact  <b>G</b> = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact</p>
<b>Economy</b>		
<b>No.</b>	<b>Site appraisal criteria</b>	<b>Decision rules</b>
<b>Emp Centre</b>	How far is the nearest main employment centre?	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;3km  <b>A</b> = 1-3km  <b>G</b> = &lt;1km or allocation is for or includes a significant element of employment or is for another non-residential use</p>
<b>Deprived Area</b>	Would allocation result in development in deprived areas of Cambridge?	<p><b>A</b> = Not within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.  <b>G</b> = Within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.</p>
<b>Loss Emp. Land</b>	Would development result in the loss of employment land identified in the Employment Land Review?	<p><b>R</b> = Significant loss of employment land and job opportunities not mitigated by alternative allocation in the area (&gt; 50%)  <b>A</b> = Some loss of employment land and job opportunities mitigated by alternative allocation in the area (&lt; 50%).  <b>G</b> = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development</p>
<b>Transport</b>		

No.	Site appraisal criteria	Decision rules
<b>Cycle Routes</b>	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?	<p><b>RR</b> = No cycling provision and traffic speeds &gt;30mph with high vehicular traffic volume.</p> <p><b>R</b> = No cycling provision or a cycle lane less than 1.5m width with medium volume of traffic. Having to cross a busy junction with high cycle accident rate to access local facilities/school.</p> <p><b>A</b> = Poor or medium quality off-road path.</p> <p><b>G</b> = Quiet residential street speed below 30mph, cycle lane with 1.5m minimum width, high quality off-road path e.g. cycleway adjacent to guided busway.</p> <p><b>GG</b> = Quiet residential street designed for 20mph speeds, high quality off-road paths with good segregation from pedestrians, uni-directional hybrid cycle lanes.</p>
<b>Public Transport</b>	What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site?	<p><b>R</b> = Service does not meet the requirements of a high quality public transport (HQPT)</p> <p><b>A</b> = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances</p> <p><b>G</b> = High quality public transport service</p>
<b>Train Station</b>	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;800m</p> <p><b>A</b> = 400 - 800m</p> <p><b>G</b> = &lt;400m</p>
<b>City Edge</b>	How far is the site from edge of defined Cambridge City Centre?	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;800m</p> <p><b>A</b> = 400 - 800m</p> <p><b>G</b> = &lt;400m</p>
<b>Dist/Local Centre</b>	How far is the site from the nearest district or local centre?	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;800m</p> <p><b>A</b> = 400 - 800m</p> <p><b>G</b> = &lt;400m</p>
<b>Water</b>		
<b>No.</b>	<b>Site appraisal criteria</b>	<b>Decision rules</b>

<b>Source PZ</b>	Would development be within a source protection zone?	<b>A</b> = Within SPZ 1 <b>G</b> = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for green space
<b>Flood risk (inc. climate change adaptation)</b>		
<b>No.</b>	<b>Site appraisal criteria</b>	<b>Decision rules</b>
<b>Fluvial Flooding</b>	Is site within a flood zone?	<b>R</b> = Flood risk zone 3 <b>A</b> = Flood risk zone 2 <b>G</b> = Flood risk zone 1
<b>Surface Flooding</b>	Is site at risk from surface water flooding?	<b>R</b> = High risk, <b>A</b> = Medium risk <b>G</b> = Low risk
<b>Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</b>		
<b>No.</b>	<b>Site appraisal criteria</b>	<b>Decision rules</b>
<b>SAM</b>	Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?	<b>R</b> = Site is on a SAM or allocation will lead to development adjacent to a SAM with the potential for negative impacts incapable of mitigation <b>A</b> = Site is adjacent to a SAM that is less sensitive / not likely to be impacted/ or impacts are capable of mitigation <b>G</b> = Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM
<b>Listed Building</b>	Would development impact upon Listed Buildings?	<b>R</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation <b>A</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation <b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings

<b>Historic Park</b>	Would allocation impact upon a historic park/garden?	<p><b>R</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such areas with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p><b>A</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such areas with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p><b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin such areas, and there is no impact to the setting of such areas</p>
<b>Cons. Area</b>	Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?	<p><b>R</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such an area with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p><b>A</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such an area with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p><b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin such an area, and there is no impact to the setting of such an area</p>
<b>Local interest</b>	Would development impact upon buildings of local interest?	<p><b>A</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p><b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings</p>
<b>Greenbelt Loss</b>	Will the allocation lead to loss of land within the Green Belt?	<p><b>R</b> = Site is in the Green Belt</p> <p><b>G</b> = Site is not in the Green Belt</p>
<b>Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure</b>		
<b>No.</b>	<b>Site appraisal criteria</b>	<b>Decision rules</b>
<b>SSSI</b>	Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)?	<p><b>R</b> = Site is on or adjacent to an SSSI with negative impacts incapable of mitigation</p> <p><b>A</b> = Site is on or adjacent to an SSSI with negative impacts capable of mitigation</p> <p><b>G</b> = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts</p>



<p><b>Local Wildlife</b></p>	<p>Would development impact upon a locally designated wildlife site i.e. (Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site)</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site and impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Does not contain, is not adjacent to or local area will be developed as green space</p>
<p><b>Green Infra.</b></p>	<p>Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Development involves a loss of existing green infrastructure which is incapable of appropriate mitigation.  <b>A</b> = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure</p>
<p><b>Imp. Biodiversity</b></p>	<p>Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links</p>
<p><b>TPOs</b></p>	<p>Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Development likely to have a significant adverse impact on the protected trees incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees</p>

Table 4: Fringe sites

Communities and wellbeing	
Criteria codes	Decision rules
<b>Health Fac.</b>	<p><b>Site appraisal criteria</b></p> <p>How far is the nearest health centre or GP service?</p> <p><b>R</b> = &gt;800m  <b>A</b> = 400 - 800m  <b>G</b> = &lt;400m</p>
<b>Noise &amp; Vib.</b>	<p>Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</p> <p><b>R</b> = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation  <b>G</b> = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation</p>
<b>Light Pollution</b>	<p>Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</p> <p><b>R</b> = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation  <b>G</b> = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation</p>
<b>Odour</b>	<p>Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</p> <p><b>R</b> = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation  <b>G</b> = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation</p>
<b>Contamination</b>	<p>Is there possible contamination on the site?</p> <p><b>R</b> = All or a significant part of the site within an area with a history of contamination which, due to physical constraints or economic viability, is incapable of appropriate mitigation during the plan period  <b>A</b> = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development  <b>G</b> = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination</p>
<b>Comm. Facilities</b>	<p>Would development lead to a loss of community facilities?</p> <p><b>R</b> = Development would lead to the loss of one or more community facilities incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or appropriate mitigation possible</p>
<b>Protected Space</b>	<p>Would development result in the loss of land protected by policy?</p> <p><b>R</b> = Yes  <b>G</b> = No</p>
<b>Replace Space</b>	<p>If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced?</p> <p><b>R</b> = No  <b>G</b> = Yes</p>

<p><b>Space Standards</b></p>	<p>If the site does not involve any protected open space would the development increase the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space /outdoor sports facilities and achieve minimum standards of onsite public open space provision?</p>	<p><b>RR</b> = No, the site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of OS and is located in a ward or parish with identified deficiency.  <b>R</b> = No, the site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of OS.  <b>G</b> = Assumes minimum onsite provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite  <b>GG</b> = Development would create the opportunity to deliver significantly enhanced provision of new public open spaces in excess of adopted plan standards</p>
<p><b>PDL</b></p>	<p>Would development make use of previously developed land?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = No  <b>G</b> = Yes</p>
<p><b>Secondary Sch.</b></p>	<p>How far is the nearest secondary school?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;3km  <b>A</b> = 1-3km  <b>G</b> = &lt;1km or non-housing allocation; or site large enough to provide new school</p>
<p><b>Primary Sch.</b></p>	<p>How far is the nearest primary school?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;800m  <b>A</b> = 400-800m  <b>G</b> = &lt;400m or non-housing allocation; or site large enough to provide new school</p>
<p><b>AQMA</b></p>	<p>Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Within or adjacent to an AQMA, M11 or A14  <b>A</b> = &lt;1000m of an AQMA, M11 or A14  <b>G</b> = &gt;1000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14</p>
<p><b>Air Quality</b></p>	<p>Will the allocation result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Significant adverse impact  <b>A</b> = Adverse impact  <b>G</b> = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact</p>
<p><b>Economy</b></p>		
<p><b>Site appraisal criteria</b></p>		
<p><b>Emp Centre</b></p>	<p>How far is the nearest main employment centre?</p>	<p><b>Decision rules</b></p> <p><b>R</b> = &gt;3km  <b>A</b> = 1-3km  <b>G</b> = &lt;1km or allocation is for or includes a significant element of employment or is for another non-residential use</p>

<p><b>Deprived Area</b></p>	<p>Will allocation result in development in deprived areas?</p>	<p><b>A</b> = Not within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.  <b>G</b> = Within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Local Super Output Areas (LSOA) within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.  <b>R</b> = Significant loss of employment land and job opportunities not mitigated by alternative allocation in the area (&gt; 50%).  <b>A</b> = Some loss of employment land and job opportunities mitigated by alternative allocation in the area (&lt; 50%).  <b>G</b> = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development.</p>
<p><b>Loss Emp. Land</b></p>	<p>Would development result in the loss of employment land identified in the Employment Land Review (ELR)?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Significant negative effect  <b>A</b> = Negative effect  <b>G</b> = No effect or would support the vitality and viability of existing centres</p>
<p><b>Shop Hierarchy</b></p>	<p>Would development protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, Town, district and local centres?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Significant negative effect  <b>A</b> = Negative effect  <b>G</b> = No effect or would support the vitality and viability of existing centres</p>
<p><b>Transport</b></p>		
<p><b>Site appraisal criteria</b></p>		
<p><b>Cycle Routes</b></p>	<p>What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?</p>	<p><b>RR</b> = No cycling provision and traffic speeds &gt;30mph with high vehicular traffic volume.  <b>R</b> = No cycling provision or a cycle lane less than 1.5m width with medium volume of traffic. Having to cross a busy junction with high cycle accident rate to access local facilities/school. Poor quality off road path.  <b>A</b> = Medium quality off-road path.  <b>G</b> = Quiet residential street speed below 30mph, cycle lane with 1.5m minimum width, high quality off-road path e.g. cycleway adjacent to guided bus-way.  <b>GG</b> = Quiet residential street designed for 20mph speeds, high quality off-road paths with good segregation from pedestrians, uni-directional hybrid cycle lanes.</p>
<p><b>Public Transport</b></p>	<p>What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Service does not meet the requirements of a high quality public transport  <b>A</b> = Service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances  <b>G</b> = High quality public transport service</p>

<b>Train Station</b>	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?	<p>R = &gt;800m A = 400-800m G = &lt;400m</p>
<b>Sust. Transport</b>	Would development reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable transport choices?	<p>RR = Score 0-4 from 4 SCDC criteria R = Score 5-9 from 4 criteria A = Score 10-14 from 4 criteria G = Score 15-19 from 4 criteria GG = Score 19-24 from 4 criteria<sup>16</sup></p>
<b>Dist/local centre</b>	How far is the site from the nearest district or local centre?	<p>R = &gt;800m A = 400-800m G = &lt;400m</p>
<b>Water</b>		
<b>Site appraisal criteria</b>		
<b>Source PZ</b>	Would development be within a Source Protection Zone?	<p>R = Within SPZ 1 G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for green space</p>
<b>Flood risk (inc. climate change adaptation)</b>		
<b>Site appraisal criteria</b>		
<b>Fluvial Flooding</b>	Is site within a flood zone?	<p>R = Flood risk zone 3 A = Flood risk zone 2 G = Flood risk zone 1</p>
<b>Surface Flooding</b>	Is site at risk from surface water flooding?	<p>R = High risk A = Medium Risk G = Low risk</p>
<b>Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</b>		
<b>Site appraisal criteria</b>		
<b>SAM</b>	Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?	<p>R = Site is on a SAM or allocation will lead to development adjacent to a SAM with the potential for negative impacts incapable of mitigation A = Site is adjacent to a SAM that is less sensitive / not likely to be impacted or impacts are capable of mitigation G = Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM</p>

<sup>16</sup> SCDC Sub-indicators include: Distance to a bus stop / rail station; Frequency of Public Transport; Typical public transport journey time to Cambridge city centre; Distance for cycling to city centre. Full details of the SCDC Sub-indicators are included in the Issues & Options 2, Part 2 – Consultation of Development Strategy and Site Options in Cambridge City report.

<p><b>Listed Buildings</b></p>	<p>Would development impact upon Listed Buildings?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings</p>
<p><b>Historic Park</b></p>	<p>Would allocation impact upon a historic park/garden?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such areas with potential for significant negative impacts incapable  <b>A</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such areas with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin such areas, and there is no impact to the setting of such areas</p>
<p><b>Cons. Area</b></p>	<p>Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such an area with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such an area with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin such areas, and there is no impact to the setting of such areas</p>
<p><b>Local interest</b></p>	<p>Would development impact upon buildings of local interest?<sup>17</sup></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings</p>
<p><b>Greenbelt Overall</b></p>	<p>What is the overall effect of development on the Green Belt?</p>	<p><b>RR</b> = Very significant constraints or adverse impacts  <b>R</b> = Significant constraints or adverse impacts  <b>A</b> = Some constraints or adverse impacts  <b>G</b> = Minor constraints or adverse impacts  <b>GG</b> = None or negligible constraints or adverse impacts</p>
<p>Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure</p>		
<p><b>Site appraisal criteria</b></p>		
<p><b>SSSI</b></p>	<p>Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)?</p>	<p><b>Decision rules</b></p> <p><b>R</b> = Site is on or adjacent to an SSSI with negative impacts incapable of mitigation  <b>A</b> = Site is on or adjacent to an SSSI with negative impacts capable of mitigation  <b>G</b> = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts</p>

<sup>17</sup> Cambridge only

<p><b>Local Wildlife</b></p>	<p>Would development impact upon a locally designated wildlife site i.e. (Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site)</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site and impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Does not contain, is not adjacent to or local area will be developed as greenspace</p>
<p><b>Green infra.</b></p>	<p>Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Development involves a loss of existing green infrastructure which is incapable of appropriate mitigation.  <b>A</b> = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure</p>
<p><b>Imp. Biodiversity</b></p>	<p>Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links</p>
<p><b>TPOs</b></p>	<p>Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Development likely to have a significant adverse impact on the protected trees incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees</p>
<p><b>Best Ag. Land</b></p>	<p>Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Significant negative impacts incapable of satisfactory mitigation  <b>A</b> = Negative impacts but capable of partial mitigation  <b>G</b> = No impacts or impacts capable of mitigation</p>