

Intended for

Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

Date

November, 2015 (updated March 2016)


Project Number



UK15-22172

CAMBRIDGE AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLANS SA ADDENDUM REPORT

**CAMBRIDGE AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL
PLANS
SA ADDENDUM REPORT**

Project No. **UK15-22172**
 Issue No. **4**
 Date **27/11/2015**
 Made by **Emma Jones**
 Checked by **Bram Miller**
 Approved by **Matt Royall**
 Description **Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans SA
Addendum Report**

Made by: 

Checked/Approved by:  

This report has been prepared by Ramboll Environ with all reasonable skill, care and diligence, and taking account of the Services and the Terms agreed between Ramboll Environ and the Client. This report is confidential to the Client, and Ramboll Environ accepts no responsibility whatsoever to third parties to whom this report, or any part thereof, is made known, unless formally agreed by Ramboll Environ beforehand. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk.

Ramboll Environ disclaims any responsibility to the Client and others in respect of any matters outside the agreed scope of the Services.

Version Control Log

Revision	Date	Made by	Checked by	Approved by	Description
A	01/10/2015	EJ	BM	MR	First Internal Draft
B	04/11/2015	EJ	BM	MR	Internal Draft
1	05/11/2015	EJ	BM	MR	Draft Final report to Client
2	09/11/2015	EJ	BM	MR	Version 2 to Client
3	18/11/2015	EJ	BM	MR	Version 3 to Client
4	27/11/2015	EJ	BM	MR	Final report to Client

Ramboll Environ
 8 The Wharf
 Bridge Street
 Birmingham
 B1 2JS
 United Kingdom
 T +44 121 616 2180
 www.ramboll-environ.com

CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Purpose of this Report	1
1.2	Structure of the SA Addendum Report	2
1.3	Issues raised by the Inspectors	3
2.	BACKGROUND	5
2.1	Introduction	5
2.2	The Need to Review the Local Plans	5
2.3	Joint working	5
2.4	The Cambridge Local Plan	6
2.4.1	The Current Position	6
2.4.2	Cambridge Local Plan Vision and Objectives	6
2.4.3	Content of the Cambridge Local Plan	8
2.5	The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan	9
2.5.1	The Current Position	9
2.5.2	South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Vision and Objectives	9
2.5.3	Content of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan	10
2.6	Background to the SA work	11
2.6.1	Introduction and Parties Involved	11
2.6.2	The role of the SA and work completed to date	13
2.6.3	The consideration of alternatives	15
3.	APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY	19
3.1	Introduction	19
3.2	Cambridge Local Plan SA scoping	19
3.3	South Cambridgeshire Local Plan SA scoping	24
3.4	Joint framework for testing of strategic alternatives	29
3.5	Other aspects of methodology	35
3.5.1	Scoring of the assessment	35
3.5.2	Difficulties encountered in the assessment	35
4.	REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS	36
4.1	Introduction	36
4.2	Background	36
4.3	Growth levels considered during plan making	36
4.4	Review of new evidence	37
4.5	Proposed Modifications to Housing Targets	38
4.6	The impact of the new targets	38
4.6.1	Background to the previous SA work	38
4.6.1.1	Cambridge	38
4.6.1.2	South Cambridgeshire	38
4.6.2	Impact of the changes in the housing requirement	39
4.6.2.1	Cambridge	39
4.6.2.2	South Cambridgeshire	40
5.	STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT SEQUENCE	41
5.1	Introduction	41

5.2	Background	41
5.3	Existing development sequence	41
5.4	SA of the stages of the development sequence	43
5.4.1	Introduction and purpose	43
5.4.2	Results of the assessment	44
5.4.3	Overall conclusions	44
6.	SITE OPTIONS	56
6.1	Introduction	56
6.2	Background	56
6.2.1	Sites in the Cambridge Urban Area (Cambridge)	56
6.2.2	Sites on the edge of Cambridge (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire)	57
6.2.3	South Cambridgeshire	58
6.2.3.1	New settlements	58
6.2.3.2	Sites at Rural Centres	58
6.2.3.3	Sites at Minor Rural Centres	58
6.2.3.4	Sites at Other Villages	59
6.2.3.5	Sites for other uses	59
6.3	Site Assessment	59
6.3.1	Site appraisal criteria	59
6.3.2	A joint approach	60
6.4	Identifying Sites for Appraisal	60
6.5	Site Appraisal Results	61
6.6	Summary of Sites Assessments	61
6.6.1	Cambridge Urban Area	62
6.6.2	Edge of Cambridge	62
6.6.3	New Settlements	62
6.6.4	Better Served Villages	62
7.	STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES	93
7.1	Introduction	93
7.2	Strategic development alternatives	93
7.2.1	Introduction	93
7.2.2	Background	93
7.2.3	A new baseline	93
7.3	Considering alternative approaches to development	94
7.4	Sustainability appraisal of strategic alternatives	96
7.4.1	Introduction	96
7.5	Results of the assessment	97
7.6	Overall conclusions	97
8.	GREEN BELT IN THE SA	116
8.1	Introduction	116
8.2	The treatment of Green Belt in SA	116
8.2.1	What the NPPF says	116
8.2.2	Comments of the Local Plan Inspectors	116
8.2.3	SA regulations and guidance	117
8.2.4	How the issue of Green Belt was considered in the SAs	118
8.3	How Green Belt has been addressed in plan making	120
9.	PREFERRED APPROACH	121
9.1	Introduction	121
9.2	Outline of the reasons for selecting the alternative approaches dealt with at this stage of the SA	121
9.3	The preferred approach	121
9.4	Reason for selection of the preferred approach	122
10.	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE PLANS	125

10.1	Introduction	125
10.2	Screening the effects of the Proposed Changes	125
10.3	Summary of the effects of the Local Plans	156
10.4	Likely significant cumulative effects	156
10.4.1	Effects of the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans in association with other plans and programmes	156
10.4.1.1	Consideration of A428 and A10 transport schemes	157
10.4.2	Cumulative effects of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan	158
11.	CONSULTATION AND NEXT STEPS	169
11.1	Introduction	169
11.2	Consultation on the SA Addendum Report	169
11.3	Updates following Consultation	169
11.4	Update Regarding Habitats Regulations Assessment	170
11.5	Next steps for the SAs	170

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1:	Local Plan SA documents that have been produced by each council	1
Table 1.2:	Addressing the concerns of the Inspectors	4
Table 2.1:	Timetable of SA work	11
Table 3.1:	Cambridge SA framework	21
Table 3.2:	Sustainability themes	24
Table 3.3:	South Cambridgeshire SA framework	25
Table 3.4:	Joint Strategic SA framework	30
Table 3.5:	Assessment Key	35
Table 5.1:	SA of the Development sequence	46
Table 5.2:	Discussion of the results	53
Table 6.1:	Joint Site Assessment Criteria	64
Table 7.1:	Updated Housing Targets and Identified Supply	94
Table 7.2:	Scoring against the SA criteria	99
Table 7.3:	Discussion of the results	109
Table 10.1:	Screening the Proposed Changes – Cambridge Local Plan	126
Table 10.2:	Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan	130
Table 10.3:	Assessment of New Policy E/1b Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension	149
Table 10.4:	Overall performance of the Cambridge Local Plan	159
Table 10.5:	Summary of the significant effects identified within the SA: Spatial Strategy	163
Table 10.6:	Summary of the significant effects identified within the SA: Strategic Sites	164
Table 10.7:	Summary of the significant effects identified within the SA: Climate Change	164
Table 10.8:	Summary of the significant effects identified within the SA: Delivering High Quality Places	165
Table 10.9:	Summary of the significant effects identified within the SA: Protecting and Enhancing the Natural and Historic Environment	165
Table 10.10:	Summary of the significant effects identified within the SA: Delivering High Quality Homes	166
Table 10.11:	Summary of the significant effects identified within the SA: Building a Strong and Competitive Economy	167
Table 10.12:	Summary of the significant effects identified within the SA: Promoting Successful Communities	167

Table 10.13: Summary of the significant effects identified within the SA: Transport and Infrastructure	167
---	-----

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Authorship of the Report

Appendix 2

Relationship of Addendum to Previous SA Work

Appendix 3

Consideration of Alternatives Supporting the submitted plans – detailed tables

Appendix 4

Consultation with Key Environmental Bodies

Appendix 5

Local Plan Evidence Review 2015

Appendix 6

Joint Site Assessment Proforma

Appendix 7

Site Appraisals – Edge of Cambridge

Appendix 8

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Sites Tested which now have Planning Permission

Appendix 9

Representations received during consultation on the SAA and Councils' assessment

Appendix 10

Councils' assessment of objections to scoring of individual criteria for specific sites

Appendix 11

Letter from Natural England regarding Habitats Directive Assessment

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of this Report

This report is a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Addendum Report for the Cambridge Local Plan and the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan¹.

The purpose of this report is to address the concerns expressed by the Local Plan Inspectors during the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Joint Local Plan Examination Process². This report should be read in conjunction with the Local Plan SA documents for both Councils (please see Table 1.1 for these references).

This SA Addendum Report signposts the important SA information that the Inspectors have addressed concerns about and reports on additional assessment that has been undertaken in response to the Inspectors' concerns.

This SA Addendum Report forms part of the Submission Draft SAs, adding additional detail to some elements and superceding others. Appendix B sets out how this addendum relates to the previous SA work. Appendix B also sets out how all of the reports taken together adhere to the requirements of the SEA regulations³.

Table 1.1: Local Plan SA documents that have been produced by each council

Table 1.1: Local Plan SA documents that have been produced by each council⁴	
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Cambridge City Council
SA Scoping	
South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (South Cambridgeshire District Council, June 2010). (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/070) https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/sustainability-appraisal-scoping-report	Cambridge Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (URS Limited, June 2012) (Ref: RD/LP/210) https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/docs/Sustainability-Appraisal-Scoping-Report-June2012.pdf
SA of Issues and Options 1	
South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Stage 2: Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report (South Cambridgeshire District Council, July 2012) (Ref: RD/LP/040) https://www.scambs.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/1.%20Initial%20SA%20-%20Front%20Cover%20%26%20Contents.pdf	Cambridge Local Plan Interim SA of the Issues and Options Report (URS Limited, May 2012) (Ref: RD/LP/220) https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/docs/local-plan-review-sustainability-appraisal.pdf
SA of Issues and Options 2	
Issues and Options 2: Part 1 Interim Sustainability Appraisal, (includes SA of the Development	

¹ Proposed Submission South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (South Cambridgeshire District Council, July 2013). Reference Document Library Number RD/Sub/SC/010. Cambridge Local Plan 2014 Proposed Submission (Cambridge City Council, 2013). Reference Document Library Number RD/Sub/C/010.

² Letter dated 20th May 2015 from Laura Graham and Alan Wood to South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council. Please see <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/RD-GEN-170.pdf>

³ Statutory Instrument 2004 No. 1633 The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004

⁴ Reference numbers refer to the Local Plan Examination Reference Document Library referencing system. See <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/local-plan-review-reference-documents-library>

Table 1.1: Local Plan SA documents that have been produced by each council*	
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Cambridge City Council
Strategy and sites on the edge of Cambridge). Carried out by officers from Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council (January 2013) (Ref: RD/LP/160) https://www.scambs.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Part%201%20Interim%20Sustainability%20Appraisal.pdf	
Supplementary Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report (South Cambridgeshire District Council, January 2013) (Ref: RD/LP/050) https://www.scambs.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Chapters%201-5_0.pdf	Interim SA Report 2. Issues and Options 2 Part 2 Site Options (URS Limited, January 2013) (Ref: RD/LP/280) https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/ldf/coredocs/RD-SUB-C-030.pdf
SA of Draft Local Plans	
South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/060) https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/draft-final-sustainability-appraisal-report-and-habitat-regulations-assessment-screening	Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 – Proposed Submission (URS Limited, July 2013) (Ref: RD/LP/290) https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/ldf/coredocs/RD-SUB-C-030.pdf
	Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (March 2014) (Ref: RD/Sub/C/030 – Part 1 and RD/Sub/C/040 – Part 2). https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/ldf/coredocs/RD-SUB-C-030.pdf
Further Joint Sustainability Appraisal of the Development Strategy. Carried out by officers from Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council and reviewed by independent consultants ENVIRON, contained within the report “Reviewing the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Cambridge Area (May 2014). (Ref: RD/LP/180) https://www.scambs.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Part%203%20Appendix%201%20-%20Reviewing%20the%20Sus%20Dev%20Strategy_0.pdf	

1.2 Structure of the SA Addendum Report

This section of the report is Section 1: Introduction. This section sets out the purpose of the SA Addendum Report, and outlines how the report addresses the issues raised in the Inspectors’ Letter and the requirements of the SEA Regulations.

The structure of the remainder of the SA Addendum Report is as follows:

- Section 2: Background. This section sets out the background to the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans (including their vision and objectives), the role of SA and what has been done up to this point;
- Section 3: Methodology. This section sets out how the methodology for the SA Addendum Report specifically how new work on SA frameworks has been undertaken and how this links to the scoping of sustainability issues that was carried out for both SA processes;
- Section 4: Review of Development Needs. This section sets out the growth level options that were considered during plan making and how the updated work on Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) has been used to further develop and assess housing requirements;

- Section 5: Strategic Development Sequence. This section sets out information on the strategic development sequence and includes an updated SA of the proposed strategic development sequence taking into account the updated evidence base;
- Section 6: Site Options. This section sets out an updated joint site testing methodology and presents the results of a re-assessment of the sites;
- Section 7: Strategic Development Alternatives: This section sets out reasonable strategic development alternatives available to the Councils taking into account updated evidence. These alternatives have been subject to SA and this is reported in Section 7;
- Section 8: Green Belt in the Sustainability Appraisal. This section sets out how the issue of Green Belt has been treated in the SA and outlines how the Local Plans adhere to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), specifically paragraph 85;
- Section 9: Reasons for Selection of the Preferred Option. This section sets out a summary of the Councils' reasons for selecting the preferred approach;
- Section 10: Proposed Modifications. This section discusses the effects of the proposed modifications to the Local Plans; and
- Section 11: Consultation and Next Steps. This section sets out what the consultation period for this document is, and what happens in the final stages of the Local Plan making and SA processes.

Please note that this report has joint authorship. Parts of the report have been written by Ramboll Environ (who are employed to advise the Councils on SA matters) and the Councils themselves. Please see Appendix A for details on the authorship of the report and the Quality Assurance procedures followed.

Note: The SAA was updated in March 2016 following public consultation. Further details of this update are included in Chapter 10.

1.3 Issues raised by the Inspectors

The Local Plan Inspectors have expressed concerns about the paper trail that surrounded the Local Plans and SA processes undertaken by both Councils and we are fully aware that by producing another report it could add to this paper trail. Therefore, we have taken care in this SA Addendum Report to use clear signposting and to be as clear and succinct as possible when dealing with such a complex subject. Table 1.2 sets out how this report seeks to address the concerns of the Inspectors.

Table 1.2: Addressing the concerns of the Inspectors

Table 1.2: Addressing the concerns of the Inspectors	
Inspectors' concern	How this is addressed
<p>Larger releases of Green Belt land were rejected at an early stage in the Local Plan process. A number of sites were rejected on the grounds that they were not reasonable alternatives. The Councils need to revisit the SAs to appraise all reasonable alternatives to the same level as the preferred option.</p>	<p>Section 6 addresses this issue by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explaining the methodology that was used to select, sieve and assess sites for both Local Plans; • Setting out a clear methodology by which the sites on the edge of Cambridge have been assessed to the same level as the other sites; • Presenting an assessment of sites on the edge of Cambridge; • Presenting a re-assessment of all sites in the light of the new evidence available. <p>Section 7 addresses this issue by considering the alternative of allocating development on edge of Cambridge on an equal basis with other locations.</p>
<p>It is difficult to understand how various dimensions of sustainability were assessed with regard to paragraph 85 of the NPPF</p>	<p>Section 8 addresses this issue by explaining how NPPF paragraph 85 has been addressed by the Councils and how the SA forms part of this consideration. This is supplemented by the Councils' Overall Development Strategy paper.</p>
<p>There is an inconsistency between the SDSR and the Plans' reliance on meeting development needs in new settlements. It may be that the Councils take the view that Green Belt outweighs other considerations but this should be stated clearly.</p> <p>Further modifications need to be made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Either align the plan more closely with the SDSR; or • More fully explain the reasons for departing from the strategy together with a further evidenced explanation of how challenges in making new settlements sustainable is addressed 	<p>Section 4 outlines growth level options in light of new work on Objectively Assessed Needs. Section 5 includes a re-appraisal of the strategic development sequence in light of new evidence. Section 7 outlines the alternatives available for the strategy of the plans in light of the findings of the site assessments and new evidence base and presents an updated SA of each of these alternatives. Section 9 then sets out the reasons for selection of the Preferred Option in light of the above work.</p> <p>Issues related to the SDSR have been considered throughout the addendum but especially in Section 7.</p> <p>This is supplemented by the Councils' Overall Development Strategy paper which brings together all the different elements of work that have been undertaken.</p>

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Introduction

This section of the report:

- Sets out the background to the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans (including their vision and objectives); and
- Sets out the role of the SA and signposts what work has been undertaken up to this point in the process, especially regarding defining and testing alternatives.

2.2 The Need to Review the Local Plans

The Councils need to carry out the review of their Local Plans in order to be able to demonstrate at least a 15-year supply of deliverable housing land in line with the NPPF. In addition, there have been a number of changes in recent years that have resulted in the need for review. These changes are discussed below.

Changes in the economic climate: There has been a global recession that has impacted on the economy of the Cambridge Sub-region resulting in a slowing down of all development. The rate at which it was expected that development would proceed in the districts has been less than planned for. This has particularly impacted on the larger housing schemes such as the new settlement of Northstowe where the originally anticipated start date has been delayed. Economic policies need to be reviewed in light of evidence regarding the economic downturn and the changing needs of the Cambridge area's economy to ensure they continue to support the success of the area.

Changes in local circumstances: Cambridge East Area Action Plan plans for a large development on the site of the Cambridge airport and was produced jointly by the Councils. The owners of the land – Marshalls, have now indicated that they will not be moving from the site in the foreseeable future⁵. This has resulted in a need to find additional housing allocations to accommodate the housing numbers that were allocated for this development and has highlighted the need to review the Local Plans.

Changes in planning policy guidance at both national and regional level: In May 2010 the new Coalition Government announced its intention to carry out a major review of planning within the United Kingdom and that all regional plans were to be revoked. Housing targets would no longer be set within regional plans – top down - but were to be decided at a local level. The Localism Act 2011 included many changes to planning including the intention to abolish regional plans, the duty to cooperate between local authorities on joint planning issues and the introduction of a new tier of planning – neighbourhood plans. In March 2012 the Government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), a key part of their reforms to make the planning system less complex and more accessible and to promote sustainable growth. The NPPF replaced Planning Policy Guidance Notes and Planning Policy Statements. This combination of changes has resulted in the need to review the Local Plans.

2.3 Joint working

The Councils decided to prepare separate Local Plans for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. However, there has been joint working on the plans throughout, in conformity with the duty to cooperate and reflecting the close functional relationship between the tightly drawn city boundary and its rural surroundings.

⁵ Please note that some development is coming forward at the Airport Site (the Wing development and land north of Cherry Hinton and land north of Coldham's Lane)

The Councils established joint working arrangements at the beginning of the Local Plan processes both at officer and Member level. The councils have worked together throughout the preparation of the Issues and Options consultations on the Cambridge Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, and also the parallel consultation on issues for a new Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. The councils took the same approach to joint issues in the Summer 2012 Issues and Options consultation. Each of the Issues and Options consultation documents took a common approach to the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge, the future planning of Cambridge East and the Northern Fringe East and sub-regional sporting, cultural and community facilities. Each document also highlighted the corresponding consultation by the other council. A joint approach has also been taken for the Issues and Options 2 consultation, with the Part 1 consultation document being a joint consultation by the councils. The councils have agreed to continue to work jointly as plan preparation continues. In terms of timetables, the councils' Local Plan programmes have been very similar, although it did not prove possible to align them completely for the Summer 2012 Issues and Options and Proposed Submission consultations.

A joint examination of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and the Cambridge Local Plan commenced in 2014. There are joint issues, particularly related to development strategy, which warranted joint hearings. These will be followed by hearings related to the individual plans.

2.4 The Cambridge Local Plan

2.4.1 The Current Position

The current Development Plan for Cambridge consists of:

- The Cambridge Local Plan 2006;
- There are also a number of Area Action Plans (AAP) for major developments which have DPD (Development Plan Document) status and which include policies specific to the development of these areas:
 - The Cambridge East Area Action Plan 2008 (joint with South Cambridgeshire District Council); and
 - The North West Cambridge Action Area Plan October 2009 (joint with South Cambridgeshire District Council).
- The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan and Proposals Maps also forms part of the adopted development plan.

2.4.2 Cambridge Local Plan Vision and Objectives

Included within the plan is a Vision for Cambridge to 2031, which sets out a vision of Cambridge as:

"...a compact, dynamic city, located within the high quality landscape setting of the Cambridge Green Belt. The city will draw inspiration from its iconic historic core, heritage assets, river and structural green corridors, achieving a sense of place in all its parts, with generous, accessible and biodiverse open spaces and well-designed architecture. Building on the city's reputation for design excellence, Cambridge's new development will be innovative and will promote the use of sustainable modes of transport, helping to support the transition to a more environmentally sustainable and successful low carbon economy. The city will continue to develop as a centre of excellence and world leader in the fields of higher education and research, and will foster the dynamism, prosperity and further expansion of the knowledge-based economy, while retaining the high quality of life and place that underpins that economic success. It will also grow in importance as a sub-regional centre for a wide range of services. Housing provision in the city will be of a high quality and will support the development and enhancement of balanced and mixed communities through provision of housing of a mix of sizes and types, including a high proportion of affordable housing. The Cambridge Local Plan 2014 seeks to guide and facilitate growth and

the infrastructure required to support development, so that the city grows in a sensitive and sustainable manner. This will ensure that the high environmental quality of the city is protected and enhanced and that future developments offer a full range of opportunities to all.”

The Local Plan then establishes a set of strategic objectives for the plan to deliver this vision. The objectives of the Local Plan are presented in Box 2.1 below.

Box 2.1: Objectives of the Cambridge Local Plan. All new development should...

1. Contribute to the vision of Cambridge as an environmentally sustainable city, where it is easy for people to make a transition to a low carbon lifestyle. This means making best use of energy (including community energy projects), water and other natural resources, securing radical reductions in carbon emissions, minimising environmental impact and being capable of adapting to the impacts of climate change
2. Be highly water efficient, contribute to overall flood risk reduction through water sensitive urban design, and help to improve the quality of the River Cam and other water features in the city
3. Be of the highest quality, in terms of design excellence and innovation, addressing the development’s impact upon its surroundings and embracing the principles of sustainable design and construction;
4. Contribute to the positive management of change in the historic environment, protecting, enhancing and maintaining the unique qualities and character of Cambridge, including the River Cam corridor, the city’s wider landscape and setting, and its designated and undesignated heritage assets for the future;
5. Protect and, where appropriate, enhance the character and quality of the Cambridge skyline;
6. Protect and enhance the landscape setting of the city, which comprises the Cambridge Green Belt, the green corridors penetrating the urban area, the established network of multi-functional green spaces, and tree canopy cover in the city;
7. Protect and enhance the city’s biodiversity, network of habitats and geodiversity;
8. Meet the housing needs of the city within its sub-region, delivering an appropriate mix of housing types, sizes and tenures to meet existing and future needs, including affordable housing;
9. Assist the creation and maintenance of inclusive, environmentally sustainable communities;
10. Promote and support economic growth in environmentally sustainable and accessible locations, facilitating innovation and supporting Cambridge’s role as a world leader in higher education, research and knowledge-based industries, while maintaining the quality of life and place that contribute to economic success;
11. Support Cambridge’s vibrant and thriving centres, with a varied range of shopping facilities in accessible locations that meet the needs of people living, working and studying in, or visiting, the city and its wider sub-region;
12. Promote social cohesion and sustainability and a high quality of life by maintaining and enhancing provision for open space, sports and recreation, community and leisure facilities, including arts and cultural venues that serve Cambridge and the sub-region;
13. Be located to help minimise the distance people need to travel, and be designed to make it easy for everyone to move around the city and access jobs and services by sustainable modes of transport;
14. Ensure appropriate and timely provision of environmentally sustainable forms of infrastructure to support the demands of the city, including digital and cultural infrastructure
15. Promote a safe and healthy environment, minimising the impacts of development and ensuring quality of life and place.

2.4.3 Content of the Cambridge Local Plan

The Cambridge Local Plan 2014⁶ sets out policies to guide the future development of Cambridge to 2031. It also identifies 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. The Local Plan includes strategic policies, site allocations and more specific development management policies to guide development. On adoption, it will replace the current Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and policies CE/3 and CE/35 of the Cambridge East Area Action Plan.

Following on from the Vision and objectives, the plan is divided into a number of sections, all of which contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

Section 2 of the plan sets out the spatial strategy for Cambridge and the approach to planning for a compact city through focussing new development in accessible locations, reusing previously developed land and completing the delivery of planned new urban neighbourhoods, and small Green Belt releases where exceptional circumstances can be argued. Sufficient land for housing, jobs and education/research, and supporting land uses to meet objectively assessed needs is allocated at locations and in amounts compatible with the compact city strategy. Emphasis is placed on the need to provide strategic transport infrastructure with a focus on sustainable modes. Continued protection is given to the Cambridge Green Belt, the River Cam corridor and the setting of the historic city. A network of centres is defined to meet appropriate retail and services, and to secure the diversity, vitality and viability of the City Centre and district and local centres.

Section 3 gives consideration to Cambridge's City Centre, areas of major change and opportunity areas, and site specific policies. The City Centre will be maintained and enhanced as the focus for retail and leisure, higher education and business, and also as the home to many residents and students. Areas of major change (AOMCs) and opportunity areas will continue to be carefully masterplanned to ensure that they deliver the quality of place expected in the city. Areas where considerable change may be expected during the life of the plan are considered, as well as smaller sites that are allocated for development to help meet the city's needs.

Section 4 sets out the need for new development to integrate the principles of sustainable design and construction in order to respond to our changing climate. Development will help make the best use of scarce resources, such as water, and will need to be capable of adapting to our changing climate, securing radical reductions in carbon emissions and minimising environmental impact.

Section 5 addresses the need to support and facilitate Cambridge's economy and the role of the Cambridge Cluster of knowledge-based industries and institutions. This will include a diverse range of employment, to maintain competitiveness and achieve sustainable economic growth. The growth of Cambridge's world-class university, colleges, research and bio-medical facilities is supported.

Section 6 seeks to maintain a balanced supply of housing types and sizes to meet the needs of all sections of the community, including the maximum reasonable proportion of affordable housing.

Section 7 sets out the approach to protecting and enhancing the character of Cambridge, maintaining and improving an enviable quality of life and place.

Section 8 on services and local facilities addresses the need to protect and increase the city's community facilities. Infrastructure, including education, local retail and local health facilities, will

⁶ Cambridge Local Plan 2014 Proposed Submission (Cambridge City Council, 2013). Reference Document Library Number RD/Sub/C/010.

be secured in a timely way to support development, in particular serving new communities. The loss of public houses that are viable and valued by the community will be resisted. Cambridge's role as a national and international tourism destination is supported, while pressures arising from the visitor economy are managed.

Section 9 sets out the need to provide infrastructure to support development, including sustainable transport solutions. This section also establishes the approach to planning obligations requirements and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

2.5 The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan

2.5.1 The Current Position

South Cambridgeshire District Council has adopted three district-wide Development Plan Documents (DPD) that form part of its Local Development Framework (LDF). They are as follows:

- Core Strategy DPD (adopted January 2007);
- Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007); and
- Site Specific Policies DPD (adopted January 2010).

There are also a number of Area Action Plans (AAP) for major developments which have DPD (Development Plan Document) status and which include policies specific to the development of these parts of the district. The adopted AAPs are as follows:

- Northstowe AAP (adopted July 2007);
- Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP (adopted February 2008);
- Cambridge East AAP 2008 (joint with Cambridge City Council);
- North West Cambridge AAP October 2009 (joint with Cambridge City Council).

There is a single saved policy remaining from the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (Policy CNF6) which identifies an area on Chesterton Fen Road Cambridge as suitable for further Gypsy and Traveller site provision.

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals Plan and Proposals Maps also form part of the adopted development plan.

2.5.2 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Vision and Objectives

The Local Plan establishes a Vision for the district. This states:

"South Cambridgeshire will continue to be the best place to live, work and study in the country. Our district will demonstrate impressive and sustainable economic growth. Our residents will have a superb quality of life in an exceptionally beautiful, rural and green environment."

The Local Plan then establishes a set of objectives for the plan to deliver this vision. The objectives of the Local Plan are presented in Box 2.2 overleaf.

Box 2.2: Objectives of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan

1. To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy;
2. To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity;
3. To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost;
4. To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change;
5. To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure; and
6. To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.

2.5.3 Content of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan

The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2014⁷ sets the levels of employment and housing development that should be provided over the plan period, to best meet the needs of the area and establish a clear strategy for meeting development needs in the most sustainable way that protects the quality of life of existing and future residents. Its policies aim to ensure that development is of high quality and will meet the challenges of an ageing population and changing climate. It will ensure that new development comes with the necessary schools, health facilities, shops, leisure facilities and open spaces that residents need to provide a good quality of life.

The Local Plan includes the following chapters:

- Chapter 1 is the introduction which describes the overall purpose of the document.
- Chapter 2 sets out the vision and objectives and development needs for South Cambridgeshire to 2031 together with the spatial strategy which focuses development on the edge of Cambridge, at new towns/new villages; and in selected villages. It also has policies for small scale development in villages. It includes a policy about phasing, delivering and monitoring of the plan to ensure that it continues to meet its objectives.
- Chapter 3 contains the strategic sites which will contribute most to the delivery of sustainable development in South Cambridgeshire.
- Chapter 4 is concerned with sustainable development, climate change, water resources and flooding.
- Chapter 5 is concerned with design, landscape, and public realm.
- Chapter 6 contains proposals to protect and enhance the historic built and the natural environment.
- Chapter 7 is concerned with delivering high quality housing and includes village housing sites.
- Chapter 8 deals with building a strong and competitive economy, including sections on employment, retail and tourism and development sites.
- Chapter 9 is concerned with creating successful communities, including the provision of open space, leisure facilities and community facilities.

⁷ Proposed Submission South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (South Cambridgeshire District Council, July 2013). Reference Document Library Number RD/Sub/SC/010.

- Chapter 10 deals with promoting and delivering sustainable transport and other kinds of infrastructure.

The South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2007, Development Control Policies 2007, Site Specific Policies DPD 2010 and saved policy CNF6 from the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 will be revoked (deleted) in their entirety and will no longer form part of the development plan. The Local Plan also proposes to replace specific policies in the Cambridge East Area Action Plan and the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

2.6 Background to the SA work

2.6.1 Introduction and Parties Involved

Both Local Plans have been subject to an assessment which complies with the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the SEA Regulations.⁸

The SA work that has been undertaken to date has been carried out by the following parties:

- The SA work for the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan has been carried out by South Cambridgeshire District Council for the early stages of the work (scoping and assessment of alternatives) and Ramboll Environ (who were trading as Environ during the time they were supporting South Cambridgeshire) for the later stages of the work (assessment of the draft plan and production of the South Cambridgeshire Submission Draft SA report);
- The joint SA work has been carried out by officers from South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council with advice from URS Consultants; and
- The SA work for the Cambridge Local Plan has been carried out by URS Consultants with input from Council officers.

Ramboll Environ have been contracted to provide SA support and advice to the Councils for this SA Addendum Report. However, our work will draw extensively on the work completed by all three parties outlined above.

Table 2.1 outlines the timetable of the work that was carried out for the SA up to submission.

Table 2.1: Timetable of SA work

Table 2.1: Timetable of SA work		
Timescales	Local Plan preparation stage	SA stage
2011 – mid 2012	Initial evidence gathering	<p>Cambridge: June 2012 – SA Scoping Report for the Cambridge Local Plan⁹, carried out by URS Limited. Consultation: 17 February - 26 March 2012.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire: June 2012 – SA Scoping Report for South Cambridgeshire Local Plan carried out by South Cambridgeshire District Council¹⁰. Consultation: February 2012.</p>
June – September 2012	Issues and Options consultation including Broad Locations	<p>Cambridge: May 2012 – Interim SA of the Issues and Options Report¹¹, carried out by URS Limited. Consultation: 15 June - 27 July 2012.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire: July 2012 – Initial SA</p>

⁸ Statutory Instrument 2004 No. 1633: The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004

⁹ Cambridge City Council Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (RD/LP/210)

¹⁰ South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (RD/Sub/SC/070)

¹¹ Cambridge City Council Issues and Options – Interim Sustainability Appraisal (RD/LP/220)

Table 2.1: Timetable of SA work		
Timescales	Local Plan preparation stage	SA stage
		Report for Issues and Options Report carried out by South Cambridgeshire District Council ¹² . Consultation: 12 July – 28 September 2012.
January – February 2013	Issues and Options 2 consultation	<p>Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire: January 2013 – Issues and Options 2: Part 1 Interim SA, carried out by officers from Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council with advice from URS (includes SA of the Development Strategy and sites on the edge of Cambridge).¹³</p> <p>Cambridge: January 2013 – Interim SA Report 2. Issues and Options 2 Part 2 Site Options¹⁴, carried out by URS Limited.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire: January 2013 – Supplementary Initial SA Report on Issues and Options 2 (Part 2) carried out by South Cambridgeshire District Council¹⁵</p> <p>Consultation on all 3 documents: 7 January - 18 February 2013.</p>
March – May 2013	South Cambridgeshire Single Issue Consultation – Football Stadium at Sawston	South Cambridgeshire: Supplement to the Initial SA - Single Issue Consultation – Football Stadium at Sawston document carried out by South Cambridgeshire District Council ¹⁶ . Consultation: 25 March – 6 May 2013.
Early – mid 2013	Internal consideration of the development strategy	Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire: May 2013 – Further Joint Sustainability Appraisal of the Development Strategy carried out by officers from both Councils and reviewed by independent consultants ENVIRON, contained within the report "Reviewing the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Cambridge Area" ¹⁷ .
July – September 2013	Proposed Submission consultation	<p>Cambridge: July 2013 – Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 – Proposed Submission¹⁸, carried out by URS Limited. Consultation: 19 July – 30 September 2013.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire: July 2013 – South</p>

¹² South Cambridgeshire District Council Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report to accompany Local Plan Issues & Options Report (RD/LP/040)

¹³ Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council Interim Sustainability Appraisal to accompany Local Plan Issues & Options 2 Report (Part 1) (RD/LP/160)

¹⁴ Cambridge City Council Part 2, 'Site Options within Cambridge' – Interim Sustainability Appraisal (RD/LP/280)

¹⁵ South Cambridgeshire District Council Supplementary Initial Sustainability Appraisal to accompany Local Plan Issues & Options 2 Report (Part 2) (RD/LP/060).

¹⁶ South Cambridgeshire District Council Single Issue Consultation on Football Stadium at Sawston (RD/LP/070).

¹⁷ Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Reviewing the Development Strategy for the Cambridge Area: Joint Sustainability Appraisal (RD/LP/180).

¹⁸ Cambridge City Council Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan - SA Report - Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 - Proposed Submission (RD/LP/290).

Table 2.1: Timetable of SA work		
Timescales	Local Plan preparation stage	SA stage
		Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal ¹⁹ , prepared by ENVIRON. Consultation: 19 July – 14 October 2013.
March 2014	Proposed Major Modifications to South Cambridgeshire Proposed Submission Local Plan	South Cambridgeshire: Addendum to Part 3 of the South Cambridgeshire SA ²⁰ was produced which considered proposed major modifications to South Cambridgeshire Proposed Submission Local Plan
March 2014	Submission of the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans to the Secretary of State.	Publication of the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State ²¹ and the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report ²² .

2.6.2 The role of the SA and work completed to date

The purpose of SA is to ensure that potential sustainability effects of plans are addressed through assessing sustainability impacts of objectives, actions, policies and their alternatives at an early stage in plan preparation.

Although local authorities aim to address these issues in Local Plans, it is easy to miss opportunities for better supporting sustainability objectives, and for reducing conflicts. SA offers a systematic and robust way for informing, checking and improving on plans as they are being developed. Ideally, as a result of the assessment, conflicts with sustainability objectives will be removed, but this is not always possible. The conflicts and the decisions made must be explained within the SA reports. As a result the public and other stakeholders will find it easier to appreciate the pros and cons of the plan and to make up their own minds about whether the authority has made good decisions. It is not the role of the SA to state which alternative should be chosen, this is a decision for Councils based on a number of factors. However, the SA should make clear the sustainability implications of different courses of action. Section 9 of this report sets out why the Councils have selected the preferred approach to the Local Plans. As Section 9 points out, the SA forms only one consideration in this reasoning.

From the outset of both Local Plans' preparation, and throughout the subsequent processes, a series of iterative appraisals has been published and consulted upon. At each stage, comments were considered and, where appropriate, resulted in changes to the Plans²³.

Each authority's SA objectives were established early in the process and set out in the Councils' respective Scoping Reports²⁴, alongside baseline information, plans, programmes and policies and their objectives and local sustainability issues. After consultation with key organisations, the SA objectives were revised, where appropriate, and were then used for subsequent appraisals. The

¹⁹ See South Cambridgeshire Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal Report and HRA Screening Report (RD/Sub/SC/060)

²⁰ South Cambridgeshire Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal Report and HRA Screening Report (RD/Sub/SC/060) Part 3 Appendix 6.

²¹ Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Volume 1: Final Appraisal for the Submission to the Secretary of State (RD/Sub/C/030) and Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Volume 2: History of Site Allocations (RD/Sub/C/040).

²² South Cambridgeshire Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal Report and HRA Screening Report (RD/Sub/SC/060).

²³ Responses to Issues Raised: South Cambridgeshire SA (RD/Sub/SC/060) Part 3 Appendix 2 and Cambridge City Council Statement of Consultation and Audit Trails (RD/Sub/C/080)

²⁴ Scoping Reports were incorporated into the Final SA Reports: South Cambridgeshire SA (RD/Sub/SC/060) – Part 2; Cambridge SA. (RD/Sub/C/030) Volume 1 Part 3

key environmental organisations were consulted at each plan-making stage as the SA evolved alongside the plans. The final objectives are detailed in the Submission Draft SA reports²⁵.

At each appraisal stage, the likely effects of the reasonable alternatives available were identified, described and evaluated and possible mitigation measures to minimise adverse effects identified were proposed²⁶. The SA findings informed the choice of preferred options and helped to refine policies taken forward in the Plans²⁷. The SAs provide an appropriate level of detail, focusing on significant effects identified at the strategic level and giving reasons for the selection of the preferred approach and the rejection of alternatives²⁸.

Both Councils' SAs considered a range of jobs and homes targets²⁹. After considering alternatives, both authorities settled on the objectively assessed needs identified by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which took an integrated approach to jobs and homes³⁰. In the case of Cambridge, the jobs target was higher than the options considered at the Issues and Options 2012 stage, but there was a clear justification for this approach³¹.

The Councils worked together to appraise alternatives related to the development strategy, and particularly options related to the edge of Cambridge.

A joint pro forma was developed to appraise sites on the edge of Cambridge, in order to take into account both Councils' sustainability issues. The links between the sustainability objectives and the criteria were clearly established³². The pro formas included a number of issues related to deliverability, which are reasonable considerations for assessing whether a site should be included in a development plan. The Local Plans did not approach Green Belt status as an absolute constraint on development and, indeed, propose removal of some sites from the Green Belt.

The SAs provided information on the relative merits of different strategic approaches to delivering growth, including options which would result in no growth on the edge of Cambridge, through to significant growth³³. The two Councils worked together to review the Development Strategy for the Cambridge area. A joint SA of the Development Strategy³⁴ provided an assessment of the sustainability implications of focussing on different stages of the development sequence (Cambridge Urban Area, Edge of Cambridge, New Settlements, more sustainable villages, and less sustainable villages). This was undertaken in light of the SA topics/objectives/issues identified by the two Councils. In addition, a range of development packages were considered, which included comparisons with edge of Cambridge development, new settlement, or village focused strategies³⁵.

²⁵ South Cambridgeshire SA (RD/Sub/SC/060) Part 3 Section 2.4 (Page 3-4); Cambridge SA (RD/Sub/SC/060): Volume 1: Paragraph 1.14.

²⁶ South Cambridgeshire SA (RD/Sub/SC/060): Part 3 Section 3 The Identification and Assessment of Alternatives; Cambridge SA (RD/Sub/C/030): Part 4.5.

²⁷ South Cambridgeshire SA (RD/Sub/SC/060): Part 3 Section 4 Results of the Appraisal of the Local Plan; Cambridge SA (RD/Sub/C/030): Part 4.

²⁸ South Cambridgeshire SA (RD/Sub/SC/060): Part 3 Section 3 - 3.2.6 Reasons for choosing the preferred option for the further sites in South Cambridgeshire; Cambridge SA (RD/Sub/C/030): Part 4.5.

²⁹ South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options 2012 Issues 3 and 4 - Initial Sustainability Appraisal (RD/LP/040) Appendix 5, Final SA Reports: South Cambridgeshire SA (RD/Sub/SC/060) Part 3 Appendix 3, Annex A Chapter 2; Cambridge SA (RD/Sub/C/030) Volume 1 Sections 4.2, 4.3, 4.5 and 4.6

³⁰ South Cambridgeshire SA (RD/Sub/SC/060) Annex A Chapter 2 Spatial Strategy - (Housing Provision Page A65) (Jobs Page A51); Cambridge SA (RD/Sub/C/030): Parts 4.3 and 4.6.

³¹ Cambridge SA Volume 1 (RD/Sub/C/030) paragraph 4.5.7 to 4.5.13.

³² Green Belt Site and Sustainability Appraisal Assessment Pro forma Table Showing links to Cambridge SA Topics and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objectives - Issues & Options 2 Part 1 - Joint Consultation on Development Strategy & Site Options on the Edge of Cambridge (RD/LP/160) - Appendix 1.

³³ Cambridge SA (RD/Sub/C/030) Volume 1 Section 4.2 and 4.3 (options 2 to 5).

³⁴ Cambridge SA (RD/Sub/C/030) Volume 1 Section 4.2; and South Cambridgeshire SA (RD/Sub/SC/060) Part 3, Appendix 1

³⁵ South Cambridgeshire SA (RD/Sub/SC/060) Part 3 Appendix 4.

The SAs identified various positive and negative effects related to strategic alternatives. The comparison of options; the reason for selecting the preferred approach; and rejection of others is fully explained. The cumulative and residual effects of the preferred strategy were identified³⁶. The SA process has made an effective contribution to the plan-making process.

2.6.3 The consideration of alternatives

A key issue is how alternatives (both strategy alternatives and site alternatives) are addressed in plan making (and the SA process). The SEA Regulations require that the SA report identifies the reasons for selecting the alternatives tested in light of the others available (SEA Regulations Schedule 2 (8)). In SA practice this is usually understood as having two meanings:

1. Discuss why it was 'reasonable' to select the alternatives that were developed to be tested; and
2. Discuss why the preferred approach was selected in light of the SA of alternatives.

In addition, the SEA regulations require that the SA report identifies the significant effects of the plan (and its reasonable alternatives) (Part 3(2)). Although not an explicit legal requirement, the alternatives should be appraised to the same level as the preferred option³⁷.

Because of the importance of the issue of alternatives and the fact that the Inspectors have addressed concerns that centre on the level of detail different alternatives have been assessed to and reasonableness of options, further work has been undertaken on mapping the SA processes specifically in relation to the issue of alternatives with relation to alternative strategy assessment and alternative housing sites (this scope has been chosen to ensure that the work remains focused on the concerns of the Inspectors).

This has been done through the production of a simplified flow diagram of the Local Plan processes (specifically focusing on alternative strategies and alternative sites) which highlights where key decisions have been made. This is shown in Figure 2.1. This flow diagram is supported by the production of more detailed tables which consider the following for each stage in the planning sequence where alternatives could have been tested:

- What reasonable alternatives were presented? What were the reasons for selecting these alternatives (this is vital in ensuring that the Councils meet the requirement in Schedule 2, Regulation 12(3), which states that an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives should be included in environmental (sustainability) reports³⁸).
- Were any alternatives labelled as not reasonable and what was the reasoning?
- Outlines the reason for selecting the preferred approach.

Figure 2.1a and 2.1b show this flow diagram and Appendix 3 outlines the detailed tables. Please note that these tables signpost information published in the SA audit tables in the following reports:

- Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State – Volume 1: Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State, March 2014 (Ref: RD/Sub/C/030) – audit tables can be found from page 413 onwards – Section 4.5); and
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014) (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/060). Audit tables can be found in Appendix 3 of the SA report and additional information in Annex A.

³⁶ South Cambridgeshire SA (RD/Sub/SC/060) Part 3 section 4 table 4.5; Cambridge SA (RD/Sub/C/030): Part 4.2.

³⁷ See for example the following legal cases *Heard v. Broadland District Council*, *South Norfolk District Council*, *Norwich City Council* and *Save Historic Newmarket Ltd v. Forest Heath District Council*

³⁸ Statutory Instrument No. 1633. The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

Figure 2.1a and 2.1b do not replace the information found in these audit tables, which give a detailed account of the way that alternatives have been addressed for all the issues addressed by the Local Plans.

Figure 2.1a: Where were alternatives defined in the Local Plan processes?




Figure 2.1b: Approaches selected for Proposed Submission Local Plan

SELECTED LOCAL PLAN APPROACHES/SITES

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission (July 2013)Strategy

Over the period of 2011-2031, 19,000 new homes, including affordable housing and 85 Gypsy & Traveller pitches and 22,000 additional jobs to support the Cambridge Cluster (Policy S/5)

Need for development met on site in the following order: (Policy S/6)

- a. On the edge of Cambridge;
- b. At new settlements;
- c. In the rural area at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.

Major housing allocations are carried forward (Policy S/6)

3 new strategic scale allocations are proposed for housing-led development as follows: (Policy S/6)

- d. A new town north of Waterbeach for 8,000 to 9,000 homes, 1,400 of which by 2031;
- e. A new village based on Bourn Airfield for 3,500 homes, 1,700 of which by 2031;
- f. A major expansion of Cambourne for a fourth linked village of 1,200 homes, all of which by 2031.

Sites (see Policies SS/1 to SS/8)

Edge of Cambridge (4 sites) (Orchard Park / Land between Huntingdon Rd and Histon Rd/ Cambridge East / Cambridge Northern Fringe East)

New settlements (3 sites) (Waterbeach / Bourn Airfield / Northstowe Extension)

Most sustainable villages (1 site) (Cambourne West)

Eight village sites were also allocated under Policy H/1 in the following villages (Sawston, Histon and Impington, Melbourn, Gamlingay, Willingham and Comberton). This is for small numbers of dwellings (largest site is 260 units)

Cambridge Local Plan Submission (July 2013)Strategy

Over the period of 2011-2031, 14,000 new homes (Policy 3)

Focus the majority of new development in and around the urban area of Cambridge (Policy 3)

22,100 net additional jobs in Cambridge including a net gain of some 8,800 jobs in the 'B' use classes (offices and industry) (Policy 2)

Sites (see Policies 9-26)

Areas covered by existing AAPs:

Cambridge East

Areas of Major Change:

Northern Fringe East and land surrounding the proposed Cambridge Science Park Station;

Land south of Coldham's Lane;

Southern Fringe;

Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital);

West Cambridge;

NIAB 1;

Station Areas West and the Clifton Road Area; and

Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton.

Opportunity Areas:

Mitcham's Corner

Eastern Gate

Mill Road

Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre

Old Press/Mill Lane

Site specific proposals :

Sites GB1 and GB2 (Land north and south of Worts' Causeway),

Sites GB3 and GB4 (Fulbourn Road West 1 and 2),

3. APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This section of the report:

- Outlines the scoping processes that were undertaken for each SA and explain how this relates to the SA frameworks selected;
- Provides details of the joint framework that was used to assess strategic issues at this SA Addendum Report stage;
- Provides other information on the methodology used for the SA Addendum Report including information on any difficulties encountered.

3.2 Cambridge Local Plan SA scoping

The Cambridge Local Plan SA scoping report was produced by URS Limited. In accordance with the SEA Regulations the scoping report was consulted on in February 2012 with Statutory Environmental Bodies.³⁹ This scoping report was then reproduced as part of the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State⁴⁰.

Within the scoping report evidence was considered for eight thematic topics and five functional areas (sub-divisions of Cambridge), which when taken together ensured that the full range of sustainability issues was identified.

The thematic topics are:

- Communities and well-being;
- Economy;
- Transport;
- Water;
- Flood risk including climate change adaptation;
- Climate change mitigation and renewable energy;
- Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage; and
- Biodiversity and green infrastructure.

The five functional areas are:

- City centre;
- North Cambridge;
- South Cambridge;
- East Cambridge; and
- West Cambridge.

The list of sustainability topics was defined taking into account an initial understanding of the issues to be addressed as part of the Local Plan as identified through discussions with the plan makers, the topics suggested in the SEA Directive (Annex 1(f)) and the need to give full consideration to issues relating to health and equalities. The functional areas were loosely based on the boundaries covered by the Council's area committees.

The scoping report was structured around the sustainability themes and for each theme detailed information was collected with regard to the policy context, the existing situation (current

³⁹ Cambridge Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (URS Limited, June 2012)

(Ref: RD/LP/210). <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/docs/Sustainability-Appraisal-Scoping-Report-June2012.pdf>

⁴⁰ Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014). (Ref: RD/Sub/C/030 – Part 1 and RD/Sub/C/040 – Part 2). <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/ldf/coredocs/RD-SUB-C-030.pdf>

baseline), the likely situation without the plan (future baseline) and the key sustainability issues and opportunities. This information was then used to establish a SA framework which consists of a list of key sustainability issues under each theme and functional area. The sustainability issues were used for testing plan policies and proposals and were developed instead of decision making criteria (as was the case with South Cambridgeshire). Both approaches are equally valid as long as the key issues within the local area are addressed by the framework. The Cambridge SA framework is shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Cambridge SA framework

Table 3.1: Cambridge SA framework	
Sustainability theme	Key sustainability issues. Will the Local Plan
Communities and well being	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 education 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 meets the needs of the existing and future population, including the elderly, disabled people and those in poor health; • improve air quality in and around Cambridge City Centre AQMA and along routes to the city including the A14.
Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 that 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; • ensure adequate convenience shopping in the north west of Cambridge.
Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> capitalise on the opportunity of new development to discourage private car use and promote the use of more sustainable forms of transport.
Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensure development 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; ensure new developments take sewerage infrastructure into account.
Flood risk including climate change adaptation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 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.
Climate change mitigation and renewable energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 ensure greater deployment of energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies.
Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; ensure the scale of new development is sensitive to the existing key landmark buildings and low lying topography of the City.
Biodiversity and green infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; ensure new development does not impact on biodiversity including no further loss of biodiversity rich farmland to development.
City centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensure the centre capitalises on the opportunities for 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; ensure opportunities to reduce energy demand through renewable and low carbon technologies are maximised.
North Cambridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> address deprivation across quite expansive areas of the city's northern and north-eastern extents;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • address flood risk issues; • capitalise on opportunities to encourage use of public transport and walking/cycling (including access to 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 coordinated policy with South Cambridgeshire District Council for the development of Northern Fringe East.
South Cambridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
East Cambridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
West Cambridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

3.3 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan SA scoping

The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan SA scoping report was produced by South Cambridgeshire District Council. In accordance with the SEA Regulations the Scoping Report was consulted on in February 2012 with the Statutory Environmental Bodies⁴¹. It was also consulted on (with the wider public) alongside the Issues and Options 1 report in June 2012. This scoping report was then reproduced as part of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report⁴². This version of the scoping report is not significantly different to the version consulted on in February 2012. Small changes were made in response to comments from both the above consultations and can be found in Part 2 (Section 8) of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report.

Evidence in the Scoping Report has been framed around ten themes, which taken together address the full range of sustainability issues. The themes are shown in Table 3.2. In coming up with the list of themes, the Council considered topics suggested by the SEA directive, Planning Advisory Service Guidance, the themes identified in the Scoping Report 2006 (produced as part of the appraisal for the 2006 Local Plan), the likely scope and effects of the Local Plan, and the need to address other types of assessments (for example Health Impact Assessment, Equalities Impact Assessment etc).

Table 3.2: Sustainability themes

Table 3.2: Sustainability themes		
Environmental	Social	Economic
Land	Health	Economic Activity
Pollution	Housing	Transport
Biodiversity	Inclusive Communities	
Landscape And Townscape		
Climate Change		

For each theme detailed information was collected with regard to the policy context, the existing situation (current baseline), the likely situation without the plan (future baseline) and the key sustainability issues and problems. A summary of the sustainability issues and problems identified can be found in the Non-Technical Summary of Part 2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report (see Part 2 of the report, pages 2-2 to 2-5)⁴³. In order to provide a framework for testing policies and proposals in a consistent and comparable manner, a set of sustainability objectives was then created, drawing on the above information. In addition, a set of 'appraisal questions' were formulated to highlight specific issues for consideration when assessing draft policies/proposals against the objectives. Together these provide a SA Framework, for considering, appraising and documenting the effects of plan policies and options. The SA framework is shown in Table 3.3.

⁴¹ South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (South Cambridgeshire District Council, June 2010). (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/070). <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/sustainability-appraisal-scoping-report>

⁴² South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/060). <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/draft-final-sustainability-appraisal-report-and-habitat-regulations-assessment-screening>

⁴³ South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/060). <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/draft-final-sustainability-appraisal-report-and-habitat-regulations-assessment-screening>

Table 3.3: South Cambridgeshire SA framework

Table 3.3: South Cambridgeshire SA framework		
Themes	Sustainability objective	Decision making criteria
LAND	1. Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, economic mineral reserves, productive agricultural holdings, and the degradation / loss of soils	Will it use land that has been previously developed?
		Will it use land efficiently? Will it protect and enhance the best and most versatile agricultural land? Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves? Will it minimise the degradation/loss of soils due to new development?
	2. Minimise waste production and support the reuse and recycling of waste products	Will it encourage reduction in household waste, and increase waste recovery and recycling?
POLLUTION	3. Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution	Will it maintain or improve air quality?
		Will it minimise, and where possible improve on, unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour and vibration?
		Will it minimise, and where possible address, land contamination?
		Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?
BIODIVERSITY	4. Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity?
	5. Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	Will it reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan Targets)?
	6. Improve opportunities for people to access and appreciate wildlife and green spaces	Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery and access to green infrastructure, or access to the countryside through public rights of way?
LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL	7. Maintain and enhance the diversity and local distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?

Table 3.3: South Cambridgeshire SA framework		
Themes	Sustainability objective	Decision making criteria
HERITAGE		Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character?
	8. Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings.	Will it protect or enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments)?
	9. Create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look good	Will it lead to developments built to a high standard of design and good place making that reflects local character?
CLIMATE CHANGE	10. Minimise impacts on climate change (including greenhouse gas emissions)	Will it support the use of renewable energy resources?
		Will it promote energy efficiency?
		Will it minimise contributions to climate change through sustainable construction practices?
	11. Reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects	Will it use water in a sustainable manner, and enable and encourage high levels of water efficiency?
		Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding, and incorporate sustainable drainage measures?
		Will it minimise the likely impacts on future development of climate change through appropriate adaptation?
HEALTH	12. Maintain and enhance human health	Will it promote good health, encourage healthy lifestyles, and reduce health inequalities?
	13. Reduce and prevent crime and reduce fear of crime	Will it reduce actual levels of crime, and will it reduce fear of crime?
	14. Improve the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space.	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space?
HOUSING	15. Ensure everyone has access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	Will it support the provision of a range of quality housing of appropriate types and sizes, including affordable housing, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community?

Table 3.3: South Cambridgeshire SA framework		
Themes	Sustainability objective	Decision making criteria
		Will it result in quality homes for people within the district to live in?
		Will it provide for housing for the ageing population?
		Will it provide for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?
INCLUSIVE COMMUNITIES	16. Redress inequalities related to age, disability, gender, race, faith, location and income	Will improve relations between people from different backgrounds or social groups?
		Will it redress all the sections of inequality included in the Council’s Single Equality Scheme which are as follows - Age Disability Gender Reassignment Marriage and Civil Partnership Pregnancy and Maternity Race Religion or Belief Sex Sexual Orientation
		Will it redress rural isolation - rurality?
	17. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities)	Will it provide accessibility to key local services and facilities, including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?)
		Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?)
	18. Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities	Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions, including ‘hard to reach’ groups?
Will it encourage engagement in community activities?		

Table 3.3: South Cambridgeshire SA framework		
Themes	Sustainability objective	Decision making criteria
ECONOMIC ACTIVITY	19. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy.	Will it support business development and enhance competitiveness, enabling provision of high-quality employment land in appropriate locations to meet the needs of businesses, and the workforce?
		Will it promote the industries that thrive in the district – the key sectors such as research and development /high tech/ Cambridge University related particularly through the development and expansion of clusters?
		Will it protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres?
	20. Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence	Will it contribute to providing a range of employment opportunities, in accessible locations?
		Will it encourage the rural economy and diversification, and support sustainable tourism?
	21. Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and other infrastructure	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?
Will it improve access to education and training, and support provision of skilled employees to the economy?		
TRANSPORT	22. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices.	Will it enable shorter journeys, improve modal choice and integration of transport modes to encourage or facilitate the use of modes such as walking, cycling and public transport?
		Will it support movement of freight by means other than road?
	23. Secure appropriate investment and development in transport infrastructure, and ensure the safety of the transport network.	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?
		Will it make the transport network safer for all users, both motorised and non-motorised?

3.4 Joint framework for testing of strategic alternatives

In order to address the Inspectors' issue that all alternatives should be assessed to the same level, a new appraisal framework has been formulated which addresses the issues relevant to both Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. The themes, sustainability objectives and many of the decision making criteria are taken from the South Cambridgeshire SA framework. The decision making criteria have been expanded by addition of some of the key sustainability issues from the Cambridge SA framework (those that were not addressed by the South Cambridgeshire decision making criteria) and these have been highlighted in ***bold italic***. A cross check has been carried out to ensure that the significant sustainability issues of both areas has been addressed in the framework. The joint SA framework is shown in Table 3.4. This framework builds on work that was done before the publication of the SA reports in 2014 to formulate a joint SA framework that could be used to assess joint strategic issues. This can be found in Appendix 1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report⁴⁴. Please see Appendix 4 for details of the consultation that has been carried out on this new SA framework with the environmental bodies.

⁴⁴ South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014) (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/060)

Table 3.4: Joint Strategic SA framework

Table 3.4: Joint Strategic SA framework		
Themes	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria
LAND	1. Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, economic mineral reserves, productive agricultural holdings, and the degradation / loss of soils	Will it use land that has been previously developed?
		Will it use land efficiently?
Will it protect and enhance the best and most versatile agricultural land? Will it minimise the degradation/loss of soils due to new development?		
Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		
	2. Minimise waste production and support the reuse and recycling of waste products	Will it encourage reduction in household waste, and increase waste recovery and recycling?
POLLUTION	3. Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution	Will it maintain or improve air quality, <i>including in AQMA?</i>
		Will it minimise, and where possible improve on, unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour, and vibration (<i>including compatibility with neighbouring uses?</i>)?
		Will it remediate contaminated land?
		Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?
		<i>Will it ensure that new development takes sewerage infrastructure, and source protection zones into account?</i>
BIODIVERSITY	4. Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity, <i>including positive conservation management on local wildlife sites and SSSIs</i>
	5. Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	<i>Will it deliver net gains in biodiversity? Will it help deliver habitat restoration, and reduce habitat fragmentation (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan Targets and maintain connectivity between green infrastructure)?</i>
	6. Improve opportunities for people to access and appreciate wildlife and green spaces	Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery of and access to green infrastructure or access to the countryside through public rights of way?
LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE	7. Maintain and enhance the diversity and local	Will it maintain and enhance the distinctiveness of landscape character?

Table 3.4: Joint Strategic SA framework		
Themes	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria
AND CULTURAL HERITAGE	distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character	<i>Will it recognise the role of the Green Belt in maintaining the character of the City and the quality of its historic setting?</i>
		Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character <i>including through appropriate design and scale of development?</i>
		<i>Will it ensure the scale of development is sensitive to the existing key landmark buildings and low lying topography of the City?</i>
	8. Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings.	Will it protect or enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments, <i>buildings of local interest and archaeology</i>)?
	9. Create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look good	Will it lead to developments built to a high standard of design and good place making that reflects local character, <i>and improves the quality of the public realm?</i>
CLIMATE CHANGE	10. Minimise impacts on climate change (including greenhouse gas emissions)	Will it promote energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies?
		Will it minimise contributions to climate change through sustainable construction practices?
	11. Reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects	Will it use water in a sustainable manner, and enable and encourage high levels of water efficiency?
		Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding <i>and account for all costs of flooding (including the economic, environmental and social costs)?</i>
		<i>Will it protect and enhance existing natural flood risk management infrastructure including capitalising on the opportunity for green infrastructure to help adapt to the threats of climate change?</i>
		Will it ensure that suitable sustainable drainage measures are incorporated into developments in order to manage surface water runoff?
	<i>Does it include measures to adapt to climate change (such as green and blue infrastructure, layout and massing)?</i>	
HEALTH	12. Maintain and enhance human health	Will it promote good health and encourage healthy lifestyles, and help reduce health

Table 3.4: Joint Strategic SA framework		
Themes	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria
		inequalities (<i>particularly in the north and east of Cambridge?</i>)
	13. Reduce and prevent crime and reduce fear of crime	Will it reduce actual levels of crime, and will it reduce fear of crime?
	14. Improve the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space.	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space (<i>particularly in areas anticipated to experience significant population growth?</i>)
HOUSING	15. Ensure everyone has access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	Will it support the provision of a range of quality housing of appropriate types and sizes, including affordable housing, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community including people within the District and the City (<i>including the elderly, disabled people and those in poor health?</i>)
		Will it provide for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?
INCLUSIVE COMMUNITIES	16. Redress inequalities related to age, disability, gender, race, faith, location and income	Will it improve relations between people from different backgrounds or social groups and <i>contribute to community diversity?</i>
		Will it address inequality? (related to age, disability, gender, race, faith, location and income)
		Will it redress rural isolation - rurality?
		<i>Will it 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</i>
	17. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities)	Will it provide accessibility to and improve quality of key local services and facilities, including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?)
<i>Will it ensure adequate provision of convenience shopping in the north west of Cambridge?</i>		
Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?)		

Table 3.4: Joint Strategic SA framework		
Themes	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria
	18. Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities? Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions, including 'hard to reach' groups?
Economy and Infrastructure	19. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy.	<i>Will it maintain and enhance competitiveness, and capitalise on Cambridge's position as one of the UK's most competitive cities?</i> Will it support business development and enhance competitiveness, enabling provision of high-quality employment land in appropriate locations to meet the needs of businesses, and the workforce? Will it promote the industries that thrive in the area?
		<i>Does it address pockets of income and employment deprivation particularly in Abbey Ward and Kings Hedges? Would allocation result in development in deprived wards?</i>
		<i>Will it minimise the loss of industrial floorspace in Cambridge?</i>
		Will it protect the shopping hierarchy supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres?
	20. Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence	Will it contribute to providing a range of employment opportunities, in accessible locations?
		Will it encourage and support sustainable tourism and the rural economy?
		<i>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?</i>
		<i>Does it support high-tech clusters (including high tech manufacturing) including the provision of office space for small but growing businesses and the need for high-tech headquarters?</i>
	21. Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and other infrastructure	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?
		Will it improve access to education and training for all (including timely provision of

Table 3.4: Joint Strategic SA framework		
Themes	Sustainability Objective	Decision Making Criteria
		primary and secondary schools in locations where it is needed), and support provision of skilled employees to the economy?
Transport	22. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices.	Will it enable shorter journeys, improve modal choice (helping to reduce the use of the private car) and integration of transport modes to encourage or facilitate the use of modes such as walking, cycling and public transport? Will it build on the high modal share of cycling in the City centre?
		Will it support movement of freight by means other than road?
		Will it include infrastructure for low emission vehicles?
	23. Secure appropriate investment and development in transport infrastructure, and ensure the safety of the transport network.	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?
Will it make the transport network safer for all users, both motorised and non-motorised?		

3.5 Other aspects of methodology

3.5.1 Scoring of the assessment

Assessment against the joint strategic framework above has been used to judge the significant sustainability effects of the alternative strategy options and stages in the development sequence. The assessment key set out in Table 3.5 below has been used to guide this assessment of significance.

Table 3.5: Assessment Key

Table 3.5: Assessment Key	
Symbol	Likely effect against the SA Objective
+++	Potentially significant beneficial impact, option supports the objective
+	Option supports this objective although it may have only a minor beneficial impact
0	Option has no impact or effect is neutral insofar as the benefits and drawbacks appear equal and neither is considered significant
?	Uncertain or insufficient information on which to determine the assessment at this stage
-	Option appears to conflict with the objective and may result in adverse impacts
---	Potentially significant adverse impact, conflict with the objective

3.5.2 Difficulties encountered in the assessment

The SEA regulations require that a description of any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in undertaking the assessment is set out. Both of the Local Plan SA reports sets out difficulties that have been encountered during the assessment and these are set out in the following places in those reports:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report - Difficulties encountered are set out in Section 2.7 of Part 3; and
- Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State - Difficulties encountered are set out in Section 4.7 of Part 4.

The majority of the difficulties encountered during this stage of the assessment are similar to those noted in the reports above and the most relevant are:

- The assessment has been carried out and reported using an expert judgment-led qualitative assessment. A precautionary approach has been taken, especially with qualitative judgments;
- At a strategic level of assessment a broad assessment needs to be undertaken and the identification of absolute impacts can be difficult. Because of this a more comparative approach is often taken;
- When considering which potential effects to highlight (along with a discussion of uncertainty) or not to highlight, a foremost consideration is that the aim of SA is to have a focused discussion regarding those effects that are most likely and significant (and how they should be avoided or mitigated), rather than a potentially endless discussion relating to all of possible plan effects. Ultimately, it is a matter of professional judgement as to those effects that are highlighted and those that are not. This approach is justified by the SEA Directive (i.e. through its reference to 'technical deficiencies or lack of know-how'); and
- The SEA Regulations state that effects assessment should include assessment of secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects. At this strategic level the information is often not available to assess to this level of detail. However, where information is available on the likelihood of different types of impacts this has been included in the assessment matrices.

4. REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

4.1 Introduction

This section of the report provides:

- An overview of growth level options considered during plan making;
- A review of new evidence;
- Proposed modifications to housing requirements; and
- A discussion of the impact of the new housing requirements set out in the plan.

4.2 Background

A key issue for the new Local Plans has been to consider what the appropriate level of new housing development should be over the next 20 years.

Following consideration of a range of options for the level of housing growth which should be planned for, the Submitted Local Plans included targets based on the 'Objectively Assessed Needs' identified in the Cambridge Sub Region Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

The Inspectors' Preliminary Conclusions⁴⁵ (20 May 2015) identified concerns that the Councils' approach to the establishment of the full objectively assessed need has not fully taken into account the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance regarding market signals, particularly in relation to affordability. There should be clear evidence that the Councils have fully considered the implications and likely outcomes of an upward revision in housing numbers on the provision of affordable housing. They also ask the Councils to consider any implications of the 2012-based DCLG household projections.

The Councils have commissioned additional evidence to address the issues raised. Modifications are proposed to the dwellings target in the Submitted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, to reflect the new evidence. No modification is required to the Cambridge Local Plan target.

4.3 Growth levels considered during plan making

The NPPF says that plans should make every effort to objectively identify and then meet housing needs, taking account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities. It clarifies that to boost the supply of housing, Local Plans should meet the full, objectively assessed needs of market and affordable housing in the housing market area, including identifying key sites that are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period.

During the plan making process, both Councils considered a number of options for potential housing growth targets, which were tested through the SA process and subject to consultation. The following options were included in the Issues and Options 2012 consultations:

Cambridge⁴⁶:

- 12,700 new homes to 2031 (635 dwellings per year)
- Up to 14,000 new homes to 2031 (700 dwellings per year)
- Up to 21,000 new homes to 2031 (1050 dwellings per year)

⁴⁵ Inspectors' Preliminary Conclusions (letter of 20 May 2015)
<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/RD-GEN-170.pdf>

⁴⁶ Cambridge Issues and Options 2012 Options 2,3, 4 and 5 (RD/LP/240); Cambridge Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 Volume 1: Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State March 2014 Page 196 – 200 (RD/Sub/C/030)

- Up to 25,000 new homes to 2031 (1250 dwellings per year)

South Cambridgeshire⁴⁷:

- Low housing growth option: 18,500 dwellings (925 dwellings per year)
- Medium housing growth option: 21,500 dwellings (1,075 dwellings per year)
- High housing growth option: 23,500 dwellings (1,175 dwellings per year).

Following consideration of responses and the evidence available, the following targets were identified in the Submitted Local Plans for the period 2011 to 2031:

- Cambridge: 14,000 Dwellings (Policy 3)
- South Cambridgeshire: 19,000 Dwellings (Policy S/5)

The selection of the preferred option was guided by the Cambridge Sub Region Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013 (SHMA)⁴⁸, and the Memorandum of Co-operation May 2013⁴⁹. Both Councils' targets reflected their objectively assessed needs identified in the SHMA, and were considered capable of being met appropriately⁵⁰. These policies were subject to SA alongside other policies in the plans in the respective Submission Draft SA reports⁵¹.

4.4 Review of new evidence

The Councils commissioned consultants to carry out an assessment of the issues raised in the Inspectors Preliminary Conclusions. In particular this addresses issues regarding household projections, market signals, and affordable housing, and supplements the existing evidence in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

The submitted Local Plans set housing targets of 14,000 new dwellings for Cambridge and 19,000 for South Cambridgeshire over the plan period 2011-31. These targets are based on the objectively assessed housing need (OAN) calculated in the Cambridgeshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2013, which the Councils aim to meet in full. In their letter to the Councils⁵² the Inspectors asked the Councils to consider whether these numbers were compliant with National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), in three respects:

- Whether they took adequate account of market signals;
- Whether they should be increased in order to provide more affordable housing;
- Whether they should be reconsidered in the light of the new official household projections published by the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) in February 2015.

The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination: Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Further Evidence (October 2015) addresses each of these issues.

47 South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options 2012 Issue 4; Initial Sustainability Appraisal 2012 Appendix 5 page 220.

48 Strategic Housing Market Assessment for the Cambridge Sub-Region May 2013 (RD/Strat/090)

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/ldf/coredocs/RD-STRAT-090.pdf>

49 Memorandum of Co-operation Supporting the Spatial Approach 2011-2031

<https://www.scambs.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Memorandum%20of%20Co-operation%20May%202013.pdf>

50 Cambridge Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 Volume 1: Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State March 2014 page 455 onwards (Appraisal Of The Proposed Submission Local Plan) (RD/Sub/C/030); South Cambridgeshire Draft Final SA Annex A Audit Trail Chapter 2 page A65 (Housing Provision, including reasons for preferred approach).

51 Cambridge Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 Volume 1: Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State March 2014 Page 448 - 450 (Summary of Appraisal Findings and reasons for selecting the preferred approach for housing numbers) (RD/Sub/C/030); South Cambridgeshire Draft Final SA Part 3 appendix 5 page 3-A210 (SA Results for Local Plan Submission).

52 Letter from the Inspectors to the Councils regarding preliminary conclusions dated 20 May 2015, RD/GEN/170

The study concludes that against a demographic starting point of 10,069 new dwellings for Cambridge and 17,579 new dwellings for South Cambridgeshire, there should be an uplift of 30% and 10% respectively to take account of market signals in each area, giving figures of 13,090 homes for Cambridge and 19,337 for South Cambridgeshire. When taken alongside the SHMA figures that were assessed using a different methodology taking account of jobs forecasts, the higher of the two assessments provides the most robust assessment of Objectively Assessed Need. It endorses the current requirement of 14,000 homes for Cambridge and indicates that the current figure for South Cambridgeshire of 19,000 homes should be increased to 19,500 (rounded). Consideration of affordable housing need did not result in any further recommendations.

4.5 Proposed Modifications to Housing Targets

In response to the new evidence, Cambridge City Council is proposing no modification, maintaining the target of 14,000 dwellings included in the Submitted Cambridge Local Plan. South Cambridgeshire District Council propose to increase the dwelling target from 19,000 to 19,500.

4.6 The impact of the new targets

4.6.1 Background to the previous SA work

4.6.1.1 Cambridge

In the case of Cambridge, four options were tested as part of the SA of the Local Plan Issues and Options 1 report⁵³, as shown below (outlined as Options 2-5 in the issues and options report):

- 12,700 new homes to 2031 – “urban growth” – only option that requires no development of Green Belt;
- Up to 14,000 new homes to 2031 – “the current development strategy” ;
- Up to 21,000 new homes to 2031 – “enhanced levels of urban and Green Belt growth” ; and
- Up to 25,000 new homes to 2031 – “significantly increased levels of urban and Green Belt growth” .

The final housing requirement (14,000 homes) was also tested as part of the Submission SA report⁵⁴.

4.6.1.2 South Cambridgeshire

A range of housing requirements have been tested as part of both Local Plan processes. In the case of South Cambridgeshire, three options were tested as part of the SA of the Local Plan Issues and Options 1 report⁵⁵, as shown below (outlined as Option 4 in the issues and options report):

- Lower housing growth - additional 4,300 dwellings (equal to 925 dwellings per year) or an additional target of 18,500 dwellings;
- Medium housing growth - additional 6,800 dwellings (equates to 1,050 dwellings per year) or an additional target of 21,500 dwellings; and
- High housing growth - additional 9,300 dwellings (equate to 1,175 dwellings per year) or an additional target of 23,500 dwellings.

⁵³ Cambridge City Council Issues and Options – Interim Sustainability Appraisal (RD/LP/220).

⁵⁴ Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014)

⁵⁵ South Cambridgeshire District Council Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report to accompany Local Plan Issues & Options Report (RD/LP/040)

The final housing requirement (19,000 homes) was also tested as part of the Submission SA report.⁵⁶

4.6.2 Impact of the changes in the housing requirement

4.6.2.1 Cambridge

As set out in Section 4.3, the housing requirement for Cambridge remains as 14,000 and has not changed from that included in the Submission Local Plan. As this housing requirement has been tested previously it is not necessary to re-test this requirement to determine its sustainability effects. For details of the testing carried out for this housing requirement in Cambridge please see page 198 (paragraph 4.5.8) of the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State. On page 449 of the SA report, it is noted that in coming to its decision on the level of housing need, the Council took the following messages from the Interim SA:

- The Option for up to 14,000 new homes represents a balanced approach to development. The identified need for greater housing, including affordable housing, is met to a greater extent, while Green Belt development is minimal;
- However, despite the increased provision of housing under the Option for 14,000 new homes, there will still be a significant shortfall of affordable houses, which will impact on levels of deprivation;
- In terms of the economy, this level of housing is likely to have a neutral impact. It will enable a greater number of people to live and work within Cambridge and therefore support the vitality of the City, but a significant number of people will not be able to, which could impact on its competitiveness;
- Given the Option for 14,000 new homes requires the release of land from the Green Belt, the impact on landscape/townscape and biodiversity is assessed to be negative. However, the release of Green Belt land is less substantial than for the Options with higher housing provision.

Please note that it has not been necessary to test the option of 13,090 new dwellings (this is the figure identified in the report "Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Further Evidence, October 2015"). This figure of 13,090 should be considered as a reasonable alternative and an appraisal made of its effects. However, the figure of 12,700 has already been tested for Cambridge at the issues and options stage. 13,090 and 12,700 should not be significantly different in their effects especially as the level of detail in the assessment is necessarily broad and the conclusions of this assessment should remain valid. The conclusions of the assessment of the 12,700 figure have been validated and the conclusions of the assessment remain valid for the figure of 13,090. The original assessment can be found on page 196 of the Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014). The conclusions of this assessment are summarised below:

The relatively modest level of development (compared to the other options tested) proposed in this option has a number of implications.

- The most significant negative implication of this option is that it does not entirely address the identified need for more affordable housing in Cambridge. It is likely that this option will lead to the continuation of people living outside Cambridge and commuting in and a continuation in high house prices;
- The modest scale of development proposed is unlikely to support the economic vision of Cambridge;
- A significant positive impact of this option is the maintenance of the Green Belt and the biodiversity and wildlife it supports;

⁵⁶ South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/060)

- Since the option represents the minimum level of development it has both negative and positive impacts on the different areas of Cambridge. While it is unlikely to have a significant impact on levels of deprivation, especially in the East and North of Cambridge, it will act to safeguard open space and will have less of an impact on conservation areas as other options.

4.6.2.2 South Cambridgeshire

The housing requirement for South Cambridgeshire as devised from the updated OAN work has changed from 19,000 to 19,500. As discussed in Section 4.5.1.2 the following options have been tested as part of the SA:

- 18,500 dwellings – tested as part of the issues and options 1 assessment. The results of this assessment can be found on page 222 of Appendix 5 of the Initial SA report⁵⁷;
- 21,500 dwellings – as above;
- 23,500 dwellings – as above; and
- 19,000 – tested as part of the Submission Local Plan SA. The results of this assessment can be found in Appendix 5, page 3-A210 – A230 of the South Cambridgeshire Submission SA report.

It has not been necessary to carry out an updated SA of the new housing requirement of 19,500. This is because the changes to the housing requirement will not be significantly different to those already tested especially as the level of detail in the assessment is necessarily broad. Therefore, the approach has been to validate the assessment of the Submission Local Plan housing requirement (19,000) to ensure that the conclusions of the assessment remain valid for a housing requirement of 19,500. This review has concluded that this assessment does remain valid. As already indicated the original assessment can be found in Appendix 5, page 3-A210 – A230 of the South Cambridgeshire Submission SA report. The conclusions of this assessment are summarised below:

- There may be significant negative impacts related to land and soil. There could be impacts on agricultural land through the need to allocate land for development coupled with the fact that the limited supply of previously developed land available for development reduces the opportunity to use land efficiently;
- There could be significant negative impacts on pollution and carbon emissions as development on the scale envisaged by the plan will inherently lead to adverse impacts on air quality / carbon emissions associated with population growth (however, this should be considered against a future baseline where development is still likely to occur and without the benefit of the Local Plan in an unplanned way). Increased traffic movements, generally generated to seek employment, will lead to adverse impacts on air quality;
- There could be uncertain impacts on biodiversity, heritage and landscape character as these levels of growth will inherently lead to a change in character and loss of some habitats / heritage assets through site allocations, and unallocated development which come forward during the life of the plan. These impacts should be mitigated through policies in the plan; and
- There will be a significant beneficial impact on housing and service provision because it provides for a medium growth level in housing development to meet the objectively assessed housing needs within the plan period.

⁵⁷ South Cambridgeshire District Council Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report to accompany Local Plan Issues & Options Report (RD/LP/040)

5. STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT SEQUENCE

5.1 Introduction

This section of the report:

- Introduces the existing development strategy and development sequence, what it is for and how it has been considered during plan making; and
- Sets out an updated SA of the stages of the development sequence.

5.2 Background

The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans not only identify the amount of growth that should take place in the period to 2031, they also need to provide a development strategy to guide where this growth should take place. This needs to take account of a range of social, environmental and economic issues, in order to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

Whilst a significant part of the development needs identified in the area will be met by existing commitments (sites which already have planning permission or have been identified through existing plans), there remain strategic choices to be made about the location of future growth.

During the plan making process, the Councils considered a range of potential development locations, which were subject to SA. At a high level, this included consideration of implications of growth at each location in the existing search sequence – Cambridge Urban Area, Edge of Cambridge, New Settlements, Better Served Villages (defined as Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres).

The Inspectors' Preliminary Conclusions⁵⁸ (20 May 2015) identified concerns regarding how the Green Belt had been considered during plan making, and sought to ensure that the sustainability implications had been fully considered and documented in an accessible way. The Inspectors also highlighted issues identified in the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Sustainable Development Strategy Review⁵⁹ relating to the benefits and challenges of different development strategy choices. This was a document prepared by the Cambridgeshire Joint Strategic Planning Unit for the Councils at the beginning of the plan making process to consider the broad strategic choices and compliment the Councils SA processes.

In response, the Councils have commissioned new evidence to address a number of issues, including Green Belt, Transport, Infrastructure and Viability. In light of these issues, this section of the SA Addendum provides a review of the SA of broad strategy options that was included in the Councils' Submission Draft SA reports and considers the implications of the additional evidence.

5.3 Existing development sequence

The current development strategy for the Cambridge area stems from the 2000 Regional Plan for East Anglia⁶⁰ and the 2003 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan⁶¹. Flowing from these, the existing Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and South Cambridgeshire Local Development

58 Inspectors' Preliminary Conclusions (letter of 20 May 2015)
<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/RD-GEN-170.pdf>

59 Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Sustainable Development Strategy Review 2012

<https://www.scams.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Sustainable%20Development%20Strategy%20Review.pdf>

60 Regional Planning Guidance Note 6: Regional Planning Guidance for East Anglia to 2016 (2000) (RD/NP/131)

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/ldf/coredocs/RD-NP-131.pdf>

61 Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003 <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/rd-ad-010.pdf>

Framework (adopted between 2007 and 2010) introduced a step change in levels of planned growth, including identifying a number of urban extensions to Cambridge through land removed from the Green Belt, and the new town of Northstowe.

The strategy aimed to focus development according to a sustainable development sequence:

1. Within the urban area of Cambridge, subject to capacity and environmental considerations;
2. On the periphery of the built up area of Cambridge, subject to a review of the Green Belt;
3. In a new settlement close to Cambridge;
4. Within the built up area of market towns, larger villages and previously established new settlements where good public transport access to Cambridge exists or can be provided, provided that growth in car commuting can be minimised;
5. By extensions to market towns, larger villages and previously established new settlements where good public transport access to Cambridge exists or can be provided, provided that growth in car commuting can be minimised⁶².

One of the issues for the new round of plans is to consider whether this sequence remains appropriate, and how much development should take place at each location.

Through the first Issues and Options consultations in 2012, the Councils considered and consulted on a number of development strategy options. Cambridge considered whether growth strategies should focus on the urban area only, or whether additional growth should take place in the Green Belt on the edge of the City⁶³. Both Councils considered the implications of 10 Broad Locations of development on the edge of Cambridge⁶⁴. South Cambridgeshire sought views on whether growth should focus on edge of Cambridge, one or more new settlements, better served villages, or a combination of these⁶⁵. At the second issues and options stage in 2013, the Councils jointly sought views on the appropriate balance between protecting land on the edge of Cambridge that is of high significance to Green Belt purposes, and delivering development away from Cambridge in new settlements and at better served villages⁶⁶.

Building on the SAs supporting each of the Issues and Options consultations, a joint assessment was carried out of the sustainability implications of focusing on different stages of the development sequence (Cambridge Urban Area, Edge of Cambridge, New Settlements, better served villages, and although not part of the development sequence for comparison the less sustainable villages), to provide an overview of the development strategy option available to the Councils, taking on board issues identified during the SA and plan making process⁶⁷.

A range of site options were considered through the plan making process and tested through sustainability appraisal. Packages of sites capable of delivering sufficient development were identified, and tested to provide further comparison of the strategic alternatives available⁶⁸.

⁶² Policy 22 - Regional Planning Guidance Note 6: Regional Planning Guidance for East Anglia to 2016 (2000) (RD/NP/131)

⁶³ Cambridge Issues and Options Report 2012 (RD/LP/240) Options 2 to 5 and Option 9 and Interim Sustainability Appraisal (RD/LP/220) Section 6 pages 23 – 27 and page 31;

⁶⁴ Cambridge Issues and Options Report 2012 (RD/LP/240) Options 10 to 19 and Interim Sustainability Appraisal (RD/LP/220) Section 6 pages 31 - 37; South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options 2012 Issue 12; Initial Sustainability Appraisal 2012 Appendix 5 page 231.

⁶⁵ South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options 2012 Issue 9; Initial Sustainability Appraisal 2012 Appendix 5 page 224.

⁶⁶ Cambridge Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Issues and Options 2 Joint Part 1 2013 consultation (RD/LP/150) Chapter 8 Question1 Page 50

⁶⁷ Cambridge Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 Volume 1: Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State March 2014 Section 4.2 Page 165; South Cambridgeshire Draft Final SA Part 3 Appendix 1 Section 2 page 3-A23

⁶⁸ South Cambridgeshire Draft Final SA Part 3 Appendix 4

5.4 SA of the stages of the development sequence

5.4.1 Introduction and purpose

This section of the report provides an updated SA of the stages of the development sequence. It builds on the appraisal contained within the joint document (Reviewing the Development Strategy for the Cambridge Area: Joint Sustainability Appraisal – RD/LP/180). This appraisal is also contained in Appendix 1 (Reviewing the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Cambridge Area) of the South Cambridgeshire Submission Draft SA report⁶⁹ and in the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State⁷⁰ in Section 4.2. As well as the above report it also uses information contained in the 2012 evidence document Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Sustainable Development Strategy Review (RD/Strat/040). This was written by the Cambridgeshire Joint Strategy Unit.

The differences between this appraisal and the appraisal contained in the previous SA reports are:

- This SA is based on the new strategic SA framework developed for use in this SA Addendum Report (see Section 3 for details on how this was developed). Please note that because of the very broad strategic nature of the development sequence, the SA has been carried out to a broad level of detail and has been assessed against the SA objectives rather than against the individual decision making criteria;
- It considers the potential for development across the two districts, and does not consider the City/District administrative boundary, particularly relevant to the edge of Cambridge stage (as much as possible at this strategic level of assessment); and
- The SA takes into account new evidence on a number of issues. Please see Appendix 5 for a description of the scope of these studies:
 - Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination – Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Further Evidence(2015);
 - Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study (2015);
 - Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Viability Update (2015);
 - Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Study (2015);
 - Local Plans CSRM Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Transport Report.(Atkins, November 2015).
- Some small changes have been made to the assessment scores to make them clearer and a discussion column has been included in Table 5.1 to make the assessment more transparent.

The purpose of this SA is to show how the different stages in the development sequence would perform taking into account updated evidence and appraisal against the updated SA framework.

This is an assessment, carried out to an appropriate level of details for a strategic assessment, of the sustainability implications of focusing on different stages of the development sequence (Cambridge Urban Area, Edge of Cambridge, New Settlements, more sustainable villages, and although not part of the development sequence for comparison the less sustainable villages). The SA also builds on the assessment of South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options 2012 Issue 9: Development Strategy, which considered the broad implications of focusing development at different locations in the development sequence and Option 9 of the Cambridge Issues and Options Report, which considered the implications of focussing development within the urban area of Cambridge, and the appraisal of the Broad Locations.

Please see Section 3 of this SA Addendum Report for an explanation of the scoring used. Please note that the assessment is carried out against the future baseline or business as usual scenario

⁶⁹ South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/060)

⁷⁰ Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014) (Ref: RD/Sub/C/030 – Part 1 and RD/Sub/C/040 – Part 2).

(the options are compared against what would happen if there were no Local Plans developed). This enables a fair comparison to be made between the options. This is not as straight forward as considering a 'no development' situation. Without the Local Plans development proposals would still be considered through planning applications, guided by National planning policy (the National Planning Policy Framework), and other legislation. Proposals would be considered on an ad hoc basis, without the Local Plans to take a strategic overview of development needs, and opportunities for enhancement.

With regard to mitigation measures the SA represents an assessment of the alternative strategies with reasonable mitigation in place. The assessment has assumed, for example, that measures to address known transport issues and those likely to be brought forward to support future growth are included (these are the measures that have been modelled along with the growth options in the additional transport modelling referred to above). It has also taken on board conclusions of the viability and infrastructure work outlined above with regard to the kinds of infrastructure that will be needed and how viable these are for different development options. In addition, it has been assumed mitigation measures that would inherently be included within the design of new developments will be included within a reasonable time frame to ensure that effects are acceptable (where this is not the case this is highlighted). This approach has been taken to reflect the fact that new work has been commissioned on the measures that will realistically be needed to make growth sustainable and acceptable. It also reflects the fact that the area has now received City Deal funding which will provide additional funding to ensure that future economic growth is supported by infrastructure and is sustainable.

5.4.2 Results of the assessment

The assessment matrix is shown in Table 5.1 and results are discussed in Table 5.2.

5.4.3 Overall conclusions

The updated evidence base and changes to the SA framework have not changed the results of the assessment significantly.

The assessment concludes that the most sustainable level of the development sequence is within Cambridge. Development will have many sustainability benefits including protecting the distinctive setting of Cambridge through safeguarding the Green Belt and the associated biodiversity of the Green Belt. However, the scale of potential development within the urban area is severely constrained so will form a fairly small part of the overall strategy, forming a small but vital component of all of the alternatives.

With regard to the edge of Cambridge, the assessment has confirmed that there are sustainability benefits to development on the edge of Cambridge. With regard to transport, development on the edge of Cambridge remains the best performing option with regard to modal share and performs positively due to short distances to the city, low public transport journey times, and in many cases proximity to high frequency public transport. However, the modal share results hide the fact that these locations are in already congested areas of the city where there is little scope to create more capacity for more cars, forcing new trips to be undertaken by active modes. The Local Plans CSRM report shows that different development options do not result in radically different levels of traffic growth, travel times or delay. Whilst there are variations, these are in the context of very high overall traffic growth where significant amounts of development are already committed. Viability evidence has confirmed that sites on the edge of Cambridge do offer higher sales values than options further from the city meaning facilities and infrastructure are more viable. This offers benefits in terms of potential to secure higher funding through Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) / Section 106. Cambridge is proposing to secure a higher rate of CIL than South Cambridgeshire, and this higher rate has the potential to

be applied to edge of Cambridge sites. However, the Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study (2015) has concluded that it is unlikely that any development within identified sectors (apart from a few small exceptions) could be accommodated without substantial harm to the Green Belt purposes. Therefore, the conclusions remain that, notwithstanding some of the positive sustainability effects that development on the edge of Cambridge demonstrates, it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development here without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt.

With regard to new settlements, they could have significant landscape impacts. However, they will help to protect Green Belt and the setting of Cambridge and have the potential to use areas of previously developed land. New settlements could incorporate significant public transport routes to Cambridge, and new town and local centres as appropriate, to ensure that residents have convenient access to local services and facilities by walking, cycling and public transport. They have the potential to enable focussed investment in public transport and cycling infrastructure, delivering high quality services to provide a significantly higher modal share of travel by non-car modes than village based growth options. The Local Plans CSRM report found that the greater distance from Cambridge would mean higher levels of car use than an edge of Cambridge focus but site specific transport measures would reduce the impact of growth, increasing the proportion of trips made by non-car modes, including shift towards Park & Ride. Viability evidence has confirmed that sites on the edge of Cambridge do offer higher sales values than new settlement sites. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements. Transport schemes identified to support new settlements are expensive, but would also provide benefit to existing communities. Given the cost of transport schemes required for the sites, it is unlikely that off site infrastructure and substantial services could be delivered through CIL/S106 alone. However, it is expected that City Deal funding would be available to support delivery of major infrastructure required to make the new settlements viable and sustainable.

With regard to village led development such a strategy would be likely to deliver incremental improvements at best, rather than focused investment. Traffic impacts would be spread more around the district, but there would be a higher modal share for car use. A distribution to smaller sites would have a more incremental impact on the landscape and townscape, but village expansions could negatively impact on village character. The conclusions remain that development at these levels are not as positive as for edge of Cambridge and New Settlements and that they should remain at the bottom of the development sequence.

Table 5.1: SA of the Development sequence

Table 5.1: SA of the Development sequence – assessment matrix (criteria marked in <i>bold italic</i> are those that have been added to the framework to take into account Cambridge issues – please see Section 3.4 for more details).							
SA objective	Decision Making Criteria	Cambridge Urban Area	Edge of Cambridge	New settlements	More sustainable villages	Smaller less sustainable villages	Discussion
1. Land	Will it use land that has been previously developed? Will it use land efficiently? Will it protect and enhance the best and most versatile agricultural land? Will it minimise the degradation/loss of soils due to new development? Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?	+++	-	+/-	-	-	Development in Cambridge offers opportunities to re-use previously developed land, making use of the existing urban area, reducing the need to develop greenfield / agricultural land. A focus on new settlements have the potential to utilise previously developed land opportunities, such as former airfields or military barracks, although they would also be likely to still utilise significant areas of greenfield land. Sites on the edge of Cambridge and in the villages are likely to have a negative impact on agricultural land and are unlikely to utilise large amounts of previously developed land.
2. Waste	Will it encourage reduction in household waste, and increase waste recovery and recycling?	0	0	0	0	0	This is not a location specific issue.
3. Air quality and environmental pollution	Will it maintain or improve air quality, including in AQMA? Will it minimise, and where possible improve on, unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour, and vibration (including compatibility with neighbouring uses)? Will it remediate contaminated land? Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment? Will it ensure that new development takes sewerage infrastructure, and source protection zones into account?	-	-	-	-	-	Growth on the scale envisaged will inherently generate traffic movements, thereby having a negative impact on air pollution regardless of location of new development. However, growth would continue in the future baseline scenario and potentially in unsustainable locations. With regard to air quality, the central area of the city is identified as an AQMA, and therefore further development could include placing further population in this area. Development in the urban area has best opportunity to support non-car modes of transport, and the compact nature of the city makes it particularly suitable for cycling in addition to walking. However, as highlighted in the Local Plans CSRM report, focusing all development on Cambridge will not be sufficient to meet the identified housing need and this would lead to greater levels of travel (and effects on air quality) as people from outside the area access new jobs. Development on the edge of Cambridge could, in some locations bring dwellings closer to the M11 or A14, areas of relatively poor air quality (with an AQMA on the A14). Major development has the potential to worsen air quality, although it would support greater use of non-car modes than more distributed patterns of development. New settlements could have negative impacts on air quality. Although they could incorporate significant public transport to Cambridge, the greater distance from Cambridge will mean higher levels of car use. Development in villages is likely to generate traffic movements especially through commuting so has been scored as negative. The Local Plans CSRM report states that increasing congestion, delay and journey times means that traffic will be stationary for longer and this will have negative impacts on air quality and carbon emissions and this will be evident in all scenarios.
4. Designated sites and protected species	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity, including positive conservation management on local wildlife sites and SSSIs	0	?	?	?	?	Development in the urban area is unlikely to affect designated sites and protected species so will have a neutral effect. However, the other stages in the development sequence could have positive impacts but this is dependent on the exact development sites chosen and this is uncertain at this stage. There is potential for negative impact on protected sites through development but this will be managed through policies in the Local Plans.

Table 5.1: SA of the Development sequence – assessment matrix (criteria marked in <i>bold italic</i> are those that have been added to the framework to take into account Cambridge issues – please see Section 3.4 for more details).							
SA objective	Decision Making Criteria	Cambridge Urban Area	Edge of Cambridge	New settlements	More sustainable villages	Smaller less sustainable villages	Discussion
5. Habitats and species	<i>Will it deliver net gains in biodiversity? Will it help deliver habitat restoration, and reduce habitat fragmentation (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan Targets and maintain connectivity between green infrastructure)?</i>	-	?	?	?	?	Development in Cambridge alone is unlikely to deliver gains in biodiversity and maintain connectivity between green infrastructure. However, the other stages in the development sequence could have positive impacts but this is dependent on the exact development sites chosen and this is uncertain at this stage.
6. Access to wildlife and green spaces	Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery of and access to green infrastructure or access to the countryside through public rights of way?	-	+++	+++	-	-	Development in Cambridge alone would not deliver access to wildlife and green spaces. Green Infrastructure opportunities would vary by site, but larger scale development (for example edge of Cambridge and New Settlements) could support delivery of significant green infrastructure. Viability work has confirmed that the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make this an attractive location for development meaning that facilities and infrastructure are more viable for edge of Cambridge development than new settlements, which could mean more funding available for green infrastructure. A more distributed pattern of village development would provide no direct opportunities to deliver significant scale green infrastructure.
7. Landscape and townscape character	Will it maintain and enhance the distinctiveness of landscape character? <i>Will it recognise the role of the Green Belt in maintaining the character of the City and the quality of its historic setting?</i> Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character <i>including through appropriate design and scale of development?</i> <i>Will it ensure the scale of development is sensitive to the existing key landmark buildings and low lying topography of the City?</i>	+	---	---/+	-/?	-/?	Development in the urban area will help to protect the sensitive landscape on the edge of Cambridge and protect the setting of Cambridge. With regard to development on the edge of Cambridge, this would involve Green Belt development, and loss of significant amounts of high grade agricultural land. The Inner Green Belt Study (2015) has concluded that it is unlikely that any development on the edge of Cambridge (apart from a few small exceptions) could be accommodated without substantial harm to the Green Belt purposes. New settlements could have significant impacts on landscape character but generally they are located in areas of less sensitivity and will help to protect Green Belt and the setting of Cambridge. With regard to development in the villages, there may be some landscape sensitivities to overcome but this is uncertain at this stage. Distribution to smaller sites would have a more incremental impact on the landscape and townscape, but village expansions could negatively impact on village character. The most sustainable villages are inset into the Green Belt close to Cambridge so this could cause a negative impact but this is likely to be less than large scale Green Belt releases.
8. Historic Environment	Will it protect or enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments, <i>buildings of local interest and archaeology</i>)?	?	?	?	?	?	The effect is dependent on the exact development sites chosen and this is uncertain at this stage. There is potential for negative impact on protected sites through development but this will be managed through policies in the Local Plans.
9. Good Spaces	Will it lead to developments built to a high standard of design and good place making that reflects local character, <i>and improves the quality of the public realm?</i>	0	0	0	0	0	This is not a location specific issue.

Table 5.1: SA of the Development sequence – assessment matrix (criteria marked in <i>bold italic</i> are those that have been added to the framework to take into account Cambridge issues – please see Section 3.4 for more details).							
SA objective	Decision Making Criteria	Cambridge Urban Area	Edge of Cambridge	New settlements	More sustainable villages	Smaller less sustainable villages	Discussion
10. Climate Change Mitigation	Will it promote energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies? Will it minimise contributions to climate change through sustainable construction practices?	0	0	0	0	0	This is not a location specific issue.
11. Climate Change Adaptation	Will it use water in a sustainable manner, and enable and encourage high levels of water efficiency? Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding <i>and account for all costs of flooding (including the economic, environmental and social costs)?</i> <i>Will it protect and enhance existing natural flood risk management infrastructure including capitalising on the opportunity for green infrastructure to help adapt to the threats of climate change?</i> Will it ensure that suitable sustainable drainage measures are incorporated into developments in order to manage surface water runoff? <i>Does it include measures to adapt to climate change (such as green and blue infrastructure, layout and massing)?</i>	0	0	0	0	0	Effects are either not locational issues or would be dependent on the exact development sites chosen.
12. Human health	Will it promote good health and encourage healthy lifestyles, and help reduce health inequalities <i>(particularly in the north and east of Cambridge)?</i>	0	0	0	0	0	This would be dependent on the exact development sites chosen.
13. Crime	Will it reduce actual levels of crime, and will it reduce fear of crime?	0	0	0	0	0	This is not a location specific issue.
14. Public Open Space	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space <i>(particularly in areas anticipated to experience significant population growth)?</i>	0	0	0	0	0	This would be dependent on the exact development sites chosen.

Table 5.1: SA of the Development sequence – assessment matrix (criteria marked in <i>bold italic</i> are those that have been added to the framework to take into account Cambridge issues – please see Section 3.4 for more details).							
SA objective	Decision Making Criteria	Cambridge Urban Area	Edge of Cambridge	New settlements	More sustainable villages	Smaller less sustainable villages	Discussion
15. Housing	Will it support the provision of a range of quality housing of appropriate types and sizes, including affordable housing, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community including people within the District and the City <i>(including the elderly, disabled people and those in poor health)?</i> Will it provide for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?	-	+	+	+	+	Development in the urban area will not provide adequate housing to provide for housing need so this has been scored as negative. All of the other options have the potential to provide for a range of housing needs.
16. Inequalities	Will it improve relations between people from different backgrounds or social groups and <i>contribute to community diversity?</i> Will it address inequality? (related to age, disability, gender, race, faith, location and income) Will it redress rural isolation - rurality? <i>Will it 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</i>	0	0	0	0	0	This is not a location specific issue.
17. Services and Facilities	Will it provide accessibility to and improve quality of key local services and facilities, including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?) <i>Will it ensure adequate provision of convenience shopping in the north west of Cambridge?</i> Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?)	+++	+++	+	0	0	Cambridge provides the highest concentration of jobs, and high order services and facilities in the Cambridge area, placing residential development in the urban area would enable the closest access to these. Development on the edge of Cambridge and in New Settlements will be close to key local services although development on the edge would be more accessible to the main jobs and service centre, Cambridge. All development would be expected to deliver an appropriate level of services and facilities. Viability work has confirmed that the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre (edge of Cambridge) make this an attractive location for development meaning that there is potentially higher levels of funding available for facilities and infrastructure. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements. A village based option would require incremental improvement to village infrastructure. This could put pressure on existing village services and facilities, such as schools, doctors and utilities.
18. Involvement	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities? Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions, including 'hard to reach' groups?	0	0	0	0	0	This is not a location specific issue.

Table 5.1: SA of the Development sequence – assessment matrix (criteria marked in ***bold italic*** are those that have been added to the framework to take into account Cambridge issues – please see Section 3.4 for more details).

SA objective	Decision Making Criteria	Cambridge Urban Area	Edge of Cambridge	New settlements	More sustainable villages	Smaller less sustainable villages	Discussion
19. Economy	<p><i>Will it maintain and enhance competitiveness, and capitalise on Cambridge’s position as one of the UK’s most competitive cities?</i> Will it support business development and enhance competitiveness, enabling provision of high-quality employment land in appropriate locations to meet the needs of businesses, and the workforce? Will it promote the industries that thrive in the area?</p> <p><i>Does it address pockets of income and employment deprivation particularly in Abbey Ward and Kings Hedges? Would allocation result in development in deprived wards?</i></p> <p><i>Will it minimise the loss of industrial floorspace in Cambridge?</i> Will it protect the shopping hierarchy supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres?</p>	0	0	0	0	0	This is not a location specific issue.
20. Access to Work	<p>Will it contribute to providing a range of employment opportunities, in accessible locations?</p> <p>Will it encourage and support sustainable tourism and the rural economy?</p> <p><i>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?</i></p> <p><i>Does it support high-tech clusters (including high tech manufacturing) including the provision of office space for small but growing businesses and the need for high-tech headquarters?</i></p>	+++	+++	+	-	---	<p>Cambridge provides the highest concentration of jobs, and high order services and facilities in the Cambridge area, placing residential development in the urban area would enable the closest access to these. There are 35% more jobs in Cambridge than there are economically active residents and in commuting to Cambridge is a major problem.⁷¹</p> <p>Development on the edge of Cambridge will provide housing development that is closest to the high concentration of jobs in Cambridge.</p> <p>New settlements could be developed with a mix of uses with employment delivering jobs locally and their own services and facilities of higher order than smaller scale growth at existing villages. This could provide a degree of self-containment, by providing opportunities to live and work in the same place, however, the greatest concentration of jobs will remain in and close to Cambridge.</p> <p>Villages offer a narrower range of employment options and the need to travel is greater (and smaller, less sustainable villages tend to offer a very narrow range of employment).</p>

⁷¹ Cambridge Access Study. Access Audit Report, July 2015. Mott MacDonald.

Table 5.1: SA of the Development sequence – assessment matrix (criteria marked in *bold italic* are those that have been added to the framework to take into account Cambridge issues – please see Section 3.4 for more details).

SA objective	Decision Making Criteria	Cambridge Urban Area	Edge of Cambridge	New settlements	More sustainable villages	Smaller less sustainable villages	Discussion
21. Infrastructure	<p>Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?</p> <p>Will it improve access to education and training for all (including timely provision of primary and secondary schools in locations where it is needed), and support provision of skilled employees to the economy?</p>	+++	+++	+	-	---	<p>Cambridge provides the highest concentration of services and facilities in the Cambridge area, placing residential development in the urban area would enable the closest access to these.</p> <p>Development on the edge of Cambridge will provide housing development that is closest to the high concentration of services and education opportunities in Cambridge.</p> <p>New settlements could be developed with a greater mix of services and facilities than smaller scale growth at existing villages. This could provide a degree of self-containment, by providing opportunities to live and work in the same place, however, the greatest concentration of services will remain in and close to Cambridge. Viability work has confirmed that the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre (edge of Cambridge) make this an attractive location for development meaning potentially higher levels of funding for facilities and infrastructure. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements.</p> <p>Villages offer a narrower range of services and the need to travel is greater (and smaller, less sustainable villages tend to offer a very narrow range of services if any at all).</p>

Table 5.1: SA of the Development sequence – assessment matrix (criteria marked in *bold italic* are those that have been added to the framework to take into account Cambridge issues – please see Section 3.4 for more details).

SA objective	Decision Making Criteria	Cambridge Urban Area	Edge of Cambridge	New settlements	More sustainable villages	Smaller less sustainable villages	Discussion
22. Sustainable Travel	<p>Will it enable shorter journeys, improve modal choice (helping to reduce the use of the private car) and integration of transport modes to encourage or facilitate the use of modes such as walking, cycling and public transport? Will it build on the high modal share of cycling in the City centre? Will it support movement of freight by means other than road? Will it include infrastructure for low emission vehicles?</p>	+++ / -	+++	+++/-	-	---	<p>Development in the urban area would be the most positive as this will provide homes close to the highest concentration of jobs, thus enabling shorter journeys and facilitating alternative modes. However, as highlighted in the Local Plans CSRM report , focusing all development on Cambridge will not meet the identified housing need and this would lead to greater levels of travel as people from outside the area access new jobs.</p> <p>Development on the edge of Cambridge would be the next closest development option to the urban area of the city, and performs positively due to short distances to the city, low public transport journey times, and in many cases proximity to high frequency public transport (although access to public transport services is better close to radial routes with good services, and some areas around the City currently have more limited access to high quality public transport). The Local Plans CSRM report shows that different development strategy options do not result in radically different levels of traffic growth, travel times or delay. Whilst there are variations, these are in the context of very high overall traffic growth where significant amounts of development are already committed. With regard to modal share, development on the edge of Cambridge remains the best performing option with regard to modal share. However, the modal share results hide the fact that these locations are in already congested areas of the city where there is little scope to create more capacity for more cars, forcing new trips to be undertaken by active modes.</p> <p>New settlements could incorporate significant public transport routes to Cambridge, and new town and local centres as appropriate, to ensure that residents have convenient access to local services and facilities by walking, cycling and public transport and transport schemes would also provide benefit to existing communities. They have the potential to enable focussed investment in public transport and cycling infrastructure, delivering high quality services to provide a significantly higher modal share of travel by non-car modes than village based growth options. The Local Plans CSRM report found that the greater distance from Cambridge would mean higher levels of car use than an edge of Cambridge focus but site specific transport measures would reduce the impact of growth, increasing the proportion of trips made by non car modes, including shift towards Park & Ride. Dispersed growth in villages was found to be less preferable to focused growth in New Settlements in transport terms. The focus on new settlements will provide opportunities to further minimise traffic growth through use of sustainable travel modes and internalisation of trips. Transport schemes identified to support new settlements are expensive, but would also provide benefit to existing communities. It is expected that City Deal funding would be available to support delivery of major infrastructure required to make the new settlements viable and sustainable.</p> <p>A village based strategy would be likely to deliver incremental improvements at best, rather than focused investment. Traffic impacts would be spread more around the district, but there would be a higher modal share for car use. The Local Plans CSRM report found that a purely village based strategy was likely to have a car mode share of close to 80%. Outside the Rural Centres public transport services are generally limited in terms of frequency and journey time. Cycling opportunities would also be lower than other strategy approaches, as distances to Cambridge or market towns would be greater, and would often rely on rural roads rather than dedicated routes.</p>
23. Transport infrastructure	<p>Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity? Will it make the transport network safer for all users, both motorised and non-motorised?</p>	0	0	0	0	0	<p>This would be dependent on the exact development sites chosen and the nature of the highway network in those areas.</p>

Table 5.2: Discussion of the results

Table 5.2: Discussion of the results		
Results of the SDR assessment 2012	Results of the assessment contained in the 2013 SA reports	Changes due to updated evidence and SA framework and conclusions
Cambridge		
<p>As this is the most sustainable location for new development because of the ready access to existing employment, services and transport choices, development levels that are compatible with local character should be maximised.</p>	<p>Development in Cambridge offers opportunities to re-use previously developed land, making use of the existing urban area, reducing the need to develop greenfield / agricultural land. Cambridge provides the highest concentration of jobs, and high order services and facilities in the Cambridge area, placing residential development in the urban area would enable the closest access to these. With regard to air quality, the central area of the city is identified as an AQMA, and therefore further development could include placing further population in this area. However, development in the urban area has best opportunity to support non-car modes of transport, and the compact nature of the city makes it particularly suitable for cycling in addition to walking.</p>	<p>Development at this level of the development sequence will have many sustainability benefits including protecting the distinctive setting of Cambridge through safeguarding the Green Belt and the associated biodiversity of the Green Belt. However, as highlighted in the Local Plans CSRM report, focusing all development on Cambridge will not meet the identified housing need and this would then lead to greater levels of travel (and effects on air quality) as people from outside the area access new jobs.</p> <p><i>Please note that the assessment of the other levels of the development sequence have assumed that some development will take place within Cambridge as this is the most sustainable level of the development sequence.</i></p>
Edge of Cambridge		
<p>Locating development on the urban edge has significant advantages in sustainability terms. New housing would be close to existing major employment locations and main services and facilities; as well as providing the opportunity to create new employment premises, which can benefit from a large labour pool within the city and its surrounds.</p> <p>Urban concentration generally allows for shorter journeys and enables use of existing well-established public transport, cycling and walking routes. Depending on the scale of development, new transport and utilities infrastructure can be provided at a development-wide scale and, where possible, integrated with the existing urban area.</p> <p>Occupants of new development would benefit from access to the services, facilities and opportunities that provide for a good quality of life. Urban extensions could be masterplanned to ensure a high standard of urban and built design that would complement existing communities.</p> <p>High property values within and close to the city make this an attractive location for developers and investors. Moreover, greater value means that the necessary infrastructure and facilities are more likely to be provided, for example a good balance of housing types and tenures. Large-scale planned development like a major urban extension is likely to have a long lead-in time, in terms of planning, land assembly and preparation. However, the current urban extensions which have already gone through those processes, should enable new urban extensions to be planned whilst maintaining a good supply of housing development.</p> <p>Key considerations in assessing the suitability of specific locations will be any potential conflict with Green Belt purposes and the deliverability of infrastructure improvements.</p>	<p>An edge of Cambridge focus would involve Green Belt development, and loss of significant amounts of high grade agricultural land. The review of the Green Belt identified that it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development on the edge of Cambridge without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. These purposes highlight the importance to the historic City of Cambridge of the quality of its setting as well as the usual role of Green Belts in preventing communities from merging with one another. The recent review of the Green Belt released large areas of less significance to Green Belt purposes, and the land that remains on the inner edge becomes increasingly important.</p> <p>Development on the edge of Cambridge would be the next closest development option to the urban area of the city, supporting access opportunities by alternative modes, although access to public transport services is better close to radial routes with good services, and some areas around the City currently have more limited access to high quality public transport. Larger developments could include their own local centres, and be accessed by new public transport routes.</p> <p>Development on the edge of Cambridge could bring dwellings closer to the M11 or A14, areas of relatively poor air quality (with an AQMA on the A14). Major development has the potential to worsen air quality, although it would support greater use of non-car modes than more distributed patterns of development. Development near to busy routes would still add to congestion at peak times.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure opportunities would vary by site, but larger scale development could support delivery of significant green infrastructure. A number of larger site proposals specifically reference the potential to deliver significant open space or Green Infrastructure beyond the minimum required by policy.</p>	<p>The Inner Green Belt Study (2015) has concluded that it is unlikely that any development on the edge of Cambridge (apart from a few small exceptions) could be accommodated without substantial harm to the Green Belt purposes. Therefore, the conclusions remain that it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development on the edge of Cambridge without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt.</p> <p>With regard to transport, development on the edge of Cambridge remains the best performing option with regard to modal share. However, these results hide the fact that these locations are in already congested areas of the city where there is little scope to create more capacity for more cars, forcing new trips to be undertaken by active modes. The Local Plans CSRM report shows that different development strategy options do not result in radically different levels of traffic growth, travel times or delay. Whilst there are variations, these are in the context of very high overall traffic growth where significant amounts of development are already committed.</p> <p>Viability work has confirmed that the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make this an attractive location for development meaning potentially higher levels of funding being available for facilities and infrastructure.</p> <p>In conclusion the assessment of edge of Cambridge remains largely as it was in 2013. There are sustainability benefits to development on the edge of Cambridge namely sustainable transport (although access is better close to radial routes) and access benefits and the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make this an attractive location for development meaning that facilities and infrastructure are more viable. However, updated work has confirmed that these benefits would be at the detriment to the purposes of the Green Belt.</p>
New settlements		
<p>Depending on their overall scale, new settlements should be sustainable due to their self-containment, particularly by providing homes, jobs and essential services within a single planned development. However, it is challenging to create new places where people can choose or are able to live and work. In practice, while some</p>	<p>A focus on new settlements could utilise previously developed land opportunities, such as former airfields or military barracks, although they would also be likely to still utilise significant areas of greenfield land. New settlements could incorporate significant public transport routes to</p>	<p>New evidence has been commissioned in response to the challenges identified in delivering self-contained and viable new settlements.</p> <p>New settlements could incorporate significant public transport routes to Cambridge, and new town and local centres as appropriate, to ensure that</p>

Table 5.2: Discussion of the results		
Results of the SDSR assessment 2012	Results of the assessment contained in the 2013 SA reports	Changes due to updated evidence and SA framework and conclusions
<p>element of self-containment may be achieved, new settlements will also result in out-commuting, particularly in relation to residents travelling to workplaces and other facilities and services outside the settlement.</p> <p>Therefore, while new settlements can make a significant contribution towards housing supply, there are challenges to providing homes and jobs in the same location. The balancing factor is that, subject to any constraints, the location for a new settlement can be chosen with regard to proximity to the main urban area and to good quality public transport. This should help offset the length of journeys and will enable some to be made by non-car modes.</p> <p>Planning a reasonably-sized new settlement enables self-containment and economies of scale for infrastructure, particularly heat and power networks or other renewable energy technologies. However, providing all the necessary infrastructure (for example new secondary schools) may present viability challenges as new settlements have to provide everything needed for a town whereas urban extensions can generally rely on the adjoining town for some infrastructure. Free-standing new towns have the additional burden of having to fund transport links. Overall, new settlements carry a significant risk that scarce public funding will be required for development to take place.</p> <p>As with urban extensions, new settlements can build-in quality in the built environment and public realm through a comprehensive planned approach. It is less straightforward, however, to create a sense of place and community cohesion in a new, free-standing development compared, for example, to an urban extension or smaller site.</p> <p>The likely proximity of a new settlement to Cambridge and within easy reach of countryside will mean that this form of development is attractive to potential residents and so to the market. However, challenges exist around deliverability due to the long preparation, planning and overall lead-in times before development starts.</p> <p>Furthermore, large-scale settlements can have long build-out times before they are completed. Given these issues, careful judgement will be needed if a new settlement is planned, particularly with regard to ensuring that delivery of the planned new town of Northstowe is not adversely affected.</p>	<p>Cambridge, and new town and local centres as appropriate, to ensure that residents have convenient access to local services and facilities by walking, cycling and public transport. They have the potential to enable focussed investment in public transport and cycling infrastructure, delivering high quality services to provide a significantly higher modal share of travel by non-car modes than village based growth options. The greater distance from Cambridge would mean higher levels of car use (although significantly better than dispersed villages based strategies), and it would result in focused pressure on specific routes. This could have local air quality implications.</p> <p>New settlements could be developed with a mix of uses with employment delivering jobs locally and their own services and facilities of higher order than smaller scale growth at existing villages. This could provide a degree of self-containment, by providing opportunities to live and work in the same place, however, the greatest concentration of jobs will remain in and close to Cambridge.</p> <p>The scale and mixed use nature of new settlements offer specific opportunities for renewable energy based upon potential for combined heat and power.</p> <p>Impact on landscape would depend on the site, but the scale of a new settlement means that impacts could be significant. Some sites were tested with more limited wider landscape impacts. Located outside the green belt they would have a lesser impact on townscape, and the setting of Cambridge. Sites tested were all outside the Green Belt. New settlements could provide opportunity to deliver significant green infrastructure.</p>	<p>residents have convenient access to local services and facilities by walking, cycling and public transport. They have the potential to enable focussed investment in public transport and cycling infrastructure, delivering high quality services to provide a significantly higher modal share of travel by non-car modes than village based growth options. The Local Plans CSRM report found that the greater distance from Cambridge would mean higher levels of car use than an edge of Cambridge focus but site specific transport measures would reduce the impact of growth, increasing the proportion of trips made by non-car modes, including shift towards Park & Ride.</p> <p>If designed as a sustainable settlement, new settlements can be developed with a mix of uses with both employment delivering jobs locally and services and facilities of higher order than with village focused development, although this option will still provide homes a greater distance from Cambridge than the edge of Cambridge option.</p> <p>Viability work has confirmed the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make the edge of Cambridge sites more viable than new settlements, meaning that facilities and infrastructure are more viable. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements. Transport schemes identified to support new settlements are expensive, but would also provide benefit to existing communities. It is expected that City Deal funding would be available to support delivery of major infrastructure required to make the new settlements viable and sustainable.</p> <p>Impact on landscape would again depend on the site. However, although new settlements could have significant impacts on landscape character they will help to protect Green Belt and the setting of Cambridge</p>
<p>More sustainable villages</p> <p>Villages within South Cambridgeshire are already categorised for planning purposes according to their scale, provision of services and accessibility. The rural centres are the most sustainable villages in this regard and, for this reason, these are the focus of this part of the sequence, although Minor Rural Centres and the option of a new category of Better Served Group Villages are also included as more sustainable villages for plan making purposes.</p> <p>More sustainable villages are less likely than other stages in the sequence to provide large-scale employment opportunities, but they have the advantage of being located relatively close to Cambridge with good public transport access. Appropriate levels of housing could contribute to supporting and maintaining local services and providing additional housing relatively close to the city.</p> <p>The type of planned developments that may be typical of more sustainable villages provide limited opportunities to generate new or enhanced public transport provision, although existing provision of services and opportunities for cycling are plus points. Similarly, the scale of development typically coming forward is unlikely to place significant demands for large-scale infrastructure provision. Utilities provision, for example, may be addressed on the basis of individual buildings rather</p>	<p>A focus on the more sustainable villages would focus development on villages where there is the best access to local services and facilities and best public transport to access higher order services and facilities in Cambridge, but comparatively villages offer a reduced range of opportunities, and the need to travel would be greater than in other options.</p> <p>There are likely to be significantly less opportunities to deliver sustainable transport than a Cambridge focused or new settlement option, as spreading development around villages would be likely to deliver incremental improvements at best, rather than focused investment. Traffic impacts would be spread more around the district, but there would be a higher modal share for car use. Outside the Rural Centres public transport services are generally limited in terms of frequency and journey time. Cycling opportunities would also be lower than other strategy approaches, as distances to Cambridge or market towns would be greater, and would often rely on rural roads rather than dedicated routes.</p> <p>A distribution to smaller sites would have a more incremental impact on the landscape and townscape, but village expansions could negatively impact on</p>	<p>Development at this level of the development sequence could be positive for access to services and facilities and public transport, however not as positive as for edge of Cambridge and new settlements. Development that is compatible with the character of even the more sustainable villages is unlikely to deliver very high levels of housing development overall.</p> <p>A village based strategy would be likely to deliver incremental improvements at best, rather than focused investment. Traffic impacts would be spread more around the district, but there would be a higher modal share for car use. The Local Plans CSRM report found that a purely village based strategy was likely to have a car mode share of close to 80%. Outside the Rural Centres public transport services are generally limited in terms of frequency and journey time. Cycling opportunities would also be lower than other strategy approaches, as distances to Cambridge or market towns would be greater, and would often rely on rural roads rather than dedicated routes.</p> <p>A distribution to smaller sites would have a more incremental impact on the landscape and townscape, but village expansions could negatively impact on village character. The most sustainable villages are inset into the Green Belt</p>

Table 5.2: Discussion of the results		
Results of the SDSR assessment 2012	Results of the assessment contained in the 2013 SA reports	Changes due to updated evidence and SA framework and conclusions
<p>than area-wide, as in much larger-scale developments.</p> <p>Given the high quality of life ratings for South Cambridgeshire, there is likely to be a high demand for development in the more sustainable villages. Furthermore, compared to larger planned developments, delivery of development in villages can occur relatively quickly.</p> <p>However, development that is compatible with the character of even the more sustainable villages is unlikely to deliver very high levels of housing development overall.</p>	<p>village character. The most sustainable villages are inset into the Green Belt close to Cambridge. A village based option would require incremental improvement to village infrastructure. This could put pressure on existing village services and facilities, such as schools, doctors and utilities. A more distributed pattern of village development would provide no direct opportunities to deliver significant scale green infrastructure. In order to identify the quantity of sites required to deliver required levels of development through a village focus, it could require the use of some sites in flood zone 2.</p>	<p>close to Cambridge and could have a negative effect on the Green Belt (but not as significant an effect as large scale Green Belt releases).</p>
Other Villages		
<p>Not addressed as part of this document</p>	<p>Focusing more development into less sustainable villages (group and infill villages) would have significant adverse impacts on access to services and facilities, employment, and sustainable transport. A village based strategy requiring development at lower levels of the village hierarchy would increase the proportion of growth at greater distances from major employment areas than other strategic approaches. In many cases public transport in smaller villages is extremely limited, and most lack any significant services and facilities, therefore increasing the journey length to access these.</p>	<p>Development at this level of the development sequence would have significant adverse effects on many of the sustainability issues.</p>

6. SITE OPTIONS

6.1 Introduction

The SA process considered a wide range of sites which could potentially be allocated to address identified development needs. This included sites that were considered through the plan making process and were eventually included in the Local Plans, and also sites which were tested but subsequently rejected.

This SA Addendum Report presents sites across the two districts on a like for like basis, include those located in the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge. It aims to make comparison between sites in different locations more accessible, by presenting summary tables which include sites at locations in the development sequence.

6.2 Background

The Councils considered a wide range of sites during the plan making process. This included suggestions received through the Issues and Options consultations, and consideration through both Councils' Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAA)⁷², which included 'calls for sites'. It should be noted that the assessment of sites was only undertaken for new sites, and does not include sites brought forward from existing plans that already have planning permission, or sites included in other existing Development Plan Documents (such as Area Action Plans) that have already been subject to SA.

6.2.1 Sites in the Cambridge Urban Area (Cambridge)

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

- 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 Figures Issues and 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 departments, other Councils, statutory government agencies and statutory undertakers.

Sites were assessed to see whether they were suitable for allocation for a range of uses or mixed use development including housing, employment, retail, leisure uses, community facilities, tourism uses and Gypsy and Traveller sites.

⁷² Cambridge Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/strategic-housing-land-availability-assessment>

South Cambridgeshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/strategic-housing-land-availability-assessment>

Alongside the SHLAA, the Council also produced technical documents which assessed the deliverability and developability of sites in the urban area at Issues and Options 2: Parts 2 stage and after the Issues and Options 2 consultation⁷³. These technical documents included a detailed pro forma for each site, which incorporated SA criteria.

Following a detailed site search and consideration of a long list of potential site through the Cambridge SHLAA, 59 sites were considered through the plan making process, of which there were:

- 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 its potential for more than one use, so there was some double counting.

All 59 sites were assessed by the Council using the city sites pro forma, which was developed by plan makers at Cambridge City Council and URS consultants. Of these, 34 sites were considered 'reasonable' options to take forward into the Sustainability Appraisal as part of the Issues and Options 2 consultation⁷⁴. As a result of the Issues and Options 2 consultation, a number of changes to sites were made, with some sites being removed or amended and new sites added. These changes are set out in paragraphs 4.4.52 – 4.4.55 and Table 4.15 of the Submission Draft SA⁷⁵.

6.2.2 Sites on the edge of Cambridge (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire)

The two Councils tested sites on the edge of Cambridge jointly. The Issues and Options Reports in July 2012 divided the area on the fringes of Cambridge into 10 Broad Locations⁷⁶. The impact of potential development in these areas was subject to an initial SA⁷⁷, and views were sought.

In January 2013, the Councils jointly consulted on an Issues and Options 2 Part 1 report⁷⁸. This was accompanied by a Technical Background Document providing an assessment of 41 sites on the edge of Cambridge⁷⁹. These sites were identified taking account of developer proposals following the SHLAA 'call for sites', as well as additional potential

⁷³ Cambridge Local Plan – Towards 2031 Technical Background Document – Part 2 (RD/LP/260); and Technical Background Document – Part 2 Supplement 2013, Cambridge City Council (RD/LP/310).

⁷⁴ RD/LP/280 Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Cambridge Local Plan, Interim SA Report 2, Issues and Options 2 Site Options, January 2013.

⁷⁵ RD/Sub/C/030 – Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Volume 1: Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State March 2014, pages 377 - 385

⁷⁶ South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options 2012 (Issue 12); Cambridge Issues and Options Report 2012 (Options 10 to 19)

⁷⁷ Cambridge Interim Sustainability Report 2012, South Cambridgeshire Initial Sustainability Report 2012.

⁷⁸ Issues and Options 2 Part 1 Joint Consultation on Development Strategy and Site Options on the edge of Cambridge <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/issues-options-2-jan-feb-2013>

⁷⁹ Cambridge Local Plan Towards 2031, South Cambridgeshire Local Plan – Issues and Options 2: Part 1 – Joint Consultation on Development Strategy & Site Options on the Edge of Cambridge – Technical Background Document Part 1 <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/background-documents>

options. Where falling across district boundaries the sites were broken up into separate land parcels.

A joint site testing proforma was developed for the purpose of testing edge of Cambridge sites. The criteria in the proforma took into account the social, environmental and economic sustainability themes and objectives identified in the SA scoping reports of both Councils⁸⁰, as well as deliverability and developability of sites. It included a two stage assessment, where sites failing the first stage were rejected from further consideration as potential allocations (although the remainder of the assessment was completed for each site). Six Green Belt sites within Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire were considered to be potential options for inclusion in the Local Plans, and subject to consultation as options in the Issues and Options Report. The remainder were rejected as options for development, due either to their significance to Green Belt purposes, or other planning constraints⁸¹.

6.2.3 South Cambridgeshire

In South Cambridgeshire, housing and mixed use development site options were tested through the South Cambridgeshire SHLAA, and subject to SA. Both were then used to determine whether sites had development potential. Those considered to have no significant development potential were rejected at the issues and options stage, and not subject to consultation in the Issues and Options Reports⁸². Potential site allocations were subject to consultation in the Issues and Options Reports⁸³.

6.2.3.1 New settlements

A total of 14 sites which would either deliver new standalone settlements, or expand existing new settlements were tested. Five options at three locations were subsequently identified for consultation through the Issues and Options 2012. This included options at Waterbeach and Bourn Airfield, and the Strategic Reserve at Northstowe.

Options at Six Mile Bottom, Hanley Grange, Heathfield, Duxford, north of Cambourne, north east of Northstowe, and Barrington Quarry were rejected at this stage, and identified as sites with no development potential.

6.2.3.2 Sites at Rural Centres

23 sites were subject to consultation during the South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options consultations. 4 sites were subsequently included in the Submitted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. A further 30 sites were tested but rejected, and not subject to consultation.

6.2.3.3 Sites at Minor Rural Centres

27 sites were subject to consultation during the South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options consultations. 4 sites were subsequently included in the Submitted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. A further 63 sites were tested but rejected, and not subject to consultation.

⁸⁰ Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014 Volume 1: Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State March 2014 Appendix 2.

⁸¹ Summary of Reasons for rejection can be found in: Issues and Options 2 Part 1 Joint Consultation on Development Strategy and Site Options on the edge of Cambridge – Appendix 4 <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/issues-options-2-jan-feb-2013>

⁸² South Cambridgeshire Draft Final Sustainability Report Annex Bm Summary Assessment of sites.

⁸³ South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options 2012 & Issues and Options 2013 part 2 <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/local-plan-historic-consultations>

6.2.3.4 Sites at Other Villages

At an early stage, 120 Group village sites were subject to consideration through the SHLAA, and were tested in the SA⁸⁴.

Group and Infill villages are generally the smallest settlements in the district, with limited access to services and facilities. The option of development allocations in these villages (apart from a small number of neighbourhood proposals made by Parish Councils) was not considered a reasonable option, as it was clear that sufficient sites could be identified at higher levels of the development sequence, without relying on allocations in the smallest villages, which would lead to a dispersed pattern of development where the fewest services and facilities are available.

Such sites may be capable of development as windfalls or as rural affordable housing exception sites depending on their location and scale, but they would not reflect a sustainable form of development in the context of a district wide strategy and so have not been considered as options for development site allocations in the Local Plan.

6.2.3.5 Sites for other uses

A number of sites for other uses were considered during the plan making process, including for employment, retail, residential moorings, and recreation/open space. Many of these were put forward in representations to the issues and options consultations.

6.3 Site Assessment

During the SA scoping process, each Council developed site appraisal criteria, which were used to test sites in their district, reflecting the sustainability issues identified. Joint criteria were developed for the edge of Cambridge

This SA Addendum has been prepared in order to present site assessments on a like for like basis and to the same level. Sites on the edge of Cambridge have been presented on a directly comparable basis with other potential development options. This SA Addendum Report presents these sites alongside other options available to meet development needs across Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, including sites in the urban area of Cambridge, new settlements, and sites in villages.

6.3.1 Site appraisal criteria

Within the Councils' SAs, site appraisal criteria have been used as a way of scoring each site option objectively, to identify potential impacts on the Sustainability Objectives and Themes.

The criteria include a combination of quantitative and qualitative criteria. The quantitative criteria allowed for the analysis of the sites to be undertaken using Geographical Information System (GIS) software, while the inclusion of qualitative criteria enabled professional judgement to be drawn upon. Measurements are taken "as the crow flies" as it was not possible to take account of routes/pathways.

Both Councils Sustainability Objectives contain issues not directly addressed by the site appraisal criteria. This is largely because they would be determined through detailed design of the site, or cannot be related to specific site proposals.

⁸⁴ The assessments can be found in South Cambridgeshire Submission SA Annex B

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 the development proposals are progressed and submitted as part of the planning application process.

6.3.2 A joint approach

Reflecting the joint assessment of strategic approaches in this SA Addendum Report, the assessment of individual sites has built on this, by presenting sites in a joint appraisal format. This enables sites in all locations to be appraised on a consistent basis and the information presented in a consistent format.

The site appraisal criteria used in the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire SAs are closely aligned. Table 6.1 below sets out the site testing criteria and scoring used previously in the two SAs. It then shows the joint criteria that have been applied to the site assessments in this SA Addendum Report. This builds on the joint working and site assessment approach that had already been developed at the issues and options stage. The three key environmental bodies were also consulted on the proforma used in this Addendum and this is discussed in Appendix 4.

An example of a proforma is included at Appendix 6. This provides the scoring of the site against each criteria.

The proforma presents issues related to the sustainability objective and themes. There are a range of other site specific considerations that would influence whether a site is suitable for allocation in the Local Plans. Further site assessment information can be found in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment documents⁸⁵, and other parts of the evidence base which supports the Local Plans.

6.4 Identifying Sites for Appraisal

Options for growth sites have been categorised into areas identified in the development sequence:

- Cambridge Urban Area
- Edge of Cambridge
- New Settlements
- Rural Centres & Minor Rural Centres

The sites tested reflect the sites identified in the SA processes up to submission, with the following exceptions:

- A number of sites that were previously tested have now gained planning permission. These sites are now part of existing commitments, and will contribute to meeting development needs. Appraisals of these sites as options for allocations in the Local Plans have therefore not been included in the comparison of options in this SA Addendum Report. A list of these sites can be found in Appendix 8.

⁸⁵ Cambridge Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/strategic-housing-land-availability-assessment>

South Cambridgeshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)
<https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/strategic-housing-land-availability-assessment>

- On the edge of Cambridge, sites in the Green Belt have been considered on a like for like basis with other sites. The testing has included land identified in the Submission Local Plans, developer proposals (reflecting their proposals in representations to the Proposed Submission Local Plans), and other potential areas identified that merited testing as they were potentially deliverable. There are a number of sites tested during the issues and options process which have development constraints which means they do not have development potential. The reasons why these sites have been rejected have been listed in Appendix 7.
- Sites at Group and Infill villages have been rejected for reasons stated above, they are therefore not included.

6.5 Site Appraisal Results

The new site Proformas draw on the information in the Submitted Sustainability Appraisals, and the testing that has already been completed and published, for sites in both districts and on the edge of Cambridge. The primary aim is to represent the data in order to make it more accessible, and to allow comparison across all levels of the search sequence.

Results have been amended where there is more up to date information. This has drawn on the other evidence base documents which have been prepared in response to the Inspectors' Preliminary Conclusions, including Transport, Green Belt, and Infrastructure Delivery. Where a score has been amended since the previous assessments this is stated in the assessment proforma.

The scoring considers the potential for mitigation opportunities to address impacts identified. Any assumptions made regarding mitigation measures which would impact are the scoring are set out in the commentary. Examples include delivery of new services and facilities on site, or transport improvements that could be made to address the impacts of development. Mitigation opportunities have been informed by consultation with specialist officers and other organisations such as the County Council. Mitigation measures have also been informed by site promoters proposals where appropriate.

Transport mitigation opportunities have been informed by the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Transport Study, the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, and studies related to City Deal Transport Schemes.

Where transport improvements such as additional bus services would be expected as part of a major development, the impacts of such a service on the scoring have been considered. For sites on the edge of Cambridge, mitigation opportunities were considered to inform the Local Plan Transport Study, and these have been applied to site assessments. These inputs have been informed by the County Council as Local Transport Authority.

Where revised boundaries or proposals have been submitted by site promoters, an appraisal of these has also been completed reflecting their proposals in representations made on the Pre-Submission Local Plans.

6.6 Summary of Sites Assessments

The Site Appraisal results are presented in Annex 1 of this Report. This includes a list of the sites tested, and proformas for each of the sites.

To enable easier comparison of site options, the results of the site testing have been summarised into a series of results tables. They enable comparison of site options at the full range of locations, from sites within the urban area of Cambridge, to sites in villages.

The results have informed the appraisal of strategic alternatives, and been used to inform plan making.

Many of the differences between different development strategy options are highlighted by the site assessments. The summary spreadsheet included in Annex 1 visually presents some of the differences between the stages of the development sequence.

6.6.1 Cambridge Urban Area

Most sites utilise previously developed land, and avoid the use of agricultural land. A number of sites are located close to Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA). Many offer opportunities for biodiversity enhancement, and do not impact on designated sites. However, they offer limited opportunities for Green infrastructure enhancement. As they are in the urban area, they avoid the Green Belt. Access to services and facilities varies by location, but they offer benefits in terms of access to employment. As would be expected, transport accessibility scores highly, offering access to public transport, and shorter distances for non-car modes.

6.6.2 Edge of Cambridge

On the edge of Cambridge there are few opportunities to use previously development land, and larger sites would result in significant loss of agricultural land. Many are also near to AQMA. Some sites would have negative impacts on biodiversity which would require mitigation, but larger sites also offer opportunities for the delivery of new Green Infrastructure. The Edge of Cambridge sites are largely in the Green Belt, and the significant majority of sites would have significant negative impacts on Green Belt purposes. A number of small sites are identified which would not have significant impacts. In terms of accessibility, they offer the next nearest development opportunity to the City. Although not all sites are accessible to existing public transport networks, larger sites would offer the opportunity for public transport improvements.

6.6.3 New Settlements

Sites north of Waterbeach and at Bourn Airfield offer opportunities to reuse previously developed land, although they still include significant elements of agricultural land. They are located further from the AQMAs. There are potentially negative impacts on biodiversity which would require mitigation, but larger sites also offer opportunities for the delivery of new Green Infrastructure. Sites are located outside the Green Belt, and generally have lesser landscape townscape impacts than sites on the edge of Cambridge. In terms of transport and accessibility, sites are further from Cambridge, but offer opportunities to deliver services, facilities and employment on site. The scale of development provides opportunities for investment in public transport.

6.6.4 Better Served Villages

For this large number of small sites site specific impacts varied greatly. Limited opportunities to reuse previously developed land were identified, but the impact on agricultural land is generally lower as the sites are generally relatively small in scale. Some sites had negative impacts on landscape and townscape and the Green Belt, but others

avoided these impacts. Access to services, facilities and employment were generally poorer than other levels of the development sequence, and the scale of site meant more limited opportunities for enhancement. In terms of transport, sites generally would have poorer access to public transport.

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
Land			
Previously Developed Land	Will it use land that has been previously developed? 0 = 0% to 24% Previously Developed Land (PDL) + = 25% to 74% Previously Developed Land (PDL) +++ = 75% or more Previously Developed Land (PDL)	Would development make use of previously developed land? RED = Not on PDL AMBER = Partially on PDL GREEN = Entirely on PDL	Will it use land that has been previously developed? RED = Not on PDL AMBER = Partially on PDL GREEN = Entirely on PDL
Agricultural Land	Will it protect and enhance the best and most versatile agricultural land? Will it minimise the degradation/loss of soils due to new development? --- = Significant loss (20 hectares or more) of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2) - = Minor loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2) 0 = Development would not affect best and most	Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land? RED = Significant loss (20 ha or more) of grades 1 and 2 land AMBER = Minor loss of grade 1 and 2 land GREEN = Development would not affect grade 1 and 2 land.	RED = Significant loss (20 ha or more) of grades 1 and 2 land AMBER = Minor loss of grade 1 and 2 land GREEN = Development would not affect grade 1 and 2 land.

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
	versatile agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2)		
Minerals	<p>Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?</p> <p>--- = Site falls within a designated area in the Minerals and Waste LDF, development would have significant negative effect on identified Minerals Reserves</p> <p>- = Site falls within a designated area in the Minerals and Waste LDF, development would have minor negative impacts on identified Minerals Reserves</p> <p>0 = Site not within a designated area identified in the Minerals and Waste LDF, development would not have negative impact.</p>	N/A	<p>Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?</p> <p>RED = Site or a significant part of it falls within an allocated or safeguarded area, development would have significant negative impacts</p> <p>AMBER = Site or a significant part of it falls within an allocated or safeguarded area, development would have minor negative impacts</p> <p>GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.</p>
Environmental quality and pollution (incorporating water and air SEA topics)			
Air Quality / AQMA	<p>Will it maintain or improve air quality, including in AQMA?</p> <p>--- = Site lies near source of air pollution, or</p>	<p>Would the development of the sites result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?</p>	<p>Will it maintain or improve air quality?</p>

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
	<p>development could impact on air quality, with significant negative impacts incapable of adequate mitigation</p> <p>- = Site lies near source of air pollution, or development could impact on air quality, with minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation.</p> <p>0 = Development unlikely to impact on air quality. Site lies in an area where air quality acceptable. Development unlikely to impact on air quality.</p> <p>+ = Would remove existing source of air pollution.</p> <p>+++ = Would remove existing source of air pollution.</p>	<p>RED = Significant adverse impact</p> <p>AMBER = Adverse impact</p> <p>GREEN = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact</p> <p>Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?</p> <p>RED = Within or adjacent to an AQMA, M11 or A14</p> <p>AMBER = <1000m of an AQMA, M11 or A14</p> <p>GREEN = >1000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14</p>	<p>RED = Site lies near source of air pollution, or development could impact on air quality, significant adverse impact</p> <p>AMBER = Site lies near source of air pollution, or development could impact on air quality with minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation.</p> <p>GREEN = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact</p> <p>DARK GREEN = Would remove existing source of air pollution, significant positive impact.</p> <p>Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?</p> <p>RED = Within or adjacent to an AQMA, M11 or A14</p> <p>AMBER = <1000m of an AQMA, M11 or A14</p> <p>GREEN = >1000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14</p>

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
Pollution	<p>Will it minimise, and where possible improve on, unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour, and vibration (including compatibility with neighbouring uses)?</p> <p>--- = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation - = Minor negative impacts 0 = No adverse impacts (or capable of full mitigation) + = Would remove existing source of pollution. +++ = Would remove existing significant source of pollution.</p>	<p>Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</p> <p>Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</p> <p>Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</p> <p>RED = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation AMBER = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation GREEN = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation</p>	<p>Will it minimise, and where possible improve on, unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour, and vibration?</p> <p>RED = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>AMBER = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation</p> <p>GREEN = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation</p> <p>DARK GREEN = Would remove existing significant source of pollution.</p>
Contamination	<p>Will it minimise, and where possible address, land contamination?</p>	<p>Is there possible contamination on the site?</p> <p>RED = All or a significant part of the site</p>	<p>Is there possible contamination on the site?</p>

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
	<p>--- = Land likely to be contaminated, which due to physical constraints or economic viability cannot be satisfactorily remediated during the plan period.</p> <p>0 = Development not on land likely to be contaminated</p> <p>+ / +++ = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development (benefits of contamination remediation)</p>	<p>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</p> <p>AMBER = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development</p> <p>GREEN = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination</p>	<p>RED = 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</p> <p>AMBER = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development (potential to achieve benefits subject to appropriate mitigation)</p> <p>GREEN = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination</p>
Water	<p>Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?</p> <p>--- = Development has potential to effect water</p>	<p>Would development be within a Source Protection Zone?</p> <p>RED = Within SPZ 1</p>	<p>Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?</p>

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
	quality, with significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation. - = Development has potential to affect water quality, with minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation. 0 = No impact / Capable of full mitigation + = Would remove existing source of water pollution with minor positive impact +++ = Would remove existing source of water pollution with significant positive impact	GREEN = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace	RED = Development has potential to effect water quality, with significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation. AMBER = Development has potential to affect water quality, with minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation. GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation or minor positive impact DARK GREEN = Would remove existing source of water pollution with significant positive impact
Biodiversity			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity? --- = Significant negative impact on protected sites and species incapable of mitigation. - = Minor negative impact on protected sites and	Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Would development impact upon a locally designated wildlife site i.e. (Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site)?	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity, including positive conservation management on local wildlife sites and SSSIs? RED = Contains or is adjacent to

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
	<p>species incapable of mitigation.</p> <p>0 = No impact on protected sites and species (or impacts could be mitigated)</p> <p>+ = Minor positive impact on protected sites and species</p> <p>+++ = Significant positive impact on protected sites and species</p>	<p>RED = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site and impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>AMBER = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>GREEN = Does not contain, is not adjacent to, or local area will be developed as greenspace. No or negligible impacts</p>	<p>an existing site designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species and impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>AMBER = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>GREEN = Does not contain, is not adjacent to site designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species, or local area will be developed as greenspace. No or negligible impacts</p> <p>DARK GREEN = Significant positive impact on protected sites and species</p>

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
Biodiversity / TPO	<p>Will it deliver net gains in biodiversity? Will it help deliver habitat restoration, and reduce habitat fragmentation (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan Targets and maintain connectivity between green infrastructure)?</p> <p>--- = Significant Negative Impact (loss of existing features, significant impacts unlikely to be capable of satisfactory mitigation)</p> <p>- = Minor Negative Impact (Existing features unlikely to be retained in their entirety, impacts cannot be fully mitigated)</p> <p>0 = Existing features that warrant retention can be retained or appropriate mitigation</p> <p>+ = Minor Positive Impact (opportunity for enhancement and new features.)</p> <p>+++ = Significant Positive Impact (opportunity for enhancement and new features.)</p>	<p>Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)</p> <p>RED = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>GREEN = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links</p> <p>Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)? RED = Development likely to have a significant adverse impact on the protected trees incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>AMBER = Any adverse impact on protected</p>	<p>Will it deliver net gains in biodiversity? Will it help deliver habitat restoration, and reduce habitat fragmentation (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan Targets)?</p> <p>RED = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>GREEN = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links</p> <p>Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected</p>

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
		trees capable of appropriate mitigation GREEN = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees	by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)? RED = Development likely to have a significant adverse impact on the protected trees incapable of appropriate mitigation AMBER = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation GREEN = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees
Green Infrastructure	Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery and access to green infrastructure, or access to the countryside through public rights of way? --- = Development would result in significant loss of Green Infrastructure, No satisfactory mitigation measures possible. - = Development would result in minor loss of Green Infrastructure, incapable of mitigation. 0 = No impact (existing features retained, or appropriate mitigation possible) + = Development would create minor opportunities for new Green Infrastructure.	Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery? RED = Development involves a loss of existing green infrastructure which is incapable of appropriate mitigation. AMBER = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation GREEN = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure	Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery of and access to green infrastructure? RED = Development involves a loss of existing green infrastructure which is incapable of appropriate mitigation. AMBER = No significant opportunities, or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
	+++ = Development would deliver significant new Green Infrastructure	SUB INDICATOR: How far is the nearest accessible natural green space of 2ha? RED =>800m AMBER =400 -800m GREEN =<400m	appropriate mitigation GREEN = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure
Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage (incorporating landscape and cultural heritage SEA topics)			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character? --- = Significant negative impact on landscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible. - = negative impact on landscape character, incapable of mitigation. 0 = No impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local landscape character) + = Development would relate to local landscape character and offer opportunities for landscape enhancement. +++ = Development would relate to local landscape character and offer significant opportunities for landscape enhancement		Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character? RED = Significant negative impact on landscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible. AMBER = negative impact on landscape character, incapable of mitigation. GREEN = No impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local landscape character, or provide minor improvements) DARK GREEN = Development would relate to local landscape

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
			character and offer significant opportunities for landscape enhancement
Townscape	<p>Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character?</p> <p>--- = Significant negative impact on townscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>- = negative impact on townscape character, incapable of mitigation.</p> <p>0 = No impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local landscape character)</p> <p>+ = Development would relate to local townscape character and offer opportunities for townscape enhancement.</p> <p>+++ = Development would relate to local townscape character and offer significant opportunities for landscape enhancement</p>		<p>Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character including through appropriate design and scale of development?</p> <p>Will it ensure the scale of development is sensitive to the existing key landmark buildings and low lying topography of the City?</p> <p>RED = Significant negative impact on townscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>AMBER = negative impact on townscape character, incapable of mitigation.</p> <p>GREEN = No impact (generally compatible, or capable of being</p>

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
			made compatible with local townscape character, or provide minor improvements) DARK GREEN = Development would relate to local townscape character and offer significant opportunities for townscape enhancement
Green Belt	(Addressed in Landscape and Townscape criteria)	<p>Will allocation lead to a loss of land within the Green Belt? RED = Site is in the Green Belt GREEN = Site is not in the Green Belt</p> <p>Joint assessment included 9 criteria regarding impact on Green Belt purposes and matter important to the setting of Cambridge, and an overall conclusion on Green Belt:</p> <p>RR = Very high and high impacts R = High/medium impacts A = Medium and medium/minor impacts</p>	<p>Will it recognise the role of the Green Belt in maintaining the character of the City and the quality of its historic setting?</p> <p>DARK RED: Very high and high impacts on Greenbelt purposes (very significant negative impact) RED = High / medium impacts on Greenbelt purposes (significant negative impact) AMBER = Medium and medium/minor impacts on Greenbelt purposes GREEN = No or negligible impact</p>

Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
		G = Minor and minor/negligible impacts GG = Negligible impacts	or positive impact on Green Belt purposes
Heritage	<p>Will it protect or enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments)?</p> <p>--- = Significant negative impact, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible. - = negative impact , incapable of mitigation. 0 = No impact or capable of full mitigation + = Minor opportunities for enhancement. +++ = Significant opportunities for enhancement</p>	<p>Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Would development impact upon Listed Buildings? Would allocation impact upon a historic park/garden? Would development impact upon a Conservation Area? Would development impact upon buildings of local interest?</p> <p>RED = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such sites with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation AMBER = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such sites with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation GREEN = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings or sites, and there is no impact to the setting</p>	<p>Will it protect or enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments, buildings of local interest and archaeology)?</p> <p>RED = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such sites, buildings and features with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation AMBER = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such sites buildings and features with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p>

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
			GREEN = Site does not contain or adjoin such sites, buildings and features, and there is no impact to the setting DARK GREEN = Significant opportunities for enhancement
Climate change			
Renewables	Will it support the use of renewable energy resources? 0 = Standard requirements for renewables would apply + = Development would create minor additional opportunities for renewable energy. +++ = Development would create significant additional opportunities for renewable energy.	N/A	Will it support the use of renewable energy resources? AMBER = Standard requirements for renewables would apply GREEN = Development would create significant opportunities for renewable energy. DARK GREEN = Development would create significant additional opportunities for renewable energy.
Flood Risk	Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding, and incorporate sustainable drainage measures?	Is site within a flood zone? Is site at risk from surface water flooding? RED = Flood Zone 3 / high risk.	Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding? RED = Flood Zone 3 / high risk.

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
	--- = Flood Zone 3 / high risk - = Flood Zone 2 / medium risk 0 = Flood Zone 1 / low risk	AMBER = Flood Zone 2 / medium Risk GREEN = Flood Zone 1 / low Risk	AMBER = Flood Zone 2 / medium risk GREEN = Flood Zone 1 / low risk
Human health and well being			
Open Space	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space? --- = Development would result in significant loss of public open space. - = Development would result in loss of public open space, minor impacts incapable of mitigation. 0 = No impact (existing features retained or appropriate mitigation) + = Development would create minor opportunities for new public open space +++ = Development would deliver significant new public open space	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? DARK RED = No, the site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of open space and is located in a ward or parish with identified deficiency. RED= No, the site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of open space. GREEN = Assumes minimum on-site	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space (particularly in areas anticipated to experience significant population growth)? RED = The site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of open space and is located in a ward or parish with identified deficiency, or would lead to loss of open space without suitable replacement. AMBER = The site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of open space. GREEN = Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
		<p>provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite DARK GREEN = Development would create the opportunity to deliver significantly enhanced provision of new public open spaces in excess of adopted plan standards.</p> <p>Would development lead to a loss of open space? RED =Yes GREEN =No</p> <p>SUB INDICATORS How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities? RED = >3km AMBER = 1-3km GREEN = <1km or allocation is for or includes a significant element of employment or is for another non-residential use</p> <p>How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers? RED =>800m</p>	<p>standards is provided onsite DARK GREEN = Development would create the opportunity to deliver significantly enhanced provision of new public open spaces in excess of adopted plan standards.</p> <p>SUB INDICATORS How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities? RED = >3km AMBER = 1-3km GREEN = <1km or allocation is for or includes a significant element of employment or is for another non-residential use</p> <p>How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers? RED =>800m AMBER =400 -800m</p>

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
		AMBER =400 -800m GREEN = <400m	GREEN = <400m
Gypsy & Traveller	Will it provide for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople? --- = Loss of 5 or more pitches / plots - = Loss of less than 5 pitches 0 = No impact + = Gain of less than 5 pitches +++ = Gain of 5 or more pitches	N/A	Will it provide for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople? RED = Would result in loss of existing sites AMBER = No Impact GREEN = Would deliver additional pitches
Access to Services	Will it provide accessibility to and improve quality of key local services and facilities, including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?) Settlement Hierarchy --- = Infill / Group Village - = Minor Rural Centre 0 = Rural Centre	How far is the site from edge of defined Cambridge City Centre? How far is the nearest health centre or GP service? How far is the nearest primary school? RED =>800m AMBER =400 - 800m GREEN = <400m	How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre? How far is the site from edge of defined Cambridge City Centre? How far is the nearest health centre or GP service? RED =>800m AMBER =400 - 800m GREEN = <400m

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
	<p>+ = New Settlement +++ = Edge of Cambridge</p> <p>SUB INDICATORS</p> <p>How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?</p> <p>--- = Greater than 1000m - = Within 1000m 0 = Within 800m + = Within 600m +++ = within 400m (or site large enough to provide new)</p>		
KEY LOCAL FACILITIES	<p>Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?)</p> <p>--- = Development would result in loss of an existing facilities, major negative impact. - = Development would result loss of existing facilities, minor negative impact. 0 = No impact on facilities (or satisfactory mitigation proposed). + = New facilities or improved existing facilities are</p>		<p>Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?)</p> <p>RED = Development would result in loss of an existing facilities, major negative impact.</p>

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
	<p>proposed of minor benefit +++ = New local facilities or improved existing facilities are proposed of significant benefit</p>		<p>AMBER = No impact on facilities (or satisfactory mitigation proposed), or minor benefits</p> <p>GREEN = New local facilities or improved existing facilities are proposed of significant benefit</p>
Community Facilities	<p>Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</p> <p>--- = Development would result in loss of an existing local community / village hall. No satisfactory mitigation proposed. 0 = No facilities would be lost. + = New local community / village hall or improved existing facility is proposed of minor benefit (and is viable and sustainable) +++ = New local community / village hall or improved existing facility is proposed of significant benefit (and is viable and sustainable)</p>	<p>Would development lead to a loss of community facilities?</p> <p>RED = Allocation would lead to loss of community facilities GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement /appropriate mitigation possible</p>	<p>Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</p> <p>RED = Allocation would lead to loss of community facilities GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement /appropriate mitigation possible</p>
Integration with Existing Communities		<p>How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?</p> <p>RED = Limited scope for integration with</p>	<p>How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?</p>

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
		<p>existing communities / isolated and/or separated by non-residential land uses AMBER = Adequate scope for integration with existing communities GREEN = Good scope for integration with existing communities / of sufficient scale to create a new community.</p>	<p>RED = Limited scope for integration with existing communities / isolated and/or separated by non-residential land uses AMBER = Adequate scope for integration with existing communities GREEN = Good scope for integration with existing communities / of sufficient scale to create a new community.</p>
Economy and Infrastructure (incorporating material assets SEA topic)			
Deprivation (Cambridge)	N/A	<p>Does it address pockets of income and employment deprivation particularly in Abbey Ward and Kings Hedges? Would allocation result in development in deprived wards?</p> <p>AMBER = Not within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.</p>	<p>Does it address pockets of income and employment deprivation particularly in Abbey Ward and Kings Hedges? Would allocation result in development in deprived wards?</p> <p>AMBER = Not within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within Cambridge</p>

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
		GREEN = Within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Local Super Output Areas (LSOA) within Cambridge	according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010. GREEN = Within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Local Super Output Areas (LSOA) within Cambridge
Shopping	<p>Will it protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres?</p> <p>--- = Development would have significant negative effect on vitality or viability of existing centres. - = Development would have negative effect on vitality or viability of existing centres. 0 = Development would have no effect on vitality or viability of existing centres. + = Development would support vitality or viability of existing centres. +++ = Development would significantly add to vitality or viability of existing centres.</p>	<p>Would development protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, Town, district and local centres?</p> <p>RED = Significant negative effect AMBER = Negative effect GREEN = No effect or would support the vitality and viability of existing centres</p>	<p>Will it protect the shopping hierarchy supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres?</p> <p>RED = Significant negative effect on vitality or viability of existing centres. AMBER = Negative effect on vitality or viability of existing centres. GREEN = No effect or would support the vitality and viability of existing centres</p>
Employment Accessibility	Will it contribute to providing a range of employment opportunities, in accessible locations?	How far is the nearest main employment centre? RED = >3km	Will it contribute to providing a range of employment opportunities, in accessible

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
	<p>--- = Public Transport Accessibility to Nearest Area of Employment with 2000+ Employees - Greater than 60 minutes</p> <p>- = Public Transport Accessibility to Nearest Area of Employment with 2000+ Employees - Between 45 and 60 minutes</p> <p>0 = Public Transport Accessibility to Nearest Area of Employment with 2000+ Employees - Between 30 and 45 minutes</p> <p>+ = Public Transport Accessibility to Nearest Area of Employment with 2000+ Employees - Between 15 and 30 minutes</p> <p>+++ = Public Transport Accessibility to Nearest Area of Employment with 2000+ Employees - Less than 15 minutes</p>	<p>AMBER = 1-3km GREEN = <1km or allocation is for or includes a significant element of employment or is for another non-residential use</p>	<p>locations? RED = >3km AMBER = 1-3km GREEN = <1km or allocation is for or includes a significant element of employment or is for another non-residential use</p> <p>Note: Accessibility to Nearest Area of Employment with 2000+ employees has been updated to use the 2011 census data which is now available, as before using Lower Super Output Areas (LSOA). Major new developments, which could include employment hubs, will be considered to be highly accessible. Where assumptions are made regarding site options this will be highlighted. Accession modelling has not been available, but a distance threshold has been applied.</p>

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
Employment Land	<p>Will it support business development and enhance competitiveness, enabling provision of high-quality employment land in appropriate locations to meet the needs of businesses, and the workforce?</p> <p>--- = Development would have significant negative effect on employment opportunities, as a result of the loss of existing employment land. - = Development would have a minor negative effect on employment opportunities, as a result of the loss of existing employment land. 0 = Development would have no effect on employment land or premises + = Development would support minor additional employment opportunities +++ = Development would significantly enhance employment opportunities</p>	<p>Would development result in the loss of employment land identified in the Employment Land Review (ELR)?</p> <p>RED = Significant loss of employment land and job opportunities not mitigated by alternative allocation in the area (> 50%) AMBER = Some loss of employment land and job opportunities mitigated by alternative allocation in the area (< 50%). GREEN = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development</p>	<p>Will it maintain and enhance competitiveness, and capitalise on Cambridge’s position as one of the UK’s most competitive cities? Will it support business development and enhance competitiveness, enabling provision of high-quality employment land in appropriate locations to meet the needs of businesses, and the workforce?</p> <p>RED = Significant loss of employment land and job opportunities not mitigated by alternative allocation in the area AMBER = Some loss of employment land and job opportunities mitigated by alternative allocation in the area GREEN = No loss of employment land / Minor new provision DARK GREEN= Development</p>

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
			would significantly enhance employment opportunities
Utilities	<p>Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?</p> <p>--- = Utilities capacity not sufficient, constraints cannot be adequately addressed. - = Major utilities Infrastructure improvements required, but constraints can be addressed. 0 = No impact on Utilities e.g. not built development + = Minor Utilities Infrastructure improvements required, but constraints can be addressed +++ = Development can use existing capacity in utilities infrastructure</p>	N/A	<p>Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?</p> <p>RED = Significant upgrades likely to be required but constraints incapable of appropriate mitigation AMBER = Significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation GREEN = Existing infrastructure likely to be sufficient</p>
Education	<p>Will it improve access to education and training for all (including timely provision of primary and secondary schools in locations where it is needed), and support provision of skilled employees to the economy?</p>	<p>How far is the nearest primary school? RED =>800m AMBER =400 - 800m GREEN = <400m</p> <p>How far is the nearest secondary school?</p>	<p>Is there sufficient education capacity? RED = School capacity not sufficient, constraints cannot be appropriately mitigated. AMBER = School capacity not</p>

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
	<p>--- = School capacity not sufficient, constraints cannot be adequately addressed.</p> <p>- = School capacity not sufficient, but significant issues can be adequately addressed</p> <p>0 = No impact on Schools e.g. not residential development</p> <p>+ = School capacity constraints but potential for improvement to meet needs</p> <p>+++ = Sufficient surplus capacity available in local Schools</p>	<p>RED = Greater than 3km</p> <p>AMBER = 1 to 3 km</p> <p>GREEN = Within 1km (or site large enough to provide new)</p>	<p>sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated</p> <p>GREEN= Non-residential development / surplus school places</p> <p>How far is the nearest primary school?</p> <p>RED =>800m</p> <p>AMBER =400 - 800m</p> <p>GREEN = <400m</p> <p>How far is the nearest secondary school?</p> <p>RED = Greater than 3km</p> <p>AMBER =1 to 3 km</p> <p>GREEN = Within 1km (or site large enough to provide new)</p>
Transport			
Sustainable Transport		<p>What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site?</p> <p>RED = Service does not meet the requirements of a high quality public transport (HQPT)</p>	<p>What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site?</p> <p>RED = Service does not meet the requirements of a high quality</p>

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
		<p>AMBER = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances GREEN = High quality public transport service</p> <p>How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station? RED = >800m AMBER = 400 - 800m GREEN = <400m</p> <p>What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site? DARK RED = no cycling provision and traffic speeds >30mph with high vehicular traffic volume. RED = 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. AMBER = Medium quality off-road path. GREEN = Quiet residential street speed</p>	<p>public transport (HQPT) AMBER = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances GREEN = High quality public transport service</p> <p>How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station? RED = >800m AMBER = 400 - 800m GREEN = <400m</p> <p>What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?: DARK RED = no cycling provision and traffic speeds >30mph with high vehicular traffic volume. RED = 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</p>

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
		below 30mph, cycle lane with 1.5m minimum width, high quality off-road path e.g. cycleway adjacent to guided busway. DARK GREEN = Quiet residential street designed for 20mph speeds, high quality off-road paths with good segregation from pedestrians, uni-directional hybrid cycle lanes.	access local facilities/school. Poor quality off road path. AMBER = Medium quality off-road path. GREEN = 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. DARK GREEN = Quiet residential street designed for 20mph speeds, high quality off-road paths with good segregation from pedestrians, uni-directional hybrid cycle lanes.
	SCDC Would development reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable transport choices: SCDC Sub-indicator: Distance to a bus stop / rail station SCDC Sub-indicator: Frequency of Public Transport SCDC Sub-Indicator: Typical public transport journey time to Cambridge City Centre	N/A	SCDC Would development reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable transport choices: SCDC Sub-indicator: Distance to a bus stop / rail station SCDC Sub-indicator: Frequency of Public Transport

Table 6.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria			
Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
	<p>SCDC Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre</p> <p>--- (RED) = Score 0-4 from 4 criteria below</p> <p>--- (AMBER) = Score 5-9 from 4 criteria below</p> <p>0 (YELLOW) = Score 10-14 from 4 criteria below</p> <p>+ (GREEN) = Score 15-19 from 4 criteria below</p> <p>+++ (DARK GREEN) = Score 19-24</p>		<p>SCDC Sub-Indicator: Typical public transport journey time to Cambridge City Centre</p> <p>SCDC Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre</p> <p>DARK RED = Score 0-4 from 4 sub criteria</p> <p>RED = Score 5-9 from 4 criteria below</p> <p>AMBER = Score 10-14 from 4 criteria</p> <p>GREEN = Score 15-19 from 4 criteria</p> <p>DARK GREEN = Score 19-25 from 4 criteria</p>
Access	<p>Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?</p> <p>--- = Insufficient capacity or access constraints that cannot be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>- = Insufficient capacity or access constraints. Minor negative effects incapable of mitigation.</p> <p>0 = No capacity constraints identified, safe access can be achieved.</p>	N/A	<p>Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?</p> <p>RED = Insufficient capacity/ access. Negative effects incapable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>AMBER = Insufficient capacity /</p>

Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria	Site Scoring From South Cambridgeshire SA	Site Scoring From Cambridge SA	Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria
	<p>+ = No capacity constraints identified that cannot be addressed, would result in minor improvement in highway capacity or improve highway access</p> <p>+++ = No capacity constraints identified that cannot be addressed, would result in significant improvement in highway capacity or improve highway access</p>		<p>access. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>GREEN = No capacity / access constraints identified that cannot be fully mitigated</p>
Non Car Facilities	<p>Will it make the transport network safer for all users, both motorised and non-motorised?</p> <p>--- = Would result in major negative impact to public transport, walking or cycling facilities</p> <p>- = Would result in minor negative impact to public transport, walking or cycling facilities</p> <p>0 = No impact</p> <p>+ = Would result in minor improvement to public transport, walking or cycling facilities</p> <p>+++ = Would result in significant improvement to public transport, walking or cycling facilities</p>	N/A	<p>Will it make the transport network safer for all users, both motorised and non-motorised?</p> <p>RED = Significant negative impact to public transport, walking or cycling facilities</p> <p>AMBER = No impacts / Minor impacts</p> <p>GREEN = Significant improvements to public transport, cycling, walking facilities</p>

7. STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES

7.1 Introduction

This section of the report outlines:

- Reasonable alternatives that can be tested with regard to the development strategy;
- A sustainability appraisal of strategic alternatives; and
- Overall conclusions with regard to key issues to consider regarding strategic choices.

7.2 Strategic development alternatives

7.2.1 Introduction

This SA Addendum Report has considered the environmental, social and economic impacts arising from potential development at each level of the development sequence. It also includes an appraisal of a wide range of specific site options which could potentially be allocated in the plans to meet the identified needs.

The Submission Draft SA reports included an appraisal of development 'packages'. This was combined groups of sites which could potentially be identified in the Local Plans to meet the identified needs, based on a range of different strategic choices.

This section provides an updated review of alternative strategies, informed by the updated assessments elsewhere in the report. It aims to present the alternative strategic choices in an accessible way. The potential to allocate land on the edge of Cambridge, requiring a Green Belt review, is considered on an equal basis with other strategic options.

7.2.2 Background

The Submitted Local Plans included targets of 14,000 new dwellings for Cambridge, and 19,000 for South Cambridgeshire between 2011 and 2031. Both Councils have a large number of existing commitments, developments that have already been planned, have planning permission or are under construction. This includes significant development in urban extensions identified through the last round of plan making, and the part of the Northstowe new town that it is anticipated to be completed by 2031. Once these were taken into account, on the basis of land supply assessments at that time there was a need to identify 3,563 dwellings on top of current supply for Cambridge, and a further 4,971 dwellings for South Cambridgeshire.

A total capacity of 3,324 dwellings were identified from the urban area of Cambridge, following the consideration of a wide range of options through the Cambridge Strategic Housing Market Assessment, site testing and SA. In addition, following the assessment and testing of edge of Cambridge sites in the Green Belt, 430 dwellings were identified at Worts' Causeway. This provided sufficient dwellings to meet the Cambridge target.

The package appraisal discussed above considered options of where the remaining dwellings from South Cambridgeshire should be delivered. Options centred around one or more new settlements, or village growth strategies. For comparison, these were compared with strategies with varying levels of additional growth on the edge of Cambridge, although large growth sites in these locations had been rejected by this point.

7.2.3 A new baseline

As detailed earlier in this SA Addendum Report, new evidence on housing needs has been commissioned by the Councils. Modifications are proposed to the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan which would result in a new requirement for 19,500 homes for South Cambridgeshire. For Cambridge, no modification is required in relation to the housing requirement, and as such, this figure remains at 14,000 homes in the Cambridge Local Plan.

The Councils have also updated their housing trajectories, which identify housing sites and when they are anticipated to be built. Table 7.1 reflects the updated supply situation.

Table 7.1: Updated Housing Targets and Identified Supply

Table 7.1: Updated Housing Targets and Identified Supply		
	Cambridge	South Cambridgeshire
Dwellings Target	14,000	19,500
Completions 2011 to 2015	2,860	2,735
Existing allocations in Adopted Plans (including those with planning permission)	7,296	8,771
Unallocated Sites with Planning Permission	655	1,179
Forecast Windfall Allowance	1,511	2,450
Total Existing Identified Supply	12,322	15,135
Difference	1,678	4,365

7.3 Considering alternative approaches to development

The SAs, including this SA Addendum Report, have confirmed that, subject to site specific considerations, development within Cambridge remains the top of the search sequence. Alternatives which do not seek additional development in the Cambridge urban area are therefore not considered reasonable. New allocations in the urban area of Cambridge, at the top of the development sequence, are capable of delivering 1,470 new dwellings beyond the commitments identified above.

Alternatives remain regarding how the remainder of housing need within the two authorities' areas should be met.

In terms of other land uses, there is a significant existing employment land supply, through existing commitments like the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, West and North West Cambridge, and a number of employment sites in South Cambridgeshire. Cambridge Northern Fringe has also been identified as an opportunity for an employment led development.

The Submission Draft SA reports identified specific sets of sites in order to carry out an assessment of site packages. The components of the packages applied in the Submission Draft SAs cannot be directly applied again due to passage of time, for example some sites have been built, or have planning permission. Moreover, to assemble, for the purpose of SA assessment, a series of sites on a hypothetical basis has the disadvantage of potentially not being capable of reflecting in reality what may be a realistic and reasonable alternative. As such, a different approach has been adopted in this assessment which is considered to reflect the strategic nature of the exercise. The aim here has therefore been to consider the broad strategy options, informed by the site appraisals, to provide an appropriate coverage of the broad strategic alternatives that could be delivered through strategic choices available to the Local Plans. They include village focus, combinations of new settlements, and edge of Cambridge developments, informed by the level of development needed.

The alternatives consider potential development across both districts. This is particularly relevant when considering sites on the urban edge of Cambridge, where the administrative boundary does not follow the existing urban edge. Sites on the urban edge could therefore occur in either or both districts.

Reflecting the issues raised in the Inspectors' Preliminary Conclusions, this strategic alternative of identifying development on the edge of Cambridge is being tested on a like for like basis with other strategic alternatives.

Where new settlements have been considered, the deliverability and potentially longer lead in times have been taken into account, as well as the amount of development that could be delivered during the plan period.

The strategic options are presented below:

- **Option 1 - Waterbeach New Town, Cambourne West and Village Focus:** This new settlement focused option includes provision from the partial completion by 2031 of a new town at Waterbeach, with the remainder after 2031, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne and development at larger villages comprising Rural Centre and Minor Rural Centre villages.
- **Option 2 - Bourn Airfield New Settlement and Village Focus:** This new settlement focused option includes the completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield within the plan period, and limited development at Rural Centre and Minor Rural Centre villages to meet the remaining requirement.
- **Option 3 - Cambourne and Village Focus:** This village focused option includes completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne, with the remainder of new development focused on other villages. In order to meet the required level of development, a range of village sites would be required, requiring allocation of most of the village sites identified as options during the issues and options process. At Waterbeach, there would be no new settlement, but the redevelopment of the built area of the barracks themselves would accommodate around 900 dwellings.
- **Option 4 - Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement, and Cambourne West Focus:** This combined new settlement focused option includes provision from the partial completion by 2031 of a new town at Waterbeach, the partial completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne. This would be supported by selected development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.
- **Option 5 - Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement and Village Focus:** This combined new settlement focused option includes provision from the partial completion by 2031 of a new town at Waterbeach, the partial completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield (but more than Option 4 assumes), and development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.
- **Option 6 – Edge of Cambridge and Village Focus:** This Edge of Cambridge focused option assumes 2 or 3 large urban extensions to Cambridge on land currently in the Green Belt. This would accommodate around 4000 dwellings. This would be supported by selected village sites at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, with a focus on previously developed land.
- **Option 7 – Edge of Cambridge, Waterbeach New Town, Cambourne West and Village Focus:** This combined edge of Cambridge and new settlement focused option assumes 1 or 2 large urban extensions to Cambridge on land currently in the Green Belt, accommodating around 2000 dwellings. The remaining development needs would be accommodated through the partial completion of a new town at Waterbeach, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne and limited development at villages.
- **Option 8 – Edge of Cambridge, Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement, Cambourne West and Village Focus:** This combined edge of Cambridge and new settlement focused option assumes delivery of smaller sites on land currently in the

Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge, provision from the partial completion of a new town at Waterbeach, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne and selected development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.

7.4 Sustainability appraisal of strategic alternatives

7.4.1 Introduction

The sustainability appraisal presented in this section builds upon the appraisal undertaken on the alternative site packages as part of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan SA. The original assessment can be found in Appendix 4 of the South Cambridgeshire Submission Draft SA report⁸⁶

The differences between this appraisal and the appraisal contained in the previous SA report are:

- This SA is based on the new strategic SA framework developed for use in this SA Addendum Report (see Section 3 for details on how this was developed); and
- The SA takes into account new evidence on a number of issues:
 - Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination – Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Further Evidence (2015);
 - Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study (2015);
 - Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Viability Update (2015);
 - Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Study (2015);
 - Local Plans CSRM Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Transport Report (Atkins, November 2015).
- The previous SA identified specific sets of sites to carry out the assessment. A more general approach is now taken, as this is more appropriate to a strategic assessment. The packages cannot be directly applied again due to passage of time, for example some sites have been built, or have planning permission (please see Section 7.3 above for more detailed explanation).
- Some small changes have been made to the assessment scores to make them clearer and a discussion column has been included in Table 7.2 to make the assessment more transparent.

This is an assessment of the broad implications of different strategy alternatives. The purpose of this SA is to use the updated evidence and the updated SA framework to consider the sustainability of different strategic alternatives using a common approach. Although this is a high level assessment, as is appropriate to its strategic function, it is possible to assess to a higher level of detail than the development sequence assessment so the assessment matrix has been broken down by decision making criteria although some of these have been grouped to enable a more focused appraisal.

Please see Section 3 of this SA Addendum Report for an explanation of the scoring used. Please note that the assessment is carried out against the future baseline or business as usual scenario (the options are compared against what would happen if there were no Local Plans developed). This enable a fair comparison to be made between the options. This is not as straight forward as considering a 'no development' situation. Without the Local Plans development proposals would still be considered through planning applications, guided by National planning policy (the National Planning Policy Framework), and other legislation. Proposals would be considered on an ad hoc basis, without the Local Plans to take a strategic overview of development needs, and opportunities for enhancement.

With regard to mitigation measures the SA represents an assessment of the alternative strategies with reasonable mitigation in place. The assessment has assumed, for example, that measures to address known transport issues and those likely to be bought forward to support future growth

⁸⁶ South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/060)

are included (these are the measures that have been modelled along with the growth options in the additional transport modelling referred to above). It has also taken on board conclusions of the viability and infrastructure work outlined above with regard to the kinds of infrastructure that will be needed and how viable these are for different development options. In addition, it has been assumed mitigation measures that would inherently be included within the design of new developments will be included within a reasonable time frame to ensure that effects are acceptable (where this is not the case this is highlighted). This approach has been taken to reflect the fact that new work has been commissioned on the measures that will realistically be needed to make growth sustainable and acceptable. It also reflects the fact that the area has now received City Deal funding which will provide additional funding to ensure that future economic growth is supported by infrastructure and is sustainable.

7.5 Results of the assessment

The assessment matrix is shown in Table 7.2 and results are discussed in Table 7.3 which shows a clear comparison between the previous SA of the site packages and where conclusions have changed due to the updated evidence and amended SA framework.

7.6 Overall conclusions

The updated evidence base and changes to the SA framework have not changed the results of the assessment significantly and mirror the conclusions of the SA of the development sequence (Section 5).

Options which include development in the Green Belt (Options 6, 7 and 8) have some sustainability benefits with regard to sustainable transport and with regards to viability and access to services. Viability evidence has confirmed that sites on the edge of Cambridge offer higher sales values than options further from the city meaning potentially greater funding being available for facilities and infrastructure. This offers benefits in terms of potential to secure higher funding through Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) / Section 106. Cambridge is proposing to secure a higher rate of CIL than South Cambridgeshire, and this higher rate has the potential to be applied to edge of Cambridge sites. With regard to transport, development on the edge of Cambridge remains the best performing option with regard to modal share and performs positively due to short distances to the city, low public transport journey times, and in many cases proximity to high frequency public transport. However, the modal share results hide the fact that these locations are in already congested areas of the city where there is little scope to create more capacity for more cars, forcing new trips to be undertaken by active modes. The Inner Green Belt Study (2015) has concluded that it is unlikely that any development (apart from a few small exceptions) could be accommodated without substantial harm to the Green Belt purposes. Therefore, the conclusions remain that it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development on the edge of Cambridge without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt.

With regard to village led development (Option 3) such a strategy would be likely to deliver incremental improvements at best, rather than focused investment. Traffic impacts would be spread more around the district, but there would be a higher modal share for car use (up to 80% for a purely village based strategy). A distribution to smaller sites would have a more incremental impact on the landscape and townscape, but village expansions could negatively impact on village character.

Options which include large amounts of development in new settlements (Options 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8) would help to protect Green Belt and the setting of Cambridge (less so in options 7 and 8 which also include edge of Cambridge development) but new settlements do not score as positively as edge of Cambridge development, mainly due to issues related to sustainable transport and viability. However, the new transport evidence has found that although the greater

distance from Cambridge would mean higher levels of car use than an edge of Cambridge focus site specific transport measures would reduce the impact of growth, increasing the proportion of trips made by non-car modes, including shift towards Park & Ride. New evidence has been commissioned in response to the challenges identified in delivering self-contained and viable new settlements. Viability work has confirmed that the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make edge of Cambridge a more attractive location for development than new settlements meaning that facilities and infrastructure are more viable in these locations. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements (edge of Cambridge). Given the cost of transport schemes required for the sites, it is unlikely that off site infrastructure and substantial services could be delivered through CIL alone. However, it is expected that City Deal funding would be available to support delivery of major infrastructure required to make the new settlements viable and sustainable.

Table 7.2: Scoring against the SA criteria

Table 7.2 Scoring against the SA criteria (criteria marked in <i>bold italic</i> are those that have been added to the framework to take into account Cambridge issues – please see Section 3.4 for more details)									
Decision Making Criteria	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8	Discussion
1. Land									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it use land that has been previously developed? Will it use land efficiently? 	+++	+	+	+++	+++	+	+++	+++	There is a limited supply of previously developed land available for development in the district, and this was reflected in the options identified through the plan making process. Therefore, all options perform positively against this sub-objective because areas within each of the options are likely to include some previously developed land. The only options which could utilise significant areas of previously developed land include either or both of two new settlement options, at Waterbeach and Bourn Airfield. In particular the Waterbeach new town option would involve the redevelopment of the large barracks site. As a result, options 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8 offer potentially significant beneficial impacts. This largely stems from the relative reliance in these options on Waterbeach new settlement which scores highly on this sub-objective to deliver a large proportion of their housing allocations. The other options which include this site are less reliant on it in terms of overall housing provision and include other sites with less positive performance. The impact of a relocated Waste Water Recycling centre at Waterbeach is uncertain at this stage.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it protect and enhance the best and most versatile agricultural land? Will it minimise the degradation/loss of soils due to new development? 	---	---	-	---	---	---	---	---	<p>The scale of development needed in the district means that impact on this objective will be significant, with unavoidable loss of high grade agricultural land. All options therefore perform poorly in relation to this sub-objective. The major development site options are all identified as having significant negative impact on the objective, as they would involve large areas of high grade agricultural land. Some smaller villages were identified avoiding the high grade agricultural land, but they would not be sufficient to deliver the total development required.</p> <p>Whilst the impact of a number of village sites was indicated as only minor due to their smaller scale, cumulatively options involving a number of these sites would have impacts that could still be significant. Option 3 performs slightly better overall because a significant proportion of housing provision in this option comes from rural centres and several minor rural centre sites which have a neutral impact on the best and most versatile agricultural and from the redevelopment of the barracks at Waterbeach, However, the cumulative impact of this option of sites on agricultural land should still be noted, even if it is marginally less significantly adverse than the other options.</p> <p>Some transport schemes providing wider benefits for the area would also be required to serve Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield on the A428 corridor and Waterbeach new town on the A10 would negatively impact on agricultural land.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves? 	-	0	0	-	-	0	-	0	Mineral reserves are identified on the proposals map of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework. Of particular relevance in the area are reserves of sand and gravel. The most significant site within areas identified is the Waterbeach new settlement, therefore options 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8 conflict with this sub-objective. The other options have no impact on this sub-objective or the effects are considered to be neutral.
2. Waste									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage reduction in household waste, and increase waste recovery and recycling? 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	This is not a location specific issue.
3. Air quality and environmental pollution									

Table 7.2 Scoring against the SA criteria (criteria marked in <i>bold italic</i> are those that have been added to the framework to take into account Cambridge issues – please see Section 3.4 for more details)									
Decision Making Criteria	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8	Discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it maintain or improve air quality, <i>including in AQMA?</i> 	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>Growth on the scale envisaged will inherently generate traffic movements, thereby having a negative impact on air pollution regardless of location of new development.</p> <p>New settlement options identified are located in areas of good air quality, but an increase in traffic emissions could potentially affect local air quality.</p> <p>Option 6 could have potentially significant adverse impacts because it incorporates large scale development on the edge of Cambridge and could bring dwellings closer to the M11 or A14, areas of relatively poor air quality (with an AQMA on the A14). Sites in this area could benefit from access opportunities by alternative modes.</p> <p>This objective is intrinsically linked with the transport objectives particularly objective 22 on sustainable travel. Therefore, when considering the impacts on air quality from development of a given option, consideration also needs to be given to the performance of the option against objective 22.</p> <p>The Local Plans CSRM report states that increasing congestion, delay and journey times means that traffic will be stationary for longer and this will have negative impacts on air quality and carbon emissions and this will be evident in all scenarios.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it minimise, and where possible improve on, unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour, and vibration (<i>including compatibility with neighbouring uses?</i>) 	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>It is generally possible to avoid light pollution through sensitive lighting design, in all but the darkest of landscapes. The initial assessment of the Bourn Airfield new settlement site highlighted a potential conflict with the adjoining industrial area. This had historically resulted in noise complaints from nearby residential areas. This site was proposed in representations for redevelopment for employment uses which are more compatible with residential development, and subject to consultation through Issues and Options 2. The issue is therefore now capable of appropriate mitigation and the site’s performance against this objective has therefore improved. This is case for options 2, 4, 5 and 8.</p> <p>The development options avoid significant negative performance overall, but nonetheless there are potential minor adverse impacts. A small number of village sites offered specific opportunities to address issues, such as redevelopment of industrial areas in residential areas.</p> <p>On the edge of Cambridge, option 6 has the potential to bring development closer to the M11 and A14 and therefore people closer to potential noise pollution. However, impacts are likely to be capable of mitigation and consequently this option performs positively overall.</p> <p>Option 7 has the potential for a minor positive performance for this objective, because the majority of the sites likely to be developed are considered to have neutral impact on achieving this objective and one has the potential for a major positive performance.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it remediate contaminated land? 	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	All of the options have the potential to assist with the remediation of contaminated land to some extent.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment? <i>Will it ensure that new development takes sewerage infrastructure, and source protection zones into account?</i> 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	All options have a neutral performance for this objective. Parts of the south east of South Cambridgeshire are identified as groundwater protection zones, associated with the underlying chalk. The majority of development within the options would avoid these areas. Some site options around villages in these areas, like Sawston would fall within groundwater protection zones, but appropriate mitigation measures could be included to protect water quality.
4. Designated sites and protected species									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity, <i>including positive conservation management on local wildlife sites and SSSIs?</i> 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	It has been assumed that mitigation measures could be implemented appropriately for all options, as would be required by law and planning policy. Some transport schemes providing wider benefits for the area would also be required to serve Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield on the A428 corridor could negatively impact on designated sites depending on the routes selected.
5. Habitats and species									

Table 7.2 Scoring against the SA criteria (criteria marked in <i>bold italic</i> are those that have been added to the framework to take into account Cambridge issues – please see Section 3.4 for more details)									
Decision Making Criteria	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8	Discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Will it deliver net gains in biodiversity? Will it help deliver habitat restoration, and reduce habitat fragmentation (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan Targets and maintain connectivity between green infrastructure)?</i> 	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>All options are considered to have a positive performance since they all include sites where there are opportunities for positive enhancements to be secured through development.</p> <p>Major development options identified include opportunities for habitat linkage/enhancement/restoration, and the creation of new Green Infrastructure which would provide net benefits. Waterbeach new settlement (included in options 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8), offers potentially significant beneficial impacts through habitat creation in the north of the site, as part of mitigation measures required to preserve the setting of Denny Abbey. Options including this site therefore perform well for this sub-objective. Although village sites may offer fewer opportunities for enhancement in terms of overall net gains, the significance of their contribution to ecological coherence of strategic habitat networks is highly dependent upon their location and the type of habitat they could provide. Some transport schemes providing wider benefits for the area would also be required to serve Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield on the A428 corridor could negatively impact on habitats depending on the routes selected.</p>
6. Access to wildlife and green spaces									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery of and access to green infrastructure or access to the countryside through public rights of way? 	+	+	+	+	+	+++	+++	+	<p>The greatest potential to directly deliver new green infrastructure is with major development sites. Larger sites on the edge of Cambridge have potential to include green infrastructure, as do new settlements. Smaller village sites generally offer less potential, although they may still contribute financially to improving green space provision and access through Section 106 agreements or the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), they are less likely to be able to secure increases in provision levels directly. Viability work has confirmed that the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make edge of Cambridge a more attractive location for development than new settlements meaning that facilities and infrastructure are more viable in these locations. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements (edge of Cambridge). Given the cost of transport schemes required for the sites, it is unlikely that off site infrastructure and substantial services could be delivered through CIL/S106 alone. However, it is expected that City Deal funding would be available to deliver the major infrastructure required to make the new settlements viable and sustainable. including green infrastructure.</p>
7. Landscape and townscape character									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will in maintain and enhance the distinctiveness of landscape character? 	---	-	---	-	-	---	---	---	<p>All options include some sites which conflict with the protection of landscape character, and therefore negative performances have been recorded.</p> <p>Options involving development on the edge of Cambridge are likely to have a significant negative impact on the landscape character objective. The Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study (2015) identified that it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development on the edge of Cambridge without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. These purposes highlight the importance to the historic City of Cambridge of the quality of its setting as well as the usual role of Green Belts in preventing communities from merging with one another.</p> <p>The scale of the new settlement options mean that they will also impact on this objective, but they are likely to offer greater potential for mitigation, and are located in areas of lower landscape sensitivity. The setting of Denny Abbey is a particular issue for the Waterbeach new settlement option, and mitigation will be required to maintain its setting.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Will it recognise the role of the Green Belt in maintaining the character of the City and the quality of its historic setting?</i> 	0	0	0	0	0	---	---	---	<p>Options which include edge of Cambridge development (options 6, 7 and 8) could have a significant negative impact on this objective. The Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study (2015) has concluded that it is unlikely that any development on the edge of Cambridge (apart from a few small exceptions) could be accommodated without substantial harm to the Green Belt purposes. Some transport schemes providing wider benefits for the area would also be required to serve Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield on the A428 corridor and Waterbeach new town on the A10 corridors could negatively impact on Green Belt depending on the routes selected.</p>

Table 7.2 Scoring against the SA criteria (criteria marked in <i>bold italic</i> are those that have been added to the framework to take into account Cambridge issues – please see Section 3.4 for more details)									
Decision Making Criteria	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8	Discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character <i>including through appropriate design and scale of development?</i> 	-	-	-	-	-	---	---	---	All options include some potential sites which conflict with the protection of townscape character, and therefore negative performances have been recorded. Options which include significant Green Belt release on the edge of Cambridge (6, 7 and 8) would have significant negative impacts on this objective. The rationale for this being that the Green Belt setting of Cambridge is identified as being particularly important to the historic character and setting of the City. The townscape impact of the new settlement options is identified as being less significant as they lie outside the Green Belt, away from Cambridge.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Will it ensure the scale of development is sensitive to the existing key landmark buildings and low lying topography of the City?</i> 	0	0	0	0	0	---	---	---	Options which include edge of Cambridge development (options 6, 7 and 8) could have a significant negative impact on this objective. As above, the rationale for this being that the Green Belt setting of Cambridge is identified as being particularly important to the historic character and setting of the City.
8. Historic Environment									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it protect or enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments, <i>buildings of local interest and archaeology?</i>) 	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	Only options 2, 6 and 8 have a neutral performance for this objective. A number of sites included in the options have been assessed as being in conflict with this objective. This includes Waterbeach new settlement (included in options 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8), where the key issue is the impact on Denny Abbey. Mitigation measures could be implemented, but there would be likely minor negative residual impacts. Some transport schemes providing wider benefits for the area would also be required to serve Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield on the A428 corridor and Waterbeach new town on the A10 corridors could negatively impact on heritage assets depending on the routes selected. Options involving development on the edge of Cambridge (Options 6,7 and 8) could negatively impact on this setting.
9. Good Spaces									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it lead to developments built to a high standard of design and good place making that reflects local character, <i>and improves the quality of the public realm?</i> 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	This objective is not location specific.
10. Climate Change Mitigation									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it promote energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies? 	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	Large developments present potential opportunities for district heating/combined heat and power. New settlements, with a large scale, mixed uses and potentially higher density centres may offer the greatest opportunities. This accounts for the positive performance for most options in relation to this sub-objective. The focus of option 3 on smaller scale village development means that this option is the least likely to offer opportunities for district heating or combined heat and power, meaning that this option is unlikely to positively support this sub-objective and is more likely to have a neutral effect.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it minimise contributions to climate change through sustainable construction practices? 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	This objective is not location specific.
11. Climate Change Adaptation									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it use water in a sustainable manner, and enable and encourage high levels of water efficiency? 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	This objective is not location specific.

Table 7.2 Scoring against the SA criteria (criteria marked in <i>bold italic</i> are those that have been added to the framework to take into account Cambridge issues – please see Section 3.4 for more details)									
Decision Making Criteria	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8	Discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding <i>and account for all costs of flooding (including the economic, environmental and social costs)?</i> <i>Will it protect and enhance existing natural flood risk management infrastructure including capitalising on the opportunity for green infrastructure to help adapt to the threats of climate change?</i> Will it ensure that suitable sustainable drainage measures are incorporated into developments in order to manage surface water runoff? 	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	All of the options are seen to be neutral in relation to this sub-objective apart from option 3, which potentially includes a site which is partially in flood zones 2 and 3.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Does it include measures to adapt to climate change (such as green and blue infrastructure, layout and massing)?</i> 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	This objective is not location specific.
12. Human health									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it promote good health and encourage healthy lifestyles, and help reduce health inequalities <i>(particularly in the north and east of Cambridge)?</i> 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	This objective is not location specific.
13. Crime									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce actual levels of crime, and will it reduce fear of crime? 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	This objective is not location specific.
14. Public Open Space									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space <i>(particularly in areas anticipated to experience significant population growth)?</i> 	+++	+	+	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	<p>No sites within any of the options have a negative performance for this objective and all options perform positively for the provision of public open space. General planning policies require provision of open space to meet the needs generated through new development.</p> <p>Option 3 because of its dispersed approach to development around villages, may give rise to fewer opportunities to deliver more than the minimum open space requirements, and such infrastructure investment will inherently be more dispersed, but in doing so it could achieve a wider spatial distribution of new provision. Specific opportunities will depend on how the developments evolve.</p> <p>Waterbeach new settlement (included in options 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8), offers potentially significant beneficial impacts because of the new open space which would be provided as part of this development.</p>
15. Housing									

Table 7.2 Scoring against the SA criteria (criteria marked in <i>bold italic</i> are those that have been added to the framework to take into account Cambridge issues – please see Section 3.4 for more details)									
Decision Making Criteria	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8	Discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it support the provision of a range of quality housing of appropriate types and sizes, including affordable housing, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community including people within the District and the City (including the elderly, disabled people and those in poor health)? Will it provide for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople? 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	This objective is not location specific.
16. Inequalities									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve relations between people from different backgrounds or social groups <i>and contribute to community diversity?</i> Will it address inequality? (related to age, disability, gender, race, faith, location and income) 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	This objective is not location specific.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it redress rural isolation - rurality? 	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	All of the options (apart from option 4) include some village development so all could have potential benefits on rural isolation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>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?</i> 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	This objective is not location specific.
17. Services and Facilities									

Table 7.2 Scoring against the SA criteria (criteria marked in <i>bold italic</i> are those that have been added to the framework to take into account Cambridge issues – please see Section 3.4 for more details)									
Decision Making Criteria	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8	Discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it provide accessibility to and improve quality of key local services and facilities, including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?) 	+	+	+	+	+	+++	+	+	<p>Options 6 and 7, which include the most significant levels of development on the edge of Cambridge, offer potentially the most significant positive performance in relation to this sub-objective because of the proximity of development to the higher order services and facilities available within Cambridge. Development of a new settlement would include its own town centre and facilities, although in the case of Waterbeach much of this would be delivered beyond the plan period, and so the short and medium term performance for this sub-objective would be less positive than in the longer term. Therefore, these options have been scored as minor positive. There are also differences in scale between Waterbeach and Bourn meaning that less can be provided at Bourn in terms of infrastructure and services.</p> <p>Other options include development at the Rural Centre / Minor Rural Centre level, ensuring that new housing would be accessible to local services and facilities. Because none of the options assume development on new sites beyond the better served group villages, none of the options is in conflict with this sub-objective overall.</p> <p>Options 1, 3 and 4 incorporate a relatively high level of housing provision in villages so are in conflict with this sub-objective and may result in potentially significant adverse impacts as many village sites are at some distance from existing village centres. They also rely on development in Cambourne west, which generally performs poorly against distance to centre, although it does adjoin a new secondary school so its performance for education access is good.</p> <p>In contrast, the other options have a greater reliance on new settlements and/or major development sites and generally these perform better because it is assumed that they would be able to deliver new local centres through masterplanning of these sites. Overall, however, these options are still in conflict with this sub-objective. Viability work has confirmed that the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make edge of Cambridge a more attractive location for development than new settlements meaning potentially greater funding being available for facilities and infrastructure in these locations. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements (edge of Cambridge). Given the cost of transport schemes required for the sites, it is unlikely that off site infrastructure and substantial services could be delivered through CIL alone. However, it is expected that City Deal funding would be available to deliver the major infrastructure required to make the new settlements viable and sustainable.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Will it ensure adequate provision of convenience shopping in the north west of Cambridge?</i> 	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	All of the options include the assumption of some development in the centre of Cambridge so all of the options will score positively.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?) 	+	+	+	+	+	+++	+	+	<p>Larger focused developments have more potential to deliver a range of new services, whilst more scattered village development would reduce the likely impact of investment, and could put additional pressure on existing village services.</p> <p>Consequently, option 3 performs less positively as it does not include a new settlement and is additionally the most reliant on village development. By comparison, the other options perform well for this objective. In the case of Waterbeach much of this would be delivered beyond the plan period, and so the short and medium term performance for this sub-objective would be less positive than in the longer term. Therefore, these options have been scored as minor positive. There are also differences in scale between Waterbeach and Bourn meaning that less can be provided at Bourn in terms of infrastructure and services.</p>
18. Involvement									

Table 7.2 Scoring against the SA criteria (criteria marked in <i>bold italic</i> are those that have been added to the framework to take into account Cambridge issues – please see Section 3.4 for more details)									
Decision Making Criteria	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8	Discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities? Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions, including 'hard to reach' groups? 	+++	+++	+	+++	+++	+	+	+	New development is required by plan policies to provide community facilities to meet the needs generated, and will therefore contribute to supporting engagement with community activities. Larger more focused developments are more likely to be able to deliver a wider range of new services. On this basis options 1, 2, 4 and 5, which include new settlements, are more likely to perform well and provide positive support for this sub-objective. Conversely, scattered village development would be less likely to be able to, and could in some cases put additional pressures on existing village services. On this basis Option 3 does not include a new settlement and performs less positively. With regard to the differences between edge of Cambridge focused development and new settlements, viability work has confirmed that the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make this an attractive location for development meaning potentially greater funding being available for facilities and infrastructure. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements.
19. Economy									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Will it maintain and enhance competitiveness, and capitalise on Cambridge's position as one of the UK's most competitive cities?</i> Will it support business development and enhance competitiveness, enabling provision of high-quality employment land in appropriate locations to meet the needs of businesses, and the workforce? Will it promote the industries that thrive in the area? 	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	New settlements would be mixed use developments incorporating provision of employment land, hence the strongly positive performance for the options providing new settlements (1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8) and the less positive performance for option 3, which would be a village focused strategy. Some development proposals on the edge of Cambridge would also be mixed use. It should be noted, however, that much of the employment at Waterbeach (included in options 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8) may be delivered beyond the plan period and so the short and medium term performance for this sub-objective would be less positive than in the longer term. Therefore, these options have been scored as minor positive. There are also differences in scale between Waterbeach and Bourn meaning that less can be provided at Bourn in terms of infrastructure and services.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Does it address pockets of income and employment deprivation particularly in Abbey Ward and Kings Hedges? Would allocation result in development in deprived wards?</i> <i>Will it minimise the loss of industrial floorspace in Cambridge?</i> 	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	All of the options include the assumption of some development in the centre of Cambridge so all of the options will score positively.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it protect the shopping hierarchy supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres? 	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	The policy requirements of the Local Plans would mean that new centres may be delivered to meet local needs, but that they would be required not to be of such a scale to harm the shopping hierarchy. Therefore, all options are deemed to have a positive performance for this sub-objective.
20. Access to Work									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it contribute to providing a range of employment opportunities, in accessible locations? 	+	+	+	+	+	+++	+	+	All of the options support this objective, with option 6 offering potentially significant beneficial impacts because of the concentration of development on the edge of the most significant existing employment area, that being Cambridge. New settlement sites are currently not as close to major employment areas, but as mixed use used new employment opportunities are likely to lead to increased access to employment in the longer term, and therefore these are likely to perform slightly better than the village focused options.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage and support sustainable tourism and the rural economy? 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Positive performance against this objective is likely to occur due to a result of the policies in the Local Plan on such issues as agricultural diversification and policies protecting the environment and heritage of the area (which tourism is dependent upon)

Table 7.2 Scoring against the SA criteria (criteria marked in <i>bold italic</i> are those that have been added to the framework to take into account Cambridge issues – please see Section 3.4 for more details)									
Decision Making Criteria	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8	Discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>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?</i> <i>Does it support high-tech clusters (including high tech manufacturing) including the provision of office space for small but growing businesses and the need for high-tech headquarters?</i> 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Positive performance against this objective is likely to occur due to a result of the policies in the Local Plan on such issues as employment land provision.
21. Infrastructure									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband? 	+	+	+/-	+	+	+++	+	+	<p>Larger focused developments have more potential to deliver a range of new services, whilst more scattered village development would reduce the likely impact of investment, and could put additional pressure on existing village services.</p> <p>Consequently, option 3 performs less positively as it does not include a new settlement and is additionally the most reliant on village development. By comparison, the other options perform well for this objective. In the case of Waterbeach much of this would be delivered beyond the plan period, and so the short and medium term performance for this sub-objective would be less positive than in the longer term. Therefore, these options have been scored as minor positive. There are also differences in scale between Waterbeach and Bourn meaning that less can be provided at Bourn in terms of infrastructure and services. Viability work has confirmed that the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make edge of Cambridge a more attractive location for development than new settlements meaning that facilities and infrastructure are more viable in these locations. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements (edge of Cambridge). Given the cost of transport schemes required for the sites, it is unlikely that off site infrastructure and substantial services could be delivered through CIL alone. However, it is expected that City Deal funding would be available to support delivery of major infrastructure required to make the new settlements viable and sustainable.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve access to education and training for all (including timely provision of primary and secondary schools in locations where it is needed), and support provision of skilled employees to the economy? 	+	+	+/-	+	+	+++	+	+	<p>Larger focused developments have more potential to deliver a range of new education services, whilst more scattered village development would reduce the likely impact of investment, and could put additional pressure on existing services.</p> <p>Consequently, option 3 performs less positively as it does not include a new settlement and is additionally the most reliant on village development. By comparison, the other options perform well for this objective. In the case of Waterbeach much of this would be delivered beyond the plan period, and so the short and medium term performance for this sub-objective would be less positive than in the longer term. Therefore, these options have been scored as minor positive. There are also differences in scale between Waterbeach and Bourn meaning that less can be provided at Bourn in terms of infrastructure and services. Viability work has confirmed that the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make edge of Cambridge a more attractive location for development than new settlements meaning that potentially greater funding towards facilities and infrastructure in these locations. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements (edge of Cambridge).</p>
22. Sustainable Travel									

Table 7.2 Scoring against the SA criteria (criteria marked in <i>bold italic</i> are those that have been added to the framework to take into account Cambridge issues – please see Section 3.4 for more details)									
Decision Making Criteria	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8	Discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it enable shorter journeys, improve modal choice (helping to reduce the use of the private car) and integration of transport modes to encourage or facilitate the use of modes such as walking, cycling and public transport? <i>Will it build on the high modal share of cycling in the City centre?</i> 	+	+	-	+	+	++	+	+	<p>All of the options support this sub-objective and score positively against the sub-indicators.</p> <p>Development on the edge of Cambridge (options 6, 7 and 8) would support access opportunities by alternative modes, although access to public transport services is better close to radial routes with good services, and some areas around the City currently have more limited access to high quality public transport. The Local Plans CSRM report shows that different development options do not result in radically different levels of traffic growth, travel times or delay. Whilst there are variations, these are in the context of very high overall traffic growth where significant amounts of development are already committed. With regard to modal share the study showed that an edge of Cambridge focus performs best in terms of car mode share within their own development areas. However, these results hide the fact that these locations are in already congested areas of the city where there is little scope to create more capacity for more cars, forcing new trips to be undertaken by active modes.</p> <p>New settlements (included in options 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8) could incorporate significant public transport routes to Cambridge, and new town and local centres as appropriate, to ensure that residents have convenient access to local services and facilities by walking, cycling and public transport. They have the potential to enable focussed investment in public transport and cycling infrastructure, delivering high quality services to provide a significantly higher modal share of travel by non-car modes than village based growth options. The Local Plans CSRM report found that the greater distance from Cambridge would mean higher levels of car use than an edge of Cambridge focus but site specific transport measures would reduce the impact of growth, increasing the proportion of trips made by non-car modes, including shift towards Park & Ride. Dispersed growth in villages was found to be less preferable to focused growth in New Settlements in transport terms. The focus on new settlements will provide opportunities to further minimise traffic growth through use of sustainable travel modes and internalisation of trips. Given the cost of transport schemes required for the sites, it is unlikely that off site infrastructure and substantial services could be delivered through CIL alone. However, it is expected that City Deal funding would be available to support delivery of major infrastructure required to make the new settlements viable and sustainable.</p> <p>A village based strategy would be likely to deliver incremental improvements at best, rather than focused investment. Traffic impacts would be spread more around the district, but there would be a higher modal share for car use. The Local Plans CSRM report found that a purely village based strategy was likely to have a car mode share of close to 80%. Outside the Rural Centres public transport services are generally limited in terms of frequency and journey time. Cycling opportunities would also be lower than other strategy approaches, as distances to Cambridge or market towns would be greater, and would often rely on rural roads rather than dedicated routes. This would particularly impact on option 3 as the most village based option.</p> <p>The sub-objective on the movement of freight has been scoped out of this assessment because this assessment is dealing specifically with housing allocations.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Will it include infrastructure for low emission vehicles?</i> 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	This objective is not location specific.
23. Transport infrastructure									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity? 	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	Concerns have been expressed regarding insufficient capacity on existing roads with regard to Waterbeach new settlement. However, the Local Plans CSRM report found that site specific transport measures would reduce the impact of growth of new settlements, increasing the proportion of trips made by non-car modes, including shift towards Park & Ride. Therefore, a neutral score is expected.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it make the transport network safer for all users, both motorised and non-motorised? 	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	A village based strategy would be likely to deliver incremental improvements at best, rather than focused investment and a high car mode share, therefore, affecting capacity and safety of the transport network. Safe access will be assessed at the planning application stage once further design details are known.

Table 7.3: Discussion of the results

Table 7.3: Discussion of the results	
Results of the original option assessment⁸⁷	Changes due to updated evidence and SA framework and conclusions
Option 1 – Waterbeach New Town, Cambourne West and Village Focus	
<p>This package includes provision of a new town at Waterbeach, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne and development at a range of villages down to the Better Served Group Village level. Waterbeach New Town scores strongly against a relatively large number of sub-objectives and, because of its relative reliance on this site, this is reflected in the overall scores for this package. The package performs strongly in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of previously developed land; • Provision of open space; • Quality and range of local services and facilities; • Engagement with community activities; • Business development and competitiveness; and • Safety of the transport network and promotion of non-motorised modes <p>As with all of the packages, it performs poorly in relation to the use of agricultural land. Both Waterbeach New Town and Cambourne West would involve the loss of significant amounts of agricultural land and this would be compounded by cumulatively significant further loss from a large number of village sites.</p> <p>The inclusion of a large number of village sites, which are considered to be sensitive in landscape terms, means that the cumulative impact on landscape character is likely to be significant in this package. Significant mitigation measures will be required, particularly when the town would reach its eventual size.</p> <p>Its inclusion of a large number of village sites, many of which are some distance from existing centres, also means it scores poorly in relation to the 'distance to centre' sub-indicator. The issues with highway capacity for the Waterbeach New Town site also result in this package performing poorly in terms of providing safe access to the highway network.</p> <p>In relation to the infrastructure objectives, there is a contrast between the more positive scores for the sites in minor village centre and the more negative scores for the new settlements and larger village sites, where investment in infrastructure would be required. In spite of the inclusion of a significant number of smaller village sites, we have assessed the balance overall as being negative.</p>	<p>Waterbeach New Town (and therefore the package) will score well against</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of previously developed land; • Provision of open space; and • Engagement with community activities. <p>Waterbeach will continue to score poorly in relation to the use of agricultural land. There are also likely to be negative effects on landscape although the impacts on Green Belt in particular will be much less than alternatives which include significant development on the edge of Cambridge.</p> <p>With regard to new settlements in general the Local Plans CSRM report has found that the greater distance from Cambridge would mean higher levels of car use than an edge of Cambridge focus but site specific transport measures would reduce the impact of growth, increasing the proportion of trips made by non-car modes, including shift towards Park & Ride.</p> <p>Bus priority measures and cycling and pedestrian improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge, planned to secure wider benefits for the area would also be required to serve Cambourne West. Additional studies have been undertaken as part of the City Deal work to identify options to deliver public transport and cycling on the A428. The Local Transport Plan (LTP) includes the schemes⁸⁸. The schemes will reduce the need to travel by car thus having positive impacts on air quality, accessibility and transport objectives. The segregated bus priority measure between the junction of the A428/A1303 and the M11, may affect not only the Greenbelt but also the American Cemetery, a registered park and garden, and a designated heritage asset as well as ancient woodland and BAP priority habitats. If works were able to be carried out on line rather than beyond the existing highway boundary this might alleviate some of the adverse effects. Negative effects have also been identified in relation to greenfield land take (and specifically high quality agricultural land).</p> <p>Bus priority measures, Park & Ride, cycling and pedestrian improvements, and highways improvements on the A10 corridor, planned to secure wider benefits for the area would also be required to serve a new town north of Waterbeach. The Local Transport Plan (LTP) includes the schemes⁸⁹. As with the A428 assessments, most of the schemes will reduce the need to travel by car thus having positive impacts on air quality and accessibility. Negative effects have been identified in relation to greenfield land take (and specifically high quality agricultural land) and some of the schemes are located partly in the Green Belt. A busway using the Mereway route would have potential to negatively impact on heritage assets.</p> <p>With regard to infrastructure issues there are still likely to be contrasts between positive scores in minor village centres and negative scores for new settlements where investment in infrastructure will be required and could take time to come forward or not prove to be viable. Viability work has confirmed that the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make this an attractive location for development meaning that facilities and infrastructure are more viable. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements. Given the cost of transport schemes required for the sites, it is unlikely that off site infrastructure and substantial services could be delivered through CIL/s106 alone. However, it is expected that City Deal funding would be available to deliver the major infrastructure required to make the new settlements viable and sustainable. The assessment also reports that much of the infrastructure for Waterbeach would be delivered beyond the plan period, and so the short and medium term performance for issues related to access to services and jobs would be less positive than in the longer term.</p>
Option 2 - Bourn Airfield New Settlement and Village Focus	
<p>This package includes the completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield within the plan period, and limited development in Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centre villages to meet the remaining requirement.</p> <p>Unlike Waterbeach New Town, only approximately one third of the Bourn Airfield site is previously developed land</p>	<p>This option will continue to score more poorly than options involving Waterbeach in relation to previously developed land and provision of open space.</p> <p>Bus priority measures and cycling and pedestrian improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge, planned to secure</p>

⁸⁷ South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/060). See Appendix 4 for the package assessment.

⁸⁸ In order to make a full assessment it is considered necessary to assess the environmental effects of associated transport schemes when assessing options dealing with Waterbeach, (i.e. schemes on the A10 corridor) and Cambourne and Bourn Airfield (i.e. schemes on the A428 corridor). This inclusion of the effect of transport schemes as part of the assessment of local plan options is carried out on a precautionary basis since it should be noted that these transport improvements are not proposed solely because of any Local Plan allocation since they also are also considered necessary to address existing issues. They have been identified as schemes for consideration though the City Deal process. In particular, the public transport scheme between the A428 and Cambridge including new Park and Ride has been identified as a phase 1 priority. The effects of these schemes have been assessed as part of the Local Transport Plan 3 Strategic Environmental Assessment and appropriate mitigation measures suggested within that assessment.

⁸⁹ As above.

Table 7.3: Discussion of the results	
Results of the original option assessment⁹⁷	Changes due to updated evidence and SA framework and conclusions
<p>and it also scores less strongly in relation to the provision of open space. Because of its heavy reliance on the Bourn Airfield site, this is reflected in the overall scores for this package, with fewer strongly positive scores than package 1.</p> <p>However, it performs slightly better than package 1 in relation to the distance to centre sub-indicator because so much of the provision in this package would be served by a new centre on the Bourn Airfield site, with less provision on village sites. The absence of significant capacity constraints on the highway network for the Bourn Airfield site also means it performs better than package 1 in relation to the sub-indicator for safe access to the highway network.</p>	<p>wider benefits for the area would also be required to serve Bourn Airfield. Additional studies have been undertaken as part of the City Deal work to identify options to deliver public transport and cycling on the A428. The Local Transport Plan (LTP) includes the schemes⁹⁰. The schemes will reduce the need to travel by car thus having positive impacts on air quality, accessibility and transport objectives. The segregated bus priority measure between the junction of the A428/A1303 and the M11, may affect not only the Greenbelt but also the American Cemetery, a registered park and garden, and a designated heritage asset as well as ancient woodland and BAP priority habitats. If works were able to be carried out on line rather than beyond the existing highway boundary this might alleviate some of the adverse effects. With regard to new settlements in general the Local Plans CSRM report has found that the greater distance from Cambridge would mean higher levels of car use than an edge of Cambridge focus but site specific transport measures would reduce the impact of growth, increasing the proportion of trips made by non-car modes, including shift towards Park & Ride.</p> <p>With regard to infrastructure issues there are still likely to be contrasts between positive scores in minor village centres and negative scores for new settlements where investment in infrastructure will be required and could take time to come forward or not prove to be viable. There are also differences in scale between Waterbeach and Bourn meaning that less can be provided at Bourn in terms of infrastructure and services. Viability work has confirmed that the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make this an attractive location for development meaning that facilities and infrastructure are more viable. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements. Given the cost of transport schemes required for the sites, it is unlikely that off site infrastructure and substantial services could be delivered through CIL/S106 alone. However, it is expected that City Deal funding would be available to deliver the major infrastructure required to make the new settlements viable and sustainable.</p>
Option 3 - Cambourne and Village Focus	
<p>This package adopts a village-focused approach. It includes completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne, with the remainder of new development focused on other villages. At Waterbeach, there would be no new settlement, but the redevelopment of the barracks themselves would accommodate around 900 dwellings.</p> <p>Overall, this package does not strongly support any of the sub-objectives.</p> <p>Although the Waterbeach barracks development would not result in the loss of agricultural land, the cumulative loss of agricultural land across a large number of village sites means that there is still conflict with this sub-objective, albeit to a lesser degree than the other packages as it could deliver the largest number of houses without using agricultural land.</p> <p>Although individual site impacts may be relatively minor, the cumulative impacts on landscape and townscape character from this package are likely to be significant, although some impacts may be capable of partial mitigation through design and siting.</p> <p>As with the other packages with a strong reliance on village development, it scores poorly in relation to access to services and facilities, placing larger amounts of development in lower order centres than any other package.</p> <p>Larger scale developments are more likely to incorporate new provision of services, facilities, employment space and transport facilities. The reliance on smaller sites in this package therefore results in this package performing less positively in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality and range of local services and facilities; • Engagement with community activities; • Business development and competitiveness; and • Safety of the transport network and promotion of non-motorised modes. 	<p>The assessment of this package has not changed significantly. Overall, this package does not strongly support any of the sub-objectives. Although the Waterbeach barracks development would not result in the loss of agricultural land, the cumulative loss of agricultural land across a large number of village sites means that there is still conflict with this sub-objective, albeit to a lesser degree than the other packages as it could deliver the largest number of houses without using agricultural land.</p> <p>Although individual site impacts may be relatively minor, the cumulative impacts on landscape and townscape character from this package are likely to be significant, although some impacts may be capable of partial mitigation through design and siting.</p> <p>As with the other packages with a strong reliance on village development, it scores poorly in relation to access to services and facilities, placing larger amounts of development in lower order centres than any other package.</p> <p>Larger scale developments are more likely to incorporate new provision of services, facilities, employment space and transport facilities. The reliance on smaller sites in this package therefore results in this package performing less positively in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality and range of local services and facilities; • Engagement with community activities; • Business development and competitiveness; and • Safety of the transport network and promotion of non-motorised modes. <p>The Local Plans CSRM report found that a purely village based strategy was likely to have a car mode share of close to 80% (although this is not purely a village based strategy, it will have higher car mode shares than the other options). Outside the Rural Centres public transport services are generally limited in terms of frequency and journey time. Cycling opportunities would also be lower than other strategy approaches, as distances to Cambridge or market towns would be greater, and would often rely on rural roads rather than dedicated routes.</p> <p>Bus priority measures and cycling and pedestrian improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge, planned to secure wider benefits for the area would also be required to serve Cambourne West. Additional studies have been undertaken as part</p>

⁹⁰ In order to make a full assessment it is considered necessary to assess the environmental effects of associated transport schemes when assessing options dealing with Waterbeach, (i.e. schemes on the A10 corridor) and Cambourne and Bourn Airfield (i.e. schemes on the A428 corridor). This inclusion of the effect of transport schemes as part of the assessment of local plan options is carried out on a precautionary basis since it should be noted that these transport improvements are not proposed solely because of any Local Plan allocation since they also are also considered necessary to address existing issues. They have been identified as schemes for consideration through the City Deal process. In particular, the public transport scheme between the A428 and Cambridge including new Park and Ride has been identified as a phase 1 priority. The effects of these schemes have been assessed as part of the Local Transport Plan 3 Strategic Environmental Assessment and appropriate mitigation measures suggested within that assessment.

Table 7.3: Discussion of the results	
Results of the original option assessment⁸⁷	Changes due to updated evidence and SA framework and conclusions
	<p>of the City Deal work to identify options to deliver public transport and cycling on the A428. The Local Transport Plan (LTP) includes the schemes⁹¹. The schemes will reduce the need to travel by car thus having positive impacts on air quality, accessibility and transport objectives. The segregated bus priority measure between the junction of the A428/A1303 and the M11, may affect not only the Greenbelt but also the American Cemetery, a registered park and garden, and a designated heritage asset as well as ancient woodland and BAP priority habitats. If works were able to be carried out on line rather than beyond the existing highway boundary this might alleviate some of the adverse effects.</p>
Option 4 - Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement, and Cambourne West Focus	
<p>This package includes provision from the partial completion by 2031 of a new town at Waterbeach, the partial completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne. This would be supported by selected development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.</p> <p>The overall scores for this package largely mirror the scores for package 1, with strongly positive scores for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of previously developed land; • Provision of open space; • Quality and range of local services and facilities; • Engagement with community activities; • Business development and competitiveness; and • Safety of the transport network and promotion of non-motorised modes. <p>It has strongly negative scores for use of agricultural land, distance to centre and (because of the highways issues relating to Waterbeach New Town) provision of safe access to the highway network.</p> <p>It does, however, represent a lower level of landscape impact than package 1 in terms of landscape character because the large number of sensitive village sites in option 1 are largely replaced in this package with the Bourn Airfield site, which is not considered to be sensitive. It is probably also marginally less sensitive in terms of townscape character, although the differences are too subtle to be picked up in terms of the overall performance of the packages at this level of assessment.</p>	<p>The overall scores for this package largely mirror the scores for package 1, with strongly positive scores for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of previously developed land; • Provision of open space; and • Engagement with community activities. <p>It has strongly negative scores for use of agricultural land and there are also likely to be negative effects on landscape. It does, however, represent a lower level of landscape impact than package 1 in terms of landscape character because the large number of sensitive village sites in option 1 are largely replaced in this package with the Bourn Airfield site, which is not considered to be sensitive. It is probably also marginally less sensitive in terms of townscape character, although the differences are too subtle to be picked up in terms of the overall performance of the packages at this level of assessment.</p> <p>Bus priority measures and cycling and pedestrian improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge, planned to secure wider benefits for the area would also be required to serve Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield. Additional studies have been undertaken as part of the City Deal work to identify options to deliver public transport and cycling on the A428. The Local Transport Plan (LTP) includes the schemes⁹². The schemes will reduce the need to travel by car thus having positive impacts on air quality, accessibility and transport objectives. The segregated bus priority measure between the junction of the A428/A1303 and the M11, may affect not only the Greenbelt but also the American Cemetery, a registered park and garden, and a designated heritage asset as well as ancient woodland and BAP priority habitats. If works were able to be carried out on line rather than beyond the existing highway boundary this might alleviate some of the adverse effects. Bus priority measures, Park & Ride, cycling and pedestrian improvements, and highways improvements on the A10 corridor, planned to secure wider benefits for the area would also be required to serve a new town north of Waterbeach. The Local Transport Plan (LTP) includes the schemes⁹³. As with the A428 assessments, most of the schemes will reduce the need to travel by car thus having positive impacts on air quality and accessibility. Negative effects have been identified in relation to greenfield land take (and specifically high quality agricultural land) and some of the schemes are located partly in the Green Belt. A busway using the Mereway route would have potential to negatively impact on heritage assets.</p> <p>With regard to new settlements in general the Local Plans CSRM report has found that the greater distance from Cambridge would mean higher levels of car use than an edge of Cambridge focus but site specific transport measures would reduce the impact of growth, increasing the proportion of trips made by non-car modes, including shift towards Park & Ride.</p> <p>With regard to infrastructure issues there are still likely to be contrasts between positive scores in minor village centres and negative scores for new settlements where investment in infrastructure will be required and could take time to come forward or not prove to be viable. There are also differences in scale between Waterbeach and Bourn meaning that less can be provided at Bourn in terms of infrastructure and services. The assessment also reports that much of the infrastructure for Waterbeach would be delivered beyond the plan period, and so the short and medium term performance for issues related to access to services and jobs would be less positive than in the longer term. Viability work has confirmed that the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make this an attractive location for development meaning that facilities and infrastructure are more viable. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements. Given the cost of transport schemes required for the sites, it is unlikely that off site infrastructure and substantial services could be delivered through CIL / S106 alone. However, it is expected that City Deal funding would be available to deliver the major infrastructure required to make</p>

⁹¹ In order to make a full assessment it is considered necessary to assess the environmental effects of associated transport schemes when assessing options dealing with Waterbeach, (i.e. schemes on the A10 corridor) and Cambourne and Bourn Airfield (i.e. schemes on the A428 corridor). This inclusion of the effect of transport schemes as part of the assessment of local plan options is carried out on a precautionary basis since it should be noted that these transport improvements are not proposed solely because of any Local Plan allocation since they also are also considered necessary to address existing issues. They have been identified as schemes for consideration though the City Deal process. In particular, the public transport scheme between the A428 and Cambridge including new Park and Ride has been identified as a phase 1 priority. The effects of these schemes have been assessed as part of the Local Transport Plan 3 Strategic Environmental Assessment and appropriate mitigation measures suggested within that assessment.

⁹² As above

⁹³ As above

Table 7.3: Discussion of the results	
Results of the original option assessment⁹⁷	Changes due to updated evidence and SA framework and conclusions
	the new settlements viable and sustainable.
Option 5 - Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement and Village Focus	
<p>This package includes provision from the partial completion by 2031 of a new town at Waterbeach, the partial completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield (but more than Option 4 or 9 assumes, which is offset by less reliance on development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres).</p> <p>Its relative reliance on the Bourn Airfield site means that its scores largely mirror the scores for package 2. The focus on new settlements means that it is likely to result in provision of new services, facilities, employment space and transport facilities, meaning it performs strongly in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality and range of local services and facilities; • Engagement with community activities; • Business development and competitiveness; and • Safety of the transport network and promotion of non-motorised modes. <p>The relatively low provision in villages also means that this package is likely to have less cumulative impact on landscape and townscape character than those with a strong reliance on village development or on other sensitive sites.</p>	<p>The relative reliance on the Bourn Airfield site means that its scores largely mirror the scores for package 2 (although this option will see more development at Bourn Airfield than Package 2).</p> <p>The relatively low provision in villages also means that this package is likely to have less cumulative impact on landscape and townscape character than those with a strong reliance on village development or on other sensitive sites.</p> <p>Bus priority measures and cycling and pedestrian improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge, planned to secure wider benefits for the area would also be required to serve Cambourne West. Additional studies have been undertaken as part of the City Deal work to identify options to deliver public transport and cycling on the A428. The Local Transport Plan (LTP) which includes the schemes. The schemes will reduce the need to travel by car thus having positive impacts on air quality, accessibility and transport objectives. The segregated bus priority measure between the junction of the A428/A1303 and the M11, may affect not only the Greenbelt but also the American Cemetery, a registered park and garden, and a designated heritage asset as well as ancient woodland and BAP priority habitats. If works were able to be carried out on line rather than beyond the existing highway boundary this might alleviate some of the adverse effects. Bus priority measures, Park & Ride, cycling and pedestrian improvements, and highways improvements on the A10 corridor, planned to secure wider benefits for the area would also be required to serve a new town north of Waterbeach. The Local Transport Plan (LTP) includes the schemes⁹⁴. As with the A428 assessments, most of the schemes will reduce the need to travel by car thus having positive impacts on air quality and accessibility. Negative effects have been identified in relation to greenfield land take (and specifically high quality agricultural land) and some of the schemes are located partly in the Green Belt. A busway using the Mereway route would have potential to negatively impact on heritage assets.</p> <p>With regard to new settlements in general the Local Plans CSRM report has found that the greater distance from Cambridge would mean higher levels of car use than an edge of Cambridge focus but site specific transport measures would reduce the impact of growth, increasing the proportion of trips made by non-car modes, including shift towards Park & Ride.</p> <p>With regard to infrastructure issues there are still likely to be contrasts between positive scores in minor village centres and negative scores for new settlements where investment in infrastructure will be required and could take time to come forward or not prove to be viable. There are also differences in scale between Waterbeach and Bourn meaning that less can be provided at Bourn in terms of infrastructure and services. The assessment also reports that much of the infrastructure for Waterbeach would be delivered beyond the plan period, and so the short and medium term performance for issues related to access to services and jobs would be less positive than in the longer term. Viability work has confirmed that the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make this an attractive location for development meaning that facilities and infrastructure are more viable. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements. Given the cost of transport schemes required for the sites, it is unlikely that off site infrastructure and substantial services could be delivered through CIL / S106 alone. However, it is expected that City Deal funding would be available to deliver the major infrastructure required to make the new settlements viable and sustainable.</p>
Option 6 - Edge of Cambridge and Village Focus	
<p>This package assumes 2 or 3 large urban extensions to Cambridge on land currently in the Green Belt. This would accommodate around 4000 dwellings. This would be supported by selected village sites at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, with a focus on previously developed land.</p> <p>Delivering this scale of development on the edge of Cambridge would require sites which would have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape character objectives and on air quality. The review of the Green Belt identified that it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development on the edge of Cambridge without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. These purposes highlight the importance to the historic City of Cambridge of the quality of its setting as well as the usual role of Green Belts in preventing communities from merging with one another.</p>	<p>Delivering this scale of development on the edge of Cambridge would require sites which would have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape character objectives. The Inner Green Belt Study (2015) has concluded that it is unlikely that any development (apart from a few small exceptions) could be accommodated without substantial harm to the Green Belt purposes. Therefore, the conclusions remain that it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development on the edge of Cambridge without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. These purposes highlight the importance to the historic City of Cambridge of the quality of its setting as well as the usual role of Green Belts in preventing communities from merging with one another.</p> <p>The major Green Belt sites could offer significant potential for the provision of green infrastructure, which results in this package and package 7 performing strongly in relation to this sub-objective. Because of the proximity of much of the development to Cambridge, these packages also strongly support the sub-objective of improving accessibility to key local</p>

⁹⁴ In order to make a full assessment it is considered necessary to assess the environmental effects of associated transport schemes when assessing options dealing with Waterbeach, (i.e. schemes on the A10 corridor) and Cambourne and Bourn Airfield (i.e. schemes on the A428 corridor). This inclusion of the effect of transport schemes as part of the assessment of local plan options is carried out on a precautionary basis since it should be noted that these transport improvements are not proposed solely because of any Local Plan allocation since they also are also considered necessary to address existing issues. They have been identified as schemes for consideration though the City Deal process. In particular, the public transport scheme between the A428 and Cambridge including new Park and Ride has been identified as a phase 1 priority. The effects of these schemes have been assessed as part of the Local Transport Plan 3 Strategic Environmental Assessment and appropriate mitigation measures suggested within that assessment.

Table 7.3: Discussion of the results	
Results of the original option assessment⁹⁷	Changes due to updated evidence and SA framework and conclusions
<p>The major Green Belt sites could offer significant potential for the provision of green infrastructure, which results in this package and package 7 performing strongly in relation to this sub-objective. Because of the proximity of much of the development to Cambridge, these packages also strongly support the sub-objective of improving accessibility to key local services and facilities. In addition, the provision of new services and facilities which would be required as part of the urban extensions included in this package mean that this package would improve the quality and range of key local services and facilities.</p> <p>The edge of Cambridge focus of this package also results in strongly positive scores for a number of the sustainable travel and transport infrastructure sub-objectives, including: contributing to provision of employment opportunities in accessible locations; and enabling shorter journeys, improving modal choice and integration of transport modes. It also performs well against the sub-indicator for 'distance for cycling to city centre'.</p>	<p>services and facilities. In addition, the provision of new services and facilities which would be required as part of the urban extensions included in this package mean that this package would improve the quality and range of key local services and facilities.</p> <p>With regard to modal share the study showed that an edge of Cambridge focus performs best in terms of car mode share within their own development areas. However, these results hide the fact that these locations are in already congested areas of the city where there is little scope to create more capacity for more cars, forcing new trips to be undertaken by active modes.</p>
Option 7 - Edge of Cambridge, Waterbeach New Town, Cambourne West and Village Focus	
<p>This option assumes 1 or 2 large urban extensions to Cambridge on land currently in the Green Belt, accommodating around 2000 dwellings. The remaining development needs would be accommodated through the partial completion of a new town at Waterbeach, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne and development at 1 village.</p> <p>Delivering this scale of development on the edge of Cambridge would require sites which would have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape character objectives. The review of the Green Belt identified that it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development on the edge of Cambridge without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. These purposes highlight the importance to the historic City of Cambridge of the quality of its setting as well as the usual role of Green Belts in preventing communities from merging with one another.</p> <p>The major Green Belt sites could offer significant potential for the provision of green infrastructure, which results in this package and package 6 performing strongly in relation to this sub-objective. Because of the proximity of much of the development to Cambridge, these packages also strongly support the sub-objective of improving accessibility to key local services and facilities. It performs less well than package 6 for access to employment opportunities, although still positively. In addition, the provision of new services and facilities which would be required as part of the urban extensions included in this package mean that this package would improve the quality and range of key local services and facilities.</p> <p>As with all the packages this one would lead to loss of high grade agricultural land. As above the scale of development on the edge of Cambridge would result in significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape objective.</p> <p>There are fewer strongly positive scores, for example regarding sustainable travel and transport infrastructure sub-objectives.</p>	<p>Delivering this scale of development on the edge of Cambridge would require sites which would have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape character objectives. The Inner Green Belt Study (2015) has concluded that it is unlikely that any development (apart from a few small exceptions) could be accommodated without substantial harm to the Green Belt purposes. Therefore, the conclusions remain that it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development on the edge of Cambridge without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. These purposes highlight the importance to the historic City of Cambridge of the quality of its setting as well as the usual role of Green Belts in preventing communities from merging with one another.</p> <p>The major Green Belt sites could offer significant potential for the provision of green infrastructure, which results in this package and package 6 performing strongly in relation to this sub-objective. Because of the proximity of much of the development to Cambridge, these packages also strongly support the sub-objective of improving accessibility to key local services and facilities. It performs less well than package 6 for access to employment opportunities, although still positively. In addition, the provision of new services and facilities which would be required as part of the urban extensions included in this package mean that this package would improve the quality and range of key local services and facilities.</p> <p>As with all the packages this one would lead to loss of high grade agricultural land. As above the scale of development on the edge of Cambridge (although lower than in Package 6) would result in significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape objective.</p> <p>With regard to modal share the study showed that an edge of Cambridge focus performs best in terms of car mode share within their own development areas. However, these results hide the fact that these locations are in already congested areas of the city where there is little scope to create more capacity for more cars, forcing new trips to be undertaken by active modes.</p> <p>With regard to new settlements in general, the Local Plans CSRM report found that the greater distance from Cambridge would mean higher levels of car use than an edge of Cambridge focus but site specific transport measures would reduce the impact of growth, increasing the proportion of trips made by non-car modes, including shift towards Park & Ride.</p> <p>With regard to the issues related to the A428, additional studies have been undertaken as part of the City Deal work to identify options to deliver public transport and cycling on the A428. This work will affect options dealing with Cambourne and Bourn Airfield. Work has also been undertaken in the LTP SEA that addresses the impact of infrastructure along this corridor. The assessments of most of the schemes are positive and conclude that they will reduce the need to travel by car thus having positive impacts on many sustainability objectives. Negative effects have been identified in relation to greenfield land take (and specifically high quality agricultural land) and some of the schemes are located partly in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Bus priority measures, Park & Ride, cycling and pedestrian improvements, and highways improvements on the A10 corridor, planned to secure wider benefits for the area would also be required to serve Waterbeach New Town. The Local Transport Plan (LTP) which includes the schemes⁹⁵. As with the A428 assessments, most of the schemes will reduce the need to travel by car thus having positive impacts on air quality and accessibility. Negative effects have been identified in relation to greenfield land take (and specifically high quality agricultural land) and some of the schemes are located partly in the Green Belt. A busway using the Mereway route would have potential to negatively impact on heritage assets.</p>

⁹⁵ In order to make a full assessment it is considered necessary to assess the environmental effects of associated transport schemes when assessing options dealing with Waterbeach, (i.e. schemes on the A10 corridor) and Cambourne and Bourn Airfield (i.e. schemes on the A428 corridor). This inclusion of the effect of transport schemes as part of the assessment of local plan options is carried out on a precautionary basis since it should be noted that these transport improvements are not proposed solely because of any Local Plan allocation since they also are also considered necessary to address existing issues. They have been identified as schemes for consideration though the City Deal process. In particular, the public transport scheme between the A428 and Cambridge including new Park and Ride has been identified as a phase 1 priority. The effects of these schemes have been assessed as part of the Local Transport Plan 3 Strategic Environmental Assessment and appropriate mitigation measures suggested within that assessment.

Table 7.3: Discussion of the results	
Results of the original option assessment⁶⁷	Changes due to updated evidence and SA framework and conclusions
	<p>With regard to infrastructure issues there are still likely to be contrasts between positive scores in minor village centres and negative scores for new settlements where investment in infrastructure will be required and could take time to come forward or not prove to be viable. The assessment also reports that much of the infrastructure for Waterbeach would be delivered beyond the plan period, and so the short and medium term performance for issues related to access to services and jobs would be less positive than in the longer term. Viability work has confirmed that the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make this an attractive location for development meaning that facilities and infrastructure are more viable. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements. Given the cost of transport schemes required for the sites, it is unlikely that off site infrastructure and substantial services could be delivered through CIL/S106 alone. However, it is expected that City Deal funding would be available to deliver the major infrastructure required to make the new settlements viable and sustainable.</p>
Option 8 - Edge of Cambridge, Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement, Cambourne West and Village Focus	
<p>This option assumes delivery of smaller sites on land currently in the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge, the partial completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne and selected development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.</p> <p>Delivering this scale of development on the edge of Cambridge would require sites which would have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape character objectives. The review of the Green Belt identified that it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development on the edge of Cambridge without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. These purposes highlight the importance to the historic City of Cambridge of the quality of its setting as well as the usual role of Green Belts in preventing communities from merging with one another.</p> <p>As with all the packages this one would lead to significant loss of high grade agricultural land. This package would result in significant harm to landscape and townscape character on the edge of Cambridge. There are some larger sites in the package which have negative or uncertain performances for safe highway access.</p> <p>The package performs less well than package 6 for access to employment opportunities, although still positively.</p> <p>The only strongly positive performance is for this package is for objective 23, relating to the sub-objective of transport network safety and promoting the use of non-motorise transport modes.</p>	<p>Delivering this scale of development on the edge of Cambridge would require sites which would have a significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape character objectives. The Inner Green Belt Study (2015) has concluded that it is unlikely that any development (apart from a few small exceptions) could be accommodated without substantial harm to the Green Belt purposes. Therefore, the conclusions remain that it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development on the edge of Cambridge without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. These purposes highlight the importance to the historic City of Cambridge of the quality of its setting as well as the usual role of Green Belts in preventing communities from merging with one another.</p> <p>As with all the packages this one would lead to significant loss of high grade agricultural land. This package would result in significant harm to landscape and townscape character on the edge of Cambridge. The package performs less well than package 6 for access to employment opportunities due to the more piecemeal nature of the edge of Cambridge development, although still positively.</p> <p>Bus priority measures and cycling and pedestrian improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge, planned to secure wider benefits for the area would also be required to serve Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield. Additional studies have been undertaken as part of the City Deal work to identify options to deliver public transport and cycling on the A428. The Local Transport Plan (LTP) includes the schemes⁹⁶. The schemes will reduce the need to travel by car thus having positive impacts on air quality, accessibility and transport objectives. The segregated bus priority measure between the junction of the A428/A1303 and the M11, may affect not only the Greenbelt but also the American Cemetery, a registered park and garden, and a designated heritage asset as well as ancient woodland and BAP priority habitats. If works were able to be carried out on line rather than beyond the existing highway boundary this might alleviate some of the adverse effects. Bus priority measures, Park & Ride, cycling and pedestrian improvements, and highways improvements on the A10 corridor, planned to secure wider benefits for the area would also be required to serve a New Town north of Waterbeach. The Local Transport Plan (LTP) includes the schemes⁹⁷. As with the A428 assessments, most of the schemes will reduce the need to travel by car thus having positive impacts on air quality and accessibility. Negative effects have been identified in relation to greenfield land take (and specifically high quality agricultural land) and some of the schemes are located partly in the Green Belt. A busway using the Mereway route would have potential to negatively impact on heritage assets.</p> <p>With regard to modal share the study showed that an edge of Cambridge focus performs best in terms of car mode share within their own development areas. However, these results hide the fact that these locations are in already congested areas of the city where there is little scope to create more capacity for more cars, forcing new trips to be undertaken by active modes.</p> <p>With regard to new settlements in general, the Local Plans CSRM report found that the greater distance from Cambridge would mean higher levels of car use than an edge of Cambridge focus but site specific transport measures would reduce the impact of growth, increasing the proportion of trips made by non-car modes, including shift towards Park & Ride.</p> <p>With regard to infrastructure issues there are still likely to be negative scores for new settlements where investment in infrastructure will be required and could take time to come forward or not prove to be viable. There are also differences is</p>

⁹⁶ In order to make a full assessment it is considered necessary to assess the environmental effects of associated transport schemes when assessing options dealing with Waterbeach, (i.e. schemes on the A10 corridor) and Cambourne and Bourn Airfield (i.e. schemes on the A428 corridor). This inclusion of the effect of transport schemes as part of the assessment of local plan options is carried out on a precautionary basis since it should be noted that these transport improvements are not proposed solely because of any Local Plan allocation since they also are also considered necessary to address existing issues. They have been identified as schemes for consideration though the City Deal process. In particular, the public transport scheme between the A428 and Cambridge including new Park and Ride has been identified as a phase 1 priority. The effects of these schemes have been assessed as part of the Local Transport Plan 3 Strategic Environmental Assessment and appropriate mitigation measures suggested within that assessment.

⁹⁷ As above

Table 7.3: Discussion of the results	
Results of the original option assessment⁶⁷	Changes due to updated evidence and SA framework and conclusions
	scale between Waterbeach and Bourn meaning that less can be provided at Bourn in terms of infrastructure and services Viability work has confirmed that the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make this an attractive location for development meaning that facilities and infrastructure are more viable. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements. Given the cost of transport schemes required for the sites, it is unlikely that off site infrastructure and substantial services could be delivered through CIL/S106 alone. However, it is expected that City Deal funding would be available to deliver the major infrastructure required to make the new settlements viable and sustainable.

8. GREEN BELT IN THE SA

8.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses:

- The treatment of Green Belt in SA; and
- How the issue of Green Belt has been addressed by the Councils in plan making and how the SA forms part of this consideration.

Please note that this discussion has been introduced in the report to counter the objection raised that Green Belt is not a SA issue and should be excluded from consideration in the SA (Pigeon SA Review para 3.5).

8.2 The treatment of Green Belt in SA

8.2.1 What the NPPF says

Paragraph 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)⁹⁸ states (*our emphasis*):

“When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should **take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development**. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary.”

Paragraph 85 states:

When defining boundaries, local planning authorities should (*our emphasis*):

- **Ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development;**
- Not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open;
- Where necessary, identify in their plans areas of ‘safeguarded land’ between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period;
- Make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time; Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development;
- Satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period; and
- Define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.

8.2.2 Comments of the Local Plan Inspectors

This issue was highlighted by the Local Plan Inspectors in their letter dated 20th May 2015⁹⁹. The Inspectors state on page 2 of their letter that:

“It might be expected that such an exercise (taking account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development in a Green Belt review) would be carried out through the SEA/SA process. However larger releases of Green Belt land to meet development needs were rejected

⁹⁸ Communities and Local Government. National Planning Policy Framework. March 2012.

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf

⁹⁹ Letter dated 20th May 2015 from Laura Graham and Alan Wood to South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council. Please see

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/RD-GEN-170.pdf>

at an early stage in the process of sustainability appraisal. No further consideration was given to a number of proposals for development on the urban edge on the grounds that these could not be considered as reasonable alternatives. Bearing in mind the conclusions of the Sustainable Development Strategy Review and the apparent shortcomings of the Green Belt Review we have significant concerns regarding the robustness of the SEA/SA process.”

The Inspectors then state on page 3:

“Of course, the SEA/SA process is not a wholly mechanistic one, as much depends on the weight to be given to the various dimensions of sustainability. It may be that the Councils take the view that protection of the Green Belt should outweigh other considerations. In our view, however, the way in which weight has been attributed in coming to that decision should be clearly set out without the need to trawl through so many documents. In addition, if the Green Belt is to be protected, the plans should make it clear that the Sustainable Development Strategy will not be pursued beyond the completion of existing commitments and the very limited releases of Green Belt proposed through the Plans currently under examination.”

8.2.3 SA regulations and guidance

Schedule 2 of the SEA regulations¹⁰⁰ sets out the information that should be contained in an environmental (SA) report. This states that the report should contain an assessment of the likely significant effects on the environment...on issues such as (k) cultural heritage, including architectural and archaeological heritage and (l) landscape. Given the role that the Cambridge Green Belt plays in protecting the historic character and landscape setting of Cambridge Green Belt is considered to be a key issue to include in the assessment.

The most up to date guidance from the Government in relation to SA is contained within Planning Practice Guidance (available at <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk>) and through the Planning Advisory Service (an organisation grant funded by the Government whose purpose it is to provide resources to help local authorities understand and respond to planning reform).

There are no direct references to Green Belt in the Planning Practice Guidance on SA of Local Plans but the guidance does stress in several places that the plan and the alternatives should be assessed with reference to the characteristics of the area (the baseline). For example:

“Baseline information provides the basis against which to assess the likely effects of alternative proposals in the plan” (Paragraph: 016 Reference ID: 11-016-20140306).

“The sustainability appraisal needs to compare all reasonable alternatives including the preferred approach and assess these against the baseline environmental, economic and social characteristics of the area” (Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 11-018-20140306).

Planning Practice Guidance covers a range of areas and there is reference to Green Belt being a valid SA issue in the section of the guidance that deals with waste plans. In the section entitled “What topics may be included within a set of sustainability objectives for Local Plans?” the guidance states that *impact on Green Belt (e.g. maintain extent, openness)* is a valid issue to address within the topic of landscape (Paragraph: 020 Reference ID: 28-020-20141016)¹⁰¹

The Planning Advisory Service document “Principles of Plan Making”¹⁰² has a chapter entitled “Chapter 6 – The role of Sustainability Appraisal” and this chapter includes guidance on the role that SA has in the filtering and appraisal of options (and how issues related to the Green Belt can be used to assist in this filtering).

¹⁰⁰ Statutory Instrument No. 1633. The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

¹⁰¹ <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/waste/preparing-sustainability-appraisals-for-local-plans/>

¹⁰² <http://www.pas.gov.uk/chapter-6-the-role-of-sustainability-appraisal>

When discussing filtering options the document states (**our emphasis**):

"...potential sites – identified for example through a SHLAA – should be progressively filtered until a **'short list' of reasonable sites options** is generated. In filtering sites, you can use three broad sets of criteria. **If sites don't satisfy these criteria they aren't 'reasonable' alternatives and should be discounted.**

- **Exclusionary criteria** – e.g. flood risk areas, areas of outstanding natural beauty (AONB) **and green belt** (taking into account Section 9 of the NPPF (paras 79-92)) and areas outside the pattern of development set out in the strategy.
- Discretionary criteria – e.g. relating to public rights of way, agricultural land, local nature conservation designations etc. which might not lead to the exclusion of a site but would be important from a sustainability perspective and should influence the decision as to whether or not a site is taken forward (and, if it is, the conditions that might be attached to any development).
- Deliverability criteria – e.g. land ownership, access, planning history, viability, size etc. all of which may have a bearing on whether or not the site is deliverable as a location for development. -

It is clear from the above guidance that:

- Effect on Green Belt is a valid SA objective if SA scoping shows that Green Belt is a relevant issue; and
- The effect of a site on Green Belt can be used as an exclusionary criteria meaning that the site is not considered reasonable and is not taken forward to the next level of consideration / assessment.

8.2.4 How the issue of Green Belt was considered in the SAs Cambridge

In comparison to South Cambridgeshire, the Green Belt within the Cambridge administrative boundary is relatively small in extent. However, it provides a key role in preserving the unique character of Cambridge as a compact, dynamic city with a thriving historic centre.

The Green Belt is recognised in the Cambridge SA scoping report¹⁰³, having been identified through the scoping process as an important issue related to the area's context in terms of landscape, townscape and cultural heritage. Paragraph 9.3.4 outlines the importance of the Green Belt stating that "the Green Belt acts to preserve the character of the City and the quality of its historic setting by maintaining the distinction between neighbouring communities."

Green Belt was also identified as a sustainability issue in three of the functional areas of the city, the South, East and West Cambridge areas, as follows:

- South: The SA scoping report states "Within the Southern area of Cambridge there is a need to maintain and enhance open spaces and green space within the open area and the Green Belt setting" (Paragraph 3.3.19 of the SA scoping report);
- East: The SA scoping report states "Within the Eastern area of Cambridge there is a need to maintain and enhance open spaces and green space within the open area and the Green Belt setting" (Paragraph 3.4.18 of the SA scoping report).; and
- West: The SA scoping report states "Within the Western area of Cambridge there is a need to maintain and enhance open spaces and green space within the open area and the Green Belt setting" (Paragraph 3.15.14 of the SA scoping report).

The scoping report recognises the importance of the Green Belt to many of the areas in South, East and West Cambridge including Trumpington (paragraph 3.13.10 of the SA scoping report),

¹⁰³ Cambridge Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (URS Limited, June 2012) (Ref: RD/LP/210)

Queen Edith's ward (paragraph 3.13.13 of the SA scoping report), Cherry Hinton (paragraph 3.13.14 of the SA scoping report) and Newnham (paragraph 3.15.9 of the SA scoping report).

Once information was collected on important sustainability issues, the Council's consultants then used these issues to develop the SA framework and the pro-formas used to sieve and assess potential development sites (See Section 6 of this SA Addendum Report for more detail on the pro-formas that were developed to sieve and assess sites).

The importance of Green Belt is reflected in the SA framework under the functional area section of the SA framework under the South, East and West functional areas.

South Cambridgeshire

A significant proportion of South Cambridgeshire District (25%) is designated as Green Belt. The Green Belt is recognised in the South Cambridgeshire SA scoping report, having been identified through the scoping process as an important issue related to the area's context in terms of landscape, townscape and cultural heritage¹⁰⁴. Appendix 1 to the SA scoping report sets out in detail baseline information in relation to Green Belt thus acknowledging the importance of the issue to the District. This section of the SA scoping report recognises that a key issue is striking an appropriate balance between protecting the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt and providing a sustainable pattern of development that best meets the long term needs of the Cambridge area.

During the scoping consultation in February 2012, Natural England welcomed consideration of Green Belt under this theme¹⁰⁵. English Heritage also noted Green Belt issues, and advised updating the 2002 study¹⁰⁶.

Once information was collected on important sustainability issues, the Council then used these issues to develop the SA framework and the pro-formas used to sieve and assess potential development sites (See Section 6 of this SA Addendum Report for more detail on the pro-formas that were developed to sieve and assess sites).

The SA framework for South Cambridgeshire does not explicitly mention Green Belt and this has been highlighted in some of the objections to the Local Plan. However, the references to Green Belt in the scoping work outlined above make it clear that Green Belt issues are significant and contribute to the 'Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character' objective¹⁰⁷. The Green Belt purposes recognise the landscape and townscape qualities important to the edge of Cambridge and it is a valid approach to use these as a guide for considering landscape and townscape impacts. Paragraph 80 of the NPPF clearly acknowledges that preserving the setting and special character of historic towns is a Green Belt purpose. Where there is a significant impact on the Green Belt there would be a consequent significant impact on the Landscape and Townscape objective.

This importance is acknowledged by the joint SA of the Development Strategy which notes that the characteristics afforded to Cambridge by the Green Belt "are valued assets and significantly contribute to the character and attractiveness of the historic city and the wider Cambridge area, and the quality of life enjoyed here. The Green Belt around Cambridge has an inextricable relationship with the preservation of the character of the city, which is derived from the interplay between the historic centre, the suburbs around it and the rural setting that encircles it"¹⁰⁸. This

¹⁰⁴ South Cambridgeshire SA (RD/Sub/SC/060) Part 2 (Scoping) Appendix 1 Issue 13.2. Green Belt.

¹⁰⁵ South Cambs SA (RD/Sub/SC/060 Part 2 page 2-45)

¹⁰⁶ South Cambs SA (RD/Sub/SC/060 Part 2 page 2-53)

¹⁰⁷ For examples, Table 9.3 Assessment Matrix for Appraisal of Site Options included in the South Cambs Scoping Report refers to green belt at the Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character Objective (South Cambs SA (RD/Sub/SC/060) Part 2 page 2-65)

¹⁰⁸ South Cambridgeshire SA (RD/Sub/SC/060) Part 3 Appendix 1 paragraph 58.

link is also clear in the Cambridge Local Plan which states in objective 6: *protect and enhance the landscape setting of the city, which comprises the Cambridge Green Belt, the green corridors penetrating the urban area, the established network of multi-functional green spaces, and tree canopy cover in the city.*

With regard to the site pro-formas Green Belt was included as an explicit issue in the pro forma that was developed to assess the suitability of sites proposed for development on the edge of Cambridge, and the SA of the sites themselves, as set out in section 4.4 paragraphs 4.4.4 (page 285) and Table 4.5 (pages 296 – 303) and Appendix 2 pages 622 – 639) of RD/Sub/C/030 and Chapter 3 (pages 8 – 10) and Appendix 1 (pages 15 – 31) of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal of the Issues and Options 2 Part 1 document.

8.3 How Green Belt has been addressed in plan making

Section 3 of the Councils' Overall Development Strategy paper outlines how the Councils have considered the requirements of paragraphs 84 and 85 of the NPPF that account is taken of promoting sustainable patterns of development and, of the consequences for sustainable development if development is channelled to locations outside the Green Belt.

The Overall Development Strategy paper details the consideration of the options structured around each stage of the development sequence and, drawing together the evidence base and the SA, considers the consequences and issues related to the strategic choices available to the Council, and the consideration of sustainable patterns of development (as required by NPPF paragraph 84 and 85) in the context of an area with a tightly drawn Green Belt around the historic city of Cambridge. It identifies the reasons for the preferred approach of the Councils in the submitted plans and having considered the issue afresh taking account of the additional work undertaken.

9. PREFERRED APPROACH

9.1 Introduction

This section of the report outlines:

- The reasons for selecting the alternative approaches selected (and tested) at this stage;
- The preferred approach chosen; and
- The reasons for selecting this approach. Please note that the SA forms only one consideration in this reasoning.

9.2 Outline of the reasons for selecting the alternative approaches dealt with at this stage of the SA

The Submission Draft SA reports extensively document the reasons behind the identification of options during the Issues and Options process, the consideration of those options, and the reasons for the selection of the preferred approach. In this SA Addendum Report the Councils have considered:

- Strategy Options regarding development at different levels of the development sequence, identified as they reflect the broad strategic alternatives available for growth in the Cambridge area;
- A wide range of site options that could be allocated at different levels of the search sequence. This is a reassessment of sites previously tested as part of the Submission Draft SAs. Sites on the edge of Cambridge are considered on an equal basis with sites elsewhere; and
- Options regarding packages of development that could be identified to meet development needs, identified as they broadly represent strategic choices available to meet the remaining development needs after existing commitments are considered. The packages reflect the alternatives tested in the Submission Draft SA reports. Reflecting the issues raised in the Inspectors' Preliminary Conclusions, the strategic alternatives of identifying development on the edge of Cambridge is being tested on a like for like basis with other strategic alternatives. It is clear that there are many specific variations within these broad strategic options depending on the specific combination of sites identified to make up the selected strategy. It would not be reasonable or practicable to test every single potential combination of sites. The aim has been to providing a thorough coverage of strategic alternatives that could be delivered through strategic choices available to the Local Plans. The appraisals are informed by individual assessments of site options, but where there are a number of sites that could fulfil a strategic alternative they are not specific to any site.

9.3 The preferred approach

In summary the preferred approach to the development strategy reflects the Submitted Local Plans:

- Development within Cambridge where there is capacity;
- Additional development on the edge of Cambridge where this would not cause significant harm to Green Belt purposes at:
 - Worts' Causeway
 - Darwin Green (small additional area to existing site)
 - Fulbourn Road (employment allocations)
- New Settlements at North of Waterbeach and at Bourn Airfield;
- Extension of Cambourne at Cambourne West; and
- Limited Village allocations at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.

Modifications are proposed in response to the Green Belt Review 2015:

- Additional employment development opportunity south of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus

- Amendment to the land south of Fulbourn Road employment allocation.

In addition, further redevelopment capacity has been identified at Cambridge East North of Cherry Hinton.

9.4 Reason for selection of the preferred approach

The Councils acknowledge the advantages of edge of Cambridge sites in terms of accessibility to jobs and services in the urban area. The Councils have also taken account of the constraint imposed by the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt and the level of harm that large developments within the currently designated Green Belt would have. However, this factor itself has been balanced against the need to promote sustainable patterns of development and the consequences of channelling development to locations outside the Green Belt. Consideration of sustainability must take account of the full range of economic, social and environmental issues. NPPF paragraph 152 requires Local Planning Authorities to seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and net gains across all three. Significant adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued.

In the context of all evidence now available, the Councils have considered the merits of edge of Cambridge sites and the locational advantages they offer, against the significant harm that would be caused by substantial development on the edge of Cambridge to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. Additional new settlements offer sufficient benefits in terms of critical mass, services and facilities and opportunities to deliver high quality transport improvements. The Councils consider that the need for jobs and homes could in principle provide a justification for review of the green belt boundary. However whether in fact such a release is appropriate involves balancing other consideration including impact of release in the purpose of the Cambridge green belt, the accessibility advantages of locating development on the edge of the urban area and reasonable alternatives. The result of this balancing exercise has led the Councils to conclude that only small scale green belt released at locations where harm to the purposes of the green belt designation would be appropriate.

The development strategy supported by the LTP / TSCSC offers significant benefits in terms of delivering sustainable travel both for planned and existing communities. The City Deal for Greater Cambridge, securing up to £500 million with the aim of enabling continued growth in the successful Cambridge area by investing in infrastructure, housing and skills, provides a significant funding boost, and added certainty regarding commitment to delivery.

The Preferred Strategy:

- Maximises development within the urban area of Cambridge focusing on previously developed land;
- Includes the existing major developments on the edge of Cambridge identified in the adopted plans through previous Green Belt releases;
- Releases limited land for development on the edge of Cambridge weighing in each case the sustainability merits of such locations with the significance of harm to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt;
- Focuses growth at new settlements on two key strategic growth corridors, supported by transport improvements to achieve sustainable high quality public transport and other infrastructure such as education, with potential to support longer term sustainable growth outside the Green Belt;
- Continues to limit the amount of new development in villages whilst providing for new development focused at the more sustainable villages to provide some flexibility to meet local

needs supports the recycling of land at villages and schemes to meet local needs, with the scale of schemes guided by the rural settlement hierarchy.

On the edge of Cambridge, sites at Worts' Causeway and Darwin Green can deliver additional development for housing and would have limited impacts on Green Belt purposes which are capable of mitigation. In addition, a review of the land north of Cherry Hinton previously removed from the Green Belt by the Cambridge East Area Action Plans indicates capacity for an additional 740 homes beyond that indicated in the submitted Local Plans.

The development of land south of Fulbourn Road for employment would have limited impacts on Green Belt purposes which are capable of mitigation. Particular exceptional circumstances also exist relating to the expansion needs of ARM, a major local business, which now has planning permission. The release of land at Fulbourn Road East would have limited impacts on Green Belt purposes which are capable of mitigation and provides the opportunity for additional employment development on the edge of Cambridge adjacent to the successful Peterhouse Technology Park. The Green Belt Review 2015 concluded that land can be released from the Green Belt here without significant harm to Green Belt purposes but concludes that this only applies as far as the roundabout with Yarrow Road. It is therefore proposed to reduce the size of the proposed allocation to remove the area east of the Yarrow Road roundabout.

The Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study 2015 also identifies potential for an area of land immediately south of and adjoining the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Bell School site to be developed with limited impact to Green Belt purposes. This falls within two distinct areas. These areas have been re-examined through the Sustainability Appraisal process.

- The land south of the Bell School housing site that is currently under construction, has been assessed for its potential for housing. A significant part of the land south of the Bell School site is located within Flood Zone 3. The sequential test means that this land is not suitable for allocation for residential development.
- The land immediately south of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus is subject to surface water flooding with a category of Low risk. Further investigation will be required to examine whether there is development potential on this site. The Biomedical Campus has been planned to provide long term development capacity, but has been developed more quickly than anticipated, particularly with the relocation of Astra Zeneca to the site. The additional land offers an opportunity to provide for future growth needs in a sustainable way flowing specifically from the Green Belt review 2015, if further investigations show that the surface water flooding issues can be satisfactorily addressed. A Provisional Modification is therefore proposed for consultation, and a decision whether to propose a modification to the Inspector will be dependent on the outcome of further investigations of the surface water flooding issue including discussions with the landowner. These investigations are on going.

New settlements north of Waterbeach and at Bourn Airfield remain appropriate inclusions in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, along with the Cambourne West development. The preference to allocate all three strategic sites has been influenced by the long lead in times for new settlements which will therefore come forward later in the plan period and continue developing beyond 2031.

As part of the phasing strategy for new settlements, the District Council has proposed that the first housing completions at Bourn Airfield New Village should not be delivered before 2022, and no more than 1,700 dwellings by 2031. For Waterbeach new town, it states that no more than 1,400 dwellings will be completed by 2031. The promoters have indicated that development could start on site considerably earlier than had been anticipated by the District Council at the time the plan was submitted. In order to provide a flexible strategy that can respond to any

changing circumstances, modifications are proposed which would remove these restrictions (Addressed in the Councils Housing Land Supply Paper 2015).

The small number of village allocations identified in the Submission South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, focused on Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, remain an appropriate element of the strategy. These will help deliver development in the early years on the plan period and some provide additional housing in the southern part of the district close to jobs in a number of business parks.

10. PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE PLANS

10.1 Introduction

This section of the report outlines:

- How the likely significant effects of the proposed major modifications to the plan have been screened and assessed; and
- The likely significant cumulative effects of the Local Plans.

10.2 Screening the effects of the Proposed Changes

In response to the new evidence prepared in response to the Inspectors' Letter, and changes to Government guidance, the Councils have proposed some modifications to the Local Plans. Planning Practice Guidance (available at <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk>) states that it is up to the local planning authority to decide whether SA reports should be amended following proposed modifications. In order to make this decision, a screening exercise has been undertaken of the major modifications proposed and updated conclusions drawn where necessary. Screening of the changes is shown in Table 10.1a and b below.

After the Public Examination the Councils may need to make some more modifications to the Local Plans based on the Inspectors' recommendations. At this point another screening exercise will be undertaken by the Councils to ensure that the final SA reports (and importantly the monitoring programmes contained within them) reflect the significant effects of the adopted plans.

It should be noted that as part of the consultation being undertaken between December 2015 and January 2016, the Councils are including Main Modifications proposing additional housing sites at Great and Little Abington and Graveley. These were included as modifications to the Submitted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and subject to Sustainability Appraisal at the time of submission. This consultation provides an opportunity for consultation to be carried out ahead of consideration at the examination.

Table 10.1: Screening the Proposed Changes – Cambridge Local Plan

Table 10.1: Screening the Proposed Changes – Cambridge Local Plan¹⁰⁹		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
Policy 3: Spatial strategy for the location of residential development.	<p>Amend the second paragraph of Policy 3 to read:</p> <p>Provision will be made for the development of not less than 14,000 additional dwellings within Cambridge City Council's administrative boundary over the period from April 2011 to March 2031 to meet the objectively assessed need for homes in Cambridge. This will enable continuous delivery of housing for at least 15 years from the anticipated date of adoption of this local plan. The housing trajectories for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, as updated each year in the Annual Monitoring Report, will be considered together for the purposes of phasing and housing delivery, including for calculating 5-year housing land supply in development management decisions that concern housing development. This pProvision includes two small sites to be released from the Cambridge Green Belt at Worts' Causeway, which will deliver up to 430 dwellings.</p> <p>The joint housing trajectory reflects the close functional relationship between the Councils, the joint development strategy and the way that strategy is being built out, in particular that sites on the edge of Cambridge are building out from the built up area in Cambridge and have not yet reached or started building over the administrative boundary is South Cambridgeshire. It is about the phasing of housing delivery, not overall housing provision. Modification relates to the changes required to give effect to the Memorandum of Understanding between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council: Greater Cambridge Joint Housing Trajectory (September 2014, RD/Strat/350).</p>	The matter of a joint housing trajectory is an administrative change and will not lead to materially different sustainability effects on the ground.
Policy 12: Cambridge East (and site R47)	<p>Amendments to the policy are proposed including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A larger site allocation for land north of Cherry Hinton (site R47 for 	This policy was subject to SA and this is reported from page 455 onwards in the Cambridge Final SA for

¹⁰⁹ Please note that the Cambridge SA assessed the significant positive effects of the plan overall rather than assessing the effects of individual policies. Therefore, the screening assessment above focuses on the changes that the modifications will have on the effects of the plan overall.

Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p>approximately 780 dwellings during the plan period (along with adjoining land allocated in Policy SS/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan for approximately 420 dwellings);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments to policy criteria related to mitigation of environmental and health impacts, masterplanning and operation of Cambridge Airport; • Additional criterion added related to school provision and other local facilities. • Additional change following Proposed Modifications Consultation (March 2016): Additional criteria regarding vehicular access being only via the new spine road. <p>Consequential changes are also proposed to the supporting text of the policy and figure 3.2, proposals schedule and policies map.</p> <p>These changes are to reflect the fact that the exact boundary of the land that could be developed north of Cherry Hinton is more extensive than is currently allocated for development in the Local Plans. The Councils are working closely together to ensure delivery of the maximum area of land appropriate with the Airport remaining operational, consistent with the objectives of the AAP and the submitted Local Plans.</p>	<p>Submission to the Secretary of State¹¹⁰.</p> <p>The assessment found the plan would have a positive effect on community and well-being as the policy includes calls for residential proposals in Cambridge East to demonstrate that any environmental and health impacts (including noise) from the airport can be acceptably mitigated for residents of new development. This remains the case for the policy so the assessment remains valid.</p>
Policy 27: Carbon reduction, community energy networks, sustainable design and construction, and water use	<p>As a result of the Housing Standards Review and the associated Written Ministerial Statement published on 25 March 2015, the following changes to the policy are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of requirements related to the achievement of the Code for Sustainable Homes for new residential development. As a result of the Housing Standards Review, the Code has now been abolished and Local Planning Authorities are no longer able to set specific construction 	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported from page 455 onwards in the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State¹¹¹. The assessment found the plan would have a significant positive effect in terms of climate change mitigation and renewable energy, partly due to Policies 27 and 28. We consider that the plan overall will still have a slight positive effect as the</p>

¹¹⁰ Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014) (Ref: RD/Sub/C/030 – Part 1 and RD/Sub/C/040 – Part 2).
<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/ldf/coredocs/RD-SUB-C-030.pdf>

¹¹¹ Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014) (Ref: RD/Sub/C/030 – Part 1 and RD/Sub/C/040 – Part 2).
<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/ldf/coredocs/RD-SUB-C-030.pdf>

Table 10.1: Screening the Proposed Changes – Cambridge Local Plan¹⁰⁹		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p>standards for residential development; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendment of the water efficiency standard to reflect the new national technical standard of 110 litres/person/day, giving consideration to the requirements set out in paragraph 56-015-20150327 of the Planning Practice Guidance related to evidence of need. Additional change following Proposed Modifications Consultation (March 2016): Additional reference to proposals which relate to designated heritage assets, requiring proposals to not cause unacceptable harm to the assets significance. 	<p>policy still includes considerable requirements with regard to sustainability and other elements of the plan contribute to this positive effect. However, the removal of the zero carbon requirements and allowable solutions are a major step backwards in terms of delivering sustainable development and remove the clarity that the policies provided. The plan can no longer be considered to have a significant positive effect.</p> <p>The assessment found the plan would have a significant positive effect in terms of water partly due to the water requirements set out in Policy 27. These have now been relaxed from 80 litres to 110 litres/person/day. Again, the result of this change is that the plan can no longer be considered to have a significant positive effect.</p>
Policy 28 and Supporting Text (paragraphs 4.13 – 4.16)	As part of the 2015 budget, the Treasury published a document called Fixing the Foundations: Creating a more prosperous nation. As part of this, the Government announced that it did not intend to proceed with the zero carbon Allowable Solutions carbon offsetting scheme. As such, the Council proposes the deletion of policy 28, which was based on the introduction of Allowable Solutions as part of national zero carbon policy in 2016.	All other SA conclusions in relation to Policy 27 still stand.
Policy 29: Renewable and low carbon energy generation	<p>On 18 June 2015, the Government published a Written Statement on proposed wind energy development, which signalled a change in direction to the determination of planning applications for onshore wind. This statement sets out that when determining planning applications for one or more wind turbine, permission should only be granted where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development site is in an area for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan; and Following consultation, it can be clearly demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing. <p>While the Council is supportive of all forms of renewable energy, the technical assessment of renewable energy capacity included within the Decarbonising</p>	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported from page 455 onwards in the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State. The assessment found the plan would have a positive effect in terms of climate change mitigation and renewable energy partly due to the promotion of renewable energy in Policy 29. However, the SA noted that Cambridge has limited opportunities for wind energy generation. Therefore, this policy will not change the conclusion of the SA overall. However, please note that the assessment against this criteria has changed as a result to changes to Policies 27 and 28.</p>

Table 10.1: Screening the Proposed Changes – Cambridge Local Plan¹⁰⁹		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	Cambridge ¹¹² study highlights that the wind resource in Cambridge is highly constrained due to the relatively modest raw resource and the urban characteristics of the area. As such, the Council proposes modifications to Policy 29 and the addition of a new paragraph after paragraph 4.21 to clarify the situation regarding wind turbines. The Council is not, at this stage, seeking to allocate any sites in the local plan for wind turbine development. This approach will be reviewed as part of subsequent Local Plans.	
Policy 45: Affordable housing and dwelling mix	This main modification to the penultimate paragraph of Policy 45 indicates that Starter Homes Exceptions Sites are not expected to deliver affordable housing in accordance with the 2 March 2015 Written Ministerial Statement on Starter Homes.	This policy was subject to SA and this is reported from page 455 onwards in the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State. The assessment found the plan would have a positive effect in terms of community wellbeing, partly due to Policy 45. It is expected that the effects of this policy will not change due to the modification as the policy is not expected to reduce the amount of affordable homes available overall.
Policy 50: Residential space standards	On 25 March 2015, the Government published a Written Ministerial Statement in respect of space standards following the Housing Standards Review. This statement introduced the Government's Optional Technical Standard for internal space standards (Paragraphs 56-018-20150327 – 056-022-20150327 of the National Planning Practice Guidance and the Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard document). Modification proposes that new residential units will be permitted where their gross internal floor areas meet or exceed the residential space standards set out in the Government's Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard (2015).	This policy was subject to SA and this is reported from page 455 onwards in the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State. The assessment found the plan would have a positive effect in terms of community wellbeing. It is expected that the effects of this policy will not change due to the modification as although the Government standards are more prescriptive the space standards are broadly equivalent to what the original policy proposed
Site GB2	Additional change following Proposed Modifications Consultation (March 2016): Amend allocation for GB2 to include Newbury Farm. The site size increases from 6.8 hectares to 7.7 hectares.	Site has been subject to appraisal using the site assessment proforma (Annex 1), and the additional land made no changes to the site scoring.

¹¹² RD/CC/250 – Element Energy (2010). Decarbonising Cambridge: A renewable and low carbon energy study for Cambridge City Council.

Table 10.1: Screening the Proposed Changes – Cambridge Local Plan¹⁰⁹		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
		This policy was subject to SA and this is reported from page 455 onwards in the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State. It is expected that the effects of this policy will not change due to the modification, which does not alter the number of units proposed for the site.

Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan

Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan¹¹³		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
Policy S/5 Provision of New Jobs and Homes	Amend Policy S/5(b) housing requirement as follows: 19,000 <u>19,500</u> new homes, including affordable housing and 85 Gypsy & Traveller pitches. <u>Reasons:</u> Additional evidence prepared in 2015 considered Objectively Assessed Need, particularly in relation to the latest household projections data and whether market signals and affordable housing indicated the need for any uplift to the national household projections starting point. This identified that the need was slightly higher than 19,000 homes, at 19,377. In response, an increase to the requirement in the Local Plan to a rounded figure of 19,500 homes is proposed.	See Chapter 4 of this SA Addendum Report.
Policy S/6	Amend part 3 of Policy S/6 as follows:	This policy was subject to SA and this is reported in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report ¹¹⁴ Part

¹¹³ Please note that the South Cambridgeshire SA assessed the significant positive effects of each policy individually. Therefore, the screening assessment above focuses on the changes that the modifications will have on the effects of the individual policy.

Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
The Development Strategy to 2031	<p>The following 3 new strategic scale allocations are proposed for housing-led development with associated employment and supporting services and facilities to meet the majority of the additional development needs to 2031 and beyond:</p> <p>A new town north of Waterbeach for 8,000 to 9,000 homes, 1,400 of which by 2031;</p> <p>A new village based on Bourn Airfield for 3,500 homes 1,700 of which by 2031;</p> <p>A major expansion of Cambourne for a fourth linked village of 1,200 homes, all of which by 2031.</p> <p><u>Reasons:</u></p> <p>National policy requires a flexible plan that can respond to changing circumstances. The site promoters consider that they could start development sooner and deliver higher annual rates of housing completions. Whilst the Council is taking a cautious approach to these matters in its housing trajectory based on available evidence of the time taken to start strategic developments and to provide a greater level of confidence of the delivery of the housing requirement, it would not be positive planning for the Local Plan policy to prevent such development if it proves to be deliverable.</p>	<p>3, Appendix 5 from page 3-A210 onwards. A summary of this assessment is as follows:</p> <p>Significant negative effect - irreversible loss of agricultural land due to the levels of development proposed by the strategy as a whole.</p> <p>Uncertain impacts on air quality which cannot fully be mitigated due to the levels of development proposed by the strategy as a whole.</p> <p>Uncertain effects on biodiversity as some of the sites have protected species although the new settlement at Waterbeach, could support delivery of significant green infrastructure with biodiversity value</p> <p>Significant beneficial impact on climate mitigation and work / investment / transport as the concentration of development in new settlements will also enable the delivery of employment and transport infrastructure to support sustainable travel, such as rail or bus improvements and cycling. This will result in a higher modal share for sustainable modes than a more dispersed development strategy.</p> <p>Significant beneficial impacts on housing and services for the strategy as a whole.</p> <p>The changes to the policy will not change the conclusions of the Submission Draft SA. Overall effects on issues like agricultural land and air quality will still be significantly negative. Policies in the plan provide protection from site level impacts such as impacts on species and habitats that</p>

¹¹⁴ South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/060). <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/draft-final-sustainability-appraisal-report-and-habitat-regulations-assessment-screening>

Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan¹¹³		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
		could occur from bringing larger amounts of development forward and some of the impacts will be beneficial as supporting infrastructure can be bought forward sooner (for example transport infrastructure and green infrastructure).
Policy S/12: Phasing, Delivery and Monitoring	<p>Amend part 1 of Policy S/12 to read: 'The Local Plan aims to achieve a continuous high level of housing production throughout the plan period to support predicted and actual jobs growth. <u>The housing trajectories for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, as updated each year in the Annual Monitoring Report, will be considered together for the purposes of phasing of housing delivery, including for calculating 5-year housing land supply in development management decisions that concern housing development.</u> Housing sites are not <u>deliberately</u> phased.</p> <p>a. New town at Waterbeach Barracks — to start delivering housing in 2026, unless otherwise determined through a review of the Local Plan;</p> <p>b. New village at Bourn Airfield — to not start delivering housing before 2022, unless an undersupply of housing earlier in the plan period is demonstrated such that it needs to come forward earlier, including to provide an adequate 5 year housing land supply.</p> <p><u>Reasons:</u></p> <p>Modification (in part) relates to the changes required to reflect the Memorandum of Understanding between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council: Greater Cambridge Joint Housing Trajectory (September 2014, RD/Strat/350). This modification was attached to the Councils' Matter 1 Hearing Statement.</p> <p>Cambridge City Council is demonstrably delivering housing within the urban areas and urban fringe sites in the early and middle parts of the plan period. South Cambridgeshire District Council is committed to delivery of housing in the urban fringe sites and at new settlements, with an emphasis on the middle and latter parts of the plan period, but with an element of village housing allocations to provide some early delivery. This is a logical and</p>	<p>The matter of a joint housing trajectory is an administrative change and will not lead to materially different sustainability effects on the ground.</p> <p>The matter of start dates related to strategic sites is addressed below.</p>

Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan¹¹³		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p>appropriate way of delivering sites that meet the combined housing need across the Greater Cambridge footprint area.</p> <p>The site promoters of Waterbeach and Bourn Airfield new settlements consider that they could start development sooner than set out in policy S/12. Whilst the Council is taking a cautious approach to start times in its housing trajectory based on available evidence of the time taken to start strategic developments, it would not be positive planning for the Local Plan policy to prevent such development if it proves to be deliverable.</p> <p>Modification is proposed to the policy to remove start date restrictions contained in Policy S/12 part 1a and 1b.</p>	
Policy SS/3 Cambridge East	<p>Amendments to the policy are proposed including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A larger site allocation for land north of Cherry Hinton (site R47 for approximately 780 dwellings during the plan period (along with adjoining land allocated in Policy SS/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan for approximately 420 dwellings); • Amendments to policy criteria related to mitigation of environmental and health impacts, masterplanning and operation of Cambridge Airport; • Additional criterion added related to school provision and other local facilities. • Additional change following Proposed Modifications Consultation (March 2016): Additional criteria regarding vehicular access being only via the new spine road. <p>Consequential changes are also proposed to the supporting text of the policy relevant figures and the policies map.</p> <p>Policy S/3 is proposed to read:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Land at Cambridge East is allocated for development as shown on the Policies Map:</u> 	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report Part 3, Appendix 5 from page 3-A232 onwards.</p> <p>This assessment found a significant negative effect on land and soil (due to the effects on high grade agricultural land), an uncertain effect on pollution and health due to the potential noise effects from the airport and a significant positive effect on open space and services and transport infrastructure.</p> <p>The significant negative effect in relation to land and soil will remain as will the uncertain effect on pollution and health. Noise from aircraft movements including flight school and helicopters, commercial activities including engine testing as well as traffic noise from Coldham's Lane will require assessment as part of the planning application process. Mitigation measures including detailed layout and design of the development and specific mitigation measures within the built fabric of development as may be necessary</p> <p>Therefore, the SA conclusions regarding this policy are unchanged.</p>

Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan¹¹³		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p>a) <u>Land north of Newmarket Road will deliver approximately 1,300 dwellings during the plan period.</u></p> <p>b) <u>Land north of Cherry Hinton will deliver approximately 420 dwellings during the plan period (it adjoins land allocated in Policy 12 of the Cambridge Local Plan for 780 dwellings).</u></p> <p>2. <u>Proposals for residential development on sites a), and b) as shown on the Policies Map, will only be supported if:</u></p> <p>c) <u>acceptable mitigation of environmental and health impacts (including noise) from the airport can be provided; and</u></p> <p>d) <u>a masterplan is submitted for the development of site SS/3 1b) and adjoining land in Cambridge (site R47) which safeguards the appropriate future development of the wider safeguarded land; and</u></p> <p>e) <u>the continued authorised use of Cambridge Airport does not pose a safety risk.</u></p> <p>3. <u>Residential development on site SS/3 1b) as shown on the Policies Map, together with adjoining land in Cambridge (site R47), will make provision for a primary and secondary school, a local centre with community hub, open space and a spine road connecting Coldham's Lane with Cherry Hinton Road. Vehicular access to the site will only be permitted via the new spine road, unless needed for emergency access.</u></p> <p>4. <u>The rest of the Cambridge East site is safeguarded for longer term development beyond 2031. Development on safeguarded land will only occur once the site becomes available and following a review of both this Plan and the Cambridge East Area Action Plan.</u></p> <p>5. <u>This policy replaces Policies CE/3 and CE/35 of the Cambridge East AAP. All other policies in the Cambridge East AAP are retained.</u></p>	

Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan¹¹⁵		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p><u>Reasons:</u></p> <p>It would not be positive, reasonable or appropriate for the Local Plans to convert an existing allocation to safeguarded land if it can reasonably be brought forward for development to help meet objectively assessed development requirements whilst the airport remains in operation. The boundary of the land that could be developed north of Cherry Hinton is more extensive than is currently allocated for development in the Local Plans. A significant shortfall in school capacity across the City is currently forecast from 2018, which coupled with proposed development north of Newmarket Road and north of Cherry Hinton will require the early provision of the secondary school. The landowners both agree that additional land north of Cherry Hinton is deliverable over the plan period. The Councils are working closely together to ensure delivery of the maximum area of land appropriate with the Airport remaining operational, consistent with the objectives of the AAP and the submitted Local Plans. The land is highly sustainable being on the edge of Cambridge and not in the Green Belt, having been released from the Green Belt in the current adopted plans for development.</p>	
Policy SS/5: Waterbeach New Town	<p>Delete section 5 of Policy SS/5 which required no more than 1,400 dwellings to be completed by 2031, except as may be agreed by the Local Planning Authority to be necessary to maintain a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites.</p> <p><u>Reasons:</u></p> <p>National policy requires a flexible plan that can respond to changing circumstances. The site promoters consider that they could start development sooner and deliver higher annual rates of housing completions. Whilst the Council is taking a cautious approach to these matters in its housing trajectory based on available evidence of the time taken to start strategic</p>	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report¹¹⁵ Part 3, Appendix 5 from page 3-A231 onwards.</p> <p>A summary of this assessment is as follows:</p> <p>Beneficial and negative impacts as the development will use agricultural land but will also utilise some previously developed land</p> <p>Uncertain but potentially minor negative impact as development will lead to air pollution</p>

¹¹⁵ South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/060). <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/draft-final-sustainability-appraisal-report-and-habitat-regulations-assessment-screening>

Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	developments and to provide a greater level of confidence of the delivery of the housing requirement, it would not be positive planning for the Local Plan policy to prevent such development if it proves to be deliverable.	<p>Significant beneficial impact on green spaces as the new settlement could support delivery of significant green infrastructure</p> <p>Significant beneficial impacts on climate mitigation/sustainable construction as the development requires sustainable standards of design</p> <p>Significant beneficial impacts on housing</p> <p>Significant beneficial impact on services / community / work / investment / transport as the concentration of development in new settlements will also enable the delivery of employment, services and transport infrastructure</p> <p>The changes to the policy will not change the conclusions of the Submission Draft SA. Overall effects on issues like agricultural land and air quality will still be negative regardless of start date of development or levels of development. Policies in the plan provide protection from site level impacts such as impacts on species and habitats that could occur from bringing larger amounts of development forward and some of the impacts will be beneficial as supporting infrastructure can be bought forward sooner (for example transport infrastructure and green infrastructure).</p>
Policy SS/6: New Village at Bourn Airfield	Delete section 4 of Policy SS/6 which required development to be phased so that the first housing completions will be in 2022, with no more than 1,700 dwellings being completed by 2031, except as may be agreed by the Local Planning Authority to be necessary to maintain a 5 year supply of deliverable	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report¹¹⁶ Part 3, Appendix 5 from page 3-A231 onwards.</p> <p>A summary of this assessment is as follows:</p>

¹¹⁶ South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/060). <https://www.scams.gov.uk/content/draft-final-sustainability-appraisal-report-and-habitat-regulations-assessment-screening>

Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan¹¹³		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p>housing sites.</p> <p><u>Reasons:</u></p> <p>National policy requires a flexible plan that can respond to changing circumstances. The site promoters consider that they could start development sooner and deliver higher annual rates of housing completions. Whilst the Council is taking a cautious approach to these matters in its housing trajectory based on available evidence of the time taken to start strategic developments and to provide a greater level of confidence of the delivery of the housing requirement, it would not be positive planning for the Local Plan policy to prevent such development if it proves to be deliverable.</p>	<p>Beneficial and negative impacts as the development will use agricultural land but will also utilise some previously developed land</p> <p>Uncertain but potentially minor negative impact as development will lead to air pollution</p> <p>Significant beneficial impact on green spaces as the new settlement could support delivery of significant green infrastructure</p> <p>Negative / uncertain impact as the site includes a known Roman/Saxon settlement</p> <p>Significant beneficial impacts on climate mitigation/sustainable construction as the development requires sustainable standards of design</p> <p>Significant beneficial impacts on housing</p> <p>Significant beneficial impact on services / community / work / investment / transport as the concentration of development in new settlements will also enable the delivery of employment, services and transport infrastructure</p> <p>The changes to the policy will not change the conclusions of the Submission Draft SA. Overall effects on issues like agricultural land and air quality will still be negative regardless of start date of development or levels of development. Policies in the plan provide protection from site level impacts such as impacts on species and habitats that could occur from bringing larger amounts of development forward and some of the impacts will be beneficial as supporting infrastructure can be brought forward sooner (for example transport infrastructure and green infrastructure).</p>
Policy CC/2:	Amend Policy CC/2 criteria 1 of Policy CC/2 as follows: Planning permission	This policy was subject to SA and this is reported in the

Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
Renewable and low carbon energy generation	<p>for proposals to generate energy from renewable and low carbon sources, with the exception of proposals for wind turbines, will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>Amend Policy CC/2 criteria 1a to add reference to there being no unacceptable impacts on high quality agricultural land.</p> <p>Revise wording of Policy CC/2 criteria 2 to read:<u>-Planning permission for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines will only be permitted provided that:</u></p> <p>e. <u>the development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Neighbourhood Plan; and</u></p> <p>f. <u>following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing.</u></p> <p><u>Reasons:</u></p> <p>18 June 2015 – Written Ministerial Statement made by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Greg Clark) – Local planning (HCWS42) – this Written Statement sets out new considerations to be applied to proposed wind energy development:</p> <p><i>'When determining planning applications for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines, local planning authorities should only grant planning permission if:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan; and • Following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing. 	<p>South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report¹¹⁷ Part 3, Appendix 5 from page 3-A425 onwards. This assessment found that the policy had a significant positive effect on climate change mitigation through enabling low carbon energy development and through ensuring that the development can be effectively linked to national energy infrastructure. Due to the change in the policy, the assessment of the policy has changed from significant positive to minor positive as it will effectively rule out promotion of wind energy developments. The change will not affect other forms of renewable energy development. All other SA conclusions in relation to Policy CC/2 still stand.</p>

¹¹⁷ South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/060). <https://www.scams.gov.uk/content/draft-final-sustainability-appraisal-report-and-habitat-regulations-assessment-screening>

Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan¹¹³		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p><i>In applying these new considerations, suitable areas for wind energy development will need to have been allocated clearly in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan.'</i></p> <p>The proposed modification replaces the requirement for a minimum separation distance between a dwelling and a wind turbine, included as there was support from Members, Parish Councils and local residents for this criteria, with the guidance set out in the Written Statement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council has not identified areas as suitable for wind energy development in the Local Plan; however areas could be identified in Neighbourhood Plans made during the plan period. <p>25 March 2015 – Written Ministerial Statement from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Eric Pickles) This WMS covers a number of topics related to local plan policies including solar energy. It states:</p> <p><i>'The National Planning Policy Framework includes strong protections for the natural and historic environment and is quite clear that local councils when considering development proposals should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Yet, some local communities have genuine concerns that when it comes to solar farms insufficient weight has been given to these protections and the benefits of high quality agricultural land....'</i></p> <p>The proposed modifications will ensure that consideration is given to the impact of the proposed development on agricultural land.</p> <p>Main modification required to ensure that the plan is consistent with changes to national planning policy.</p>	
Policy CC/4 Sustainable Design	Revise wording of section 1 of Policy CC/4 as follows: All new residential developments must achieve as a minimum the equivalent of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 for water efficiency (105 litres per person per day)	This policy was subject to SA and this is reported in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report Part

Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan¹¹³		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
and Construction	<p><u>water efficiency equivalent to 110 litres per person per day.</u></p> <p>Reasons:</p> <p>25 March 2015 – Written Ministerial Statement from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Eric Pickles) This Written Ministerial Statement withdraws the Code for Sustainable Homes aside from legacy cases and sets out a new approach for the setting of technical standards for new housing, including for water efficiency. It states under the sections on Housing standards: streamlining the system and Plan making that:</p> <p><i>'New homes need to be high quality, accessible and sustainable. To achieve this, the government has created a new approach for the setting of technical standards for new housing. ... The new system will comprise new additional optional Building Regulations on water and access. ... From the date the Deregulation Bill 2015 is given Royal Assent, local planning authorities and qualifying bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should not set in their emerging Local Plans, neighbourhood plans, or supplementary planning documents, any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings. This includes any policy requiring any level of the Code for Sustainable Homes to be achieved by new development; the government has now withdrawn the code, aside from the management of legacy cases. ... The optional new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered.'</i></p> <p>The proposed modifications take account of the withdrawal of the Code for Sustainable Homes and the introduction of optional Building Regulations standards by removing details related to the Code for Sustainable Homes, and amending the policy to refer to the optional new national technical standard for water efficiency.</p> <p>The Cambridge Water Company is in an area of water stress as designated by the Environment Agency. Cambridge Water Company's Resources Management Plan shows that beyond 2035, without additional resources or</p>	<p>3, Appendix 5 from page 3-A425 onwards. This assessment found that the policy had either neutral or minor positive effects on all SA objectives. The policy will still have the same effects as the policy still includes considerable requirements with regard to sustainability and other elements of the plan contribute to this positive effect.</p>

Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan¹¹³		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	greater efficiency, the need for water to serve development will be greater than currently available supply. The policy reflects these local circumstances by requiring higher water efficiency standards than the national Building Regulations. The efficiency measures required can be delivered at relatively low additional cost.	
Policy CC/8: Sustainable Drainage Systems	<p>Update criterion a of Policy CC/8 as follows: Surface water drainage schemes comply with the forthcoming National SuDS Standards, Sustainable Drainage Systems: Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems, the Cambridgeshire SuDS Design and Adoption Manual and the Cambridgeshire SuDS Handbook and the Cambridgeshire Flood and Water Supplementary Planning Document or successor documents;</p> <p>Reasons: Modification required to ensure that the plan is consistent with changes to national planning policy, and correct the reference to local guidance.</p>	This modification is procedural, to ensure the policy refers to up to date guidance and will not lead to materially different sustainability effects on the ground.
Policy H/1: Allocations for Residential Development at Villages	<p>Include a new section to Policy H/1 below the existing policy text with a new sub-heading, together with additional supporting text as follows:</p> <p>Parish Council led Allocations for Residential Development in Villages</p> <p>H/1:i Land at Linton Road, Great Abington Area (ha.) and indicative dwelling capacity: 4.11 ha. 35 dwellings</p> <p>H/1:j Land at High Street / Pampisford Road, Great Abington Area (ha.) and indicative dwelling capacity: 0.55 ha. 12 dwellings</p> <p>H/1: k Land at Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington Area (ha.) and indicative dwelling capacity: 0.42 ha. 6 dwellings</p> <p>H/1: l Land at Toseland Road, Graveley Area (ha.) and indicative dwelling capacity: 0.40 ha. 6 dwellings</p> <p>Reasons:</p>	<p>This modification has been subject to original Sustainability Appraisal accompanying the South Cambridgeshire Submission Local Plan (see Part 3, Appendix 6).</p> <p>For completeness, this has been included as Annex 2 of this SA addendum.</p>

Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan¹¹³		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p>These sites were agreed for inclusion in the submission Local Plan at the 11th February 2014 meeting of the Planning Policy and Localism Portfolio Holder, and by Council on 13th March 2014.</p> <p>The Parish Councils of Great and Little Abington and Graveley, have promoted a number of small scale housing developments through the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan process to meet identified local housing needs, as an alternative to taking forward a Neighbourhood Plan. Local people were consulted by leaflet about whether the sites should be developed and there is clear evidence of local support. These Parish Council-led sites were brought forward just before the submission of the Local Plan for examination and have already been identified as Main Modifications, but have not yet been generally consulted upon. They provide part of the Council’s housing supply, respond to the localism agenda, provide additional rural housing as supported by the DEFRA ‘Towards a one nation economy: A 10-point plan for boosting productivity in rural area’ publication of August 2015, and provide flexibility in housing land supply. This consultation provides an opportunity for consultation to be carried out by the district council ahead of consideration at the examination.</p> <p>Parish Council led proposals pursued through Local Plan instead of Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>This consultation provides an opportunity for consultation to be carried out by the district council ahead of consideration at the examination.</p>	
Policy H/4 Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate	<p>Revise wording of Policy H/4 as follows:</p> <p>Within the former Land Settlement Association Estate at Fen Drayton, as defined on the Policies Map, planning permission for the redevelopment of existing buildings (excluding glasshouses) will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>a. <u>Any new development delivers onsite experimental or groundbreaking forms of sustainable living and that any</u> Any new dwellings achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 6 <u>are carbon neutral</u> and any non-residential buildings achieve Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) outstanding standard;</p>	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report Part 3, Appendix 5 from page 3-A227 onwards. The assessment showed a significant positive effect on land and soil (as this is a brownfield site) and health (due to the fact that the policy requires development to meet the highest sustainable construction standards). The assessment also found an uncertain effect on landscape and travel (because of its remote nature). The policy will still have a significant positive</p>

Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan¹¹³		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p><u>Reasons:</u> 25 March 2015 – Written Ministerial Statement from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Eric Pickles) This Written Ministerial Statement withdraws the Code for Sustainable Homes aside from legacy cases. It states under the section on Plan making that: <i>'From the date the Deregulation Bill 2015 is given Royal Assent, local planning authorities and qualifying bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should not set in their emerging Local Plans, neighbourhood plans, or supplementary planning documents, any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings. This includes any policy requiring any level of the Code for Sustainable Homes to be achieved by new development; the government has now withdrawn the code, aside from the management of legacy cases.'</i> The proposed modifications take account of the withdrawal of the Code for Sustainable Homes by removing details related to the Code for Sustainable Homes, and amending the policy so that it will still ensure the delivery of the same outcomes. The Fen Drayton former LSA estate would be considered as 'countryside', if it was not designated as a special policy area. Housing would therefore not usually be permitted in this location unless it was a replacement dwelling, reusing/convertng an existing building or a dwelling required for the functioning of a rural enterprise or tied to agricultural use. For housing to be acceptable in this location, the current adopted policy in the Site Specific Policies DPD (January 2010) requires new developments to deliver ground breaking and experimental forms of sustainable living, which is defined in the accompanying SPD as meeting the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 6. Continuing to seek 'ground breaking and experimental forms of sustainable living' in this location is consistent with national policy as the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, published in March 2012) allows new isolated homes in the countryside in certain circumstances, such as delivering</p>	<p>effect as the policy still requires carbon neutral and experimental or groundbreaking forms of sustainable living. All other SA conclusions in relation to Policy H/4 still stand, including the uncertain effects identified above.</p>

Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan¹¹³		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p>an exceptional quality or innovative nature to the design of the dwelling (paragraph 55); supports the move to a low carbon future by planning for development in a location and way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (paragraph 95); and states that new developments should be planned to minimise energy consumption and avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change (paragraphs 96 and 99).</p> <p>Whilst the policy can no longer specifically require that new dwellings in this location applied for under this policy must achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 6, any new dwelling should still be 'experimental and ground breaking' and carbon neutral.</p> <p>Modification required to ensure that the plan is consistent with changes to national planning policy.</p>	
Policy H/8 Housing Mix	<p>Include reference in criterion 1 in Policy H/8 to 'those seeking starter homes' and 'people wishing to build their own homes':</p> <p>'A wide choice, type and mix of housing will be provided to meet the needs of different groups in the community including families with children, older people, <u>those seeking starter homes, people wishing to build their own homes</u> and people with disabilities. The market homes in developments of 10 or more homes will consist of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> At least 30% 1 or 2 bedroom homes; At least 30% 3 bedroom homes; At least 30% 4 or more bedroom homes; <p>With a 10% flexibility allowance that can be added to any of the above categories taking account of local circumstances.'</p> <p>Amend section 2 of the policy as follows:</p> <p>Section 1 is subject to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The housing mix of affordable homes (<u>except starter homes</u>) in all developments being determined by local housing needs evidence; 	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report Part 3, Appendix 5 from page 3-A227 onwards. The assessment showed a significant positive effect on housing and inequalities. The policy will still have a significant positive effect. All other SA conclusions in relation to Policy H/8 still stand.</p>

Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan ¹¹³		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p>b. The mix of market homes to be provided on sites of 9 or fewer homes taking account of local circumstances;</p> <p>c. <u>On all sites of 20 or more dwellings, and in each phase of strategic sites, developers will supply dwelling plots for sale to self and custom builders. Where plots have been made available and appropriately marketed for at least 12 months and have not been sold, the plot(s) may either remain on the market or be built out by the developer.</u></p> <p>Additional change following Proposed Modifications Consultation (March 2016): <u>Exceptionally, no provision will be expected in developments or phases of developments which comprise high density multi-storey flats and apartments.</u></p> <p><u>Reasons:</u> The Local Plan needs to include mention of the housing needs for different groups of people including those seeking starter homes and people wishing to build their own homes to reflect changes mentioned in two Government policy statements -</p> <p>2 March 2015 – Written Ministerial Statement by Brandon Lewis MP DCLG Changing planning policy to enable starter homes for first time buyers.</p> <p>26 March 2015 – Revision to National Planning Practice Guidance – Housing and economic development needs assessment section – Paragraph 21 – Government wanting to enable more people to build their own home. Local Planning Authority should identify demand for custom build in their areas and compile a local list or register of people who want to build their own homes.</p> <p>The PPG states that in addressing the needs for all types of housing plan makers should consider people wishing to build their own homes. The Government wants to enable more people to build their own home and wants to make this form of housing a mainstream housing option. Local planning authorities should, therefore, plan to meet the strong latent demand for such housing. Additional local demand, over and above current levels of</p>	

Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan¹¹³		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p>delivery can be identified from secondary data sources.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire District Council is one of the vanguard authorities and has a self build register. As a local planning authority it has made an early start to considering the needs of people wishing to build their own homes and the modification seeks to achieve this through the Local Plan. modification required to ensure that the plan is consistent with changes to national planning policy.</p>	
New Policy E/1b Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension	<p>PROVISIONAL MODIFICATION to add a new Policy E/1B as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>An extension to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus will be supported on land shown on the Policies Map for biomedical and biotechnology research and development within class B1(b) and related higher education and sui-generis medical research institutes.</u> 2. <u>Proposals for development should:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Create substantial and attractive landscaped edges to the western, eastern and southern boundaries reinforcing existing planting on the southern boundary.</u> b. <u>Provide an appropriate landscaped setting for the Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve, and provide pedestrian access to the Reserve whilst mitigating visitor impacts.</u> c. <u>Demonstrate and ensure that there will be no material impact on the volume, pattern of flow or water quality of the chalk springs at Nine Wells.</u> d. <u>Demonstrate that surface water flood risks can be appropriately managed and mitigated to avoid flood risks to the site and to not increase flood risks elsewhere.</u> e. <u>Have building heights which are no higher than those on the adjoining part of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and which step down to the western, eastern and southern boundaries.</u> f. <u>Provide high quality new public realm and open space, and retain and incorporate existing watercourses.</u> 	This is a new policy/site allocation which has not been subject to assessment before. Therefore, a new assessment has been included in Table 10.3.

Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan¹¹³		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p>g. <u>Include measures to enhance access to and within the Cambridge Biomedical Campus including for cyclists, pedestrians, wheelchair users and people with other disabilities, and mitigate impacts on the existing road network and parking in the surrounding area.</u></p> <p>h. <u>Connect to the Addenbrooke’s Hospital energy network, where feasible and viable.</u></p> <p><u>Reasons:</u> The Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study (November 2015) identifies land south of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus which could be released from the Green Belt for development without significant harm to Green Belt purposes. The Council considers that the need for jobs can comprise exceptional circumstances justifying a review of the Green Belt so far as this would not cause significant harm to Green Belt purposes. Whilst there is no overall shortage of employment land within South Cambridgeshire for high-tech and research and development companies and organisations, the findings of the new study provide an opportunity to allocate land for an extension to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus to provide high quality biomedical development on the edge of Cambridge with its locational benefits, without causing significant harm to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. It would not be positive planning for the Local Plan policy to prevent such development if it proves to be deliverable.</p> <p>Proposed policy would provide an effective response to the employment issues relating to the Cambridge area and the circumstances of the site.</p>	
Policy E/2 Fulbourn Road East	<p>Amend the title of Policy E/2 as follows: Policy E/2: Fulbourn Road East (Fulbourn) 6.9 <u>4.3</u> hectares</p> <p>There is a consequential amendment to site area shown on the Policies Map</p> <p><u>Reasons</u> In response to the findings in the LDA Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study 2015 (See Sector 13), which recommended allocating a smaller site to minimise impact on the Green Belt. The area will reduce from 6.9 to 4.3</p>	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report Part 3, Appendix 5 from page 3-A310 onwards.</p> <p>The assessment found either neutral or positive effects for the site. In relation to the Green Belt, the assessment stated that it has a neutral effect as although this site is within the current Green Belt the Local Plan proposes its removal as a</p>

Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan¹¹³		
Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	hectares and will extend no further east than the Yarrow Road roundabout.	result of the Cambridge Green Belt Review (2012) which suggests that the site can be released without significant harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. The Green Belt Review identified that to avoid significant negative effects the site areas would need to be reduced, and this has been reflected in the modification. This conclusion still stands and the rest of the SA conclusions in regard to this site / policy still stand.

Table 10.3: Assessment of New Policy E/1b Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension

Table 10.3: Assessment of New Policy E/1b Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension				
SA Obj	Score	Potential effect	Mitigation and enhancement	SCDC response
1. Land / soil	0	There will be minor loss of grade 2 agricultural land. In the context of the plan area this is considered to be minor / neutral.		
2. Waste	0	The site falls within a Waste Consultation Area. However, waste consultation procedures are in place to ensure that development does not interfere with future waste management development		
3. Pollution	-	<p>The site may have an adverse impact on air quality from traffic generation particularly as it is close to Addenbrooke's. The site is not within an AQMA.</p> <p>The western part of the site is adjacent to railway line to London. Agricultural use may have led to some contamination with agricultural chemicals. The site also lies close to the natural chalk springs at Nine Wells which feed into Hobsons Brook. The policy requires applicants to demonstrate and ensure that there will be no material impact on the volume, pattern of flow or water quality of the chalk springs at Nine Wells.</p>	The following assessments will be required as part of any planning application: An air quality assessment, noise assessment and an appropriate assessment of contamination.	Noted

Table 10.3: Assessment of New Policy E/1b Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension				
SA Obj	Score	Potential effect	Mitigation and enhancement	SCDC response
4. Prot. Sites	0	Site adjoins the Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve but the policy requires the provision of an appropriate landscaped setting for the Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve, and pedestrian access to the Reserve whilst mitigating visitor impacts.		
5. Habitats	0	Assumptions for a neutral impact are that existing features that warrant retention can be retained or appropriate mitigation will be achieved through the development process.	Ensure that existing features that warrant retention can be retained or appropriate mitigation will be achieved through the development process	Noted
6. Green spaces	0	Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process. Site within the Countywide Green Infrastructure Strategy.	Ensure that mitigation measures are achieved through the development process	Noted
7. Landscape & Townscape	-	Minor negative impact (development conflicts with landscape character, minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation) - development of this site would result in further encroachment of the built area into open countryside to the south of Addenbrooke's Hospital and the Biomedical Campus. This would have a negative impact on the purposes of the Green Belt affecting openness, setting and views. However, limited development in the northern and	Development should be designed in accordance with the parameters set out below. These parameters would avoid significant harm as follows: The new Green Belt boundary would be no further from the historic core than existing boundaries to the west at Trumpington and the east at Cherry Hinton. A permanent, well-designed edge to the city would be created. Thus, the increase in urban sprawl would be permanently limited and would not affect perceptions of the compact nature of the city.	Noted

Table 10.3: Assessment of New Policy E/1b Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension				
SA Obj	Score	Potential effect	Mitigation and enhancement	SCDC response
		eastern parts of sector 10 could be undertaken without significant long-term harm to Green Belt purposes, if carefully planned.	<p>A well-vegetated, soft green edge to the city would minimise the urban influences on the retained Green Belt, thus minimising the perception of encroachment into the countryside.</p> <p>The rising topography of the Gog Magog Hills would be kept open, retaining a key feature of the setting of the city, and open rural land would be retained at the foot of the hills, protecting the foreground in key views and the quality of the approach to the city along Babraham Road.</p>	
8. Heritage	-	There is extensive and intensive evidence for Bronze Age, Iron Age, Roman and medieval archaeology recorded to the north. Cropmarks to the south indicate that archaeological assets are likely to extend throughout the landscape. A site of national importance is located 250m to the south west (Scheduled Monument Number 57).	Further evidence through archaeological evaluation would be needed regarding the extent, character and significance of archaeology in the area prior to consideration of a planning application.	Noted
9. Places	0	<p>Parts of site are at risk of surface water flooding. Parts of the site are within flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>Consent for any modifications to the watercourse would need to be sought from the Flood and Water Team at Cambridgeshire County Council, but significant changes such as culverting would be discouraged and would require</p>		

Table 10.3: Assessment of New Policy E/1b Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension				
SA Obj	Score	Potential effect	Mitigation and enhancement	SCDC response
		modelling to prove no increase or relocation of risk. This is addressed in the policy which states that applicants must demonstrate that surface water flood risks can be appropriately managed and mitigated to avoid flood risks to the site and to not increase flood risks elsewhere.		
10. Climate mitig.	+	The site has access to public transport service using the Addenbrooke's Hospital public transport hub, located within 600m of the eastern edge of the site and will have a positive impact on this objective. The policy requires applicants to connect to the Addenbrooke's Hospital energy network, where feasible and viable.		
11. Climate adapt.	0	See above in relation to flooding		
12. Health	-	See above in relation to pollution		
13. Crime	0	No effect.		
14. Open space	0	Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process. Site within the Countywide Green Infrastructure Strategy.	Ensure that mitigation measures are achieved through the development process	Noted

Table 10.3: Assessment of New Policy E/1b Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension				
SA Obj	Score	Potential effect	Mitigation and enhancement	SCDC response
15. Housing	0	No effect. This is not a housing allocation		
16. Inequalities	0	No effect.		
17. Services	0	No effect.		
18. Community	0	No effect.		
19. Economy	+++	Whilst there is no overall shortage of employment land within South Cambridgeshire for high-tech and research and development companies and organisations, the findings of the new study provide an opportunity to allocate land for an extension to the CBC to provide high quality biomedical development on the edge of Cambridge with its locational benefits. This is significant because the site is an international centre of excellence		
20. Work	+++	As above		
21. Investment	+++	As above		
22. Travel	-	The site has access to public transport service using the Addenbrooke's Hospital public transport hub, located	Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.	Noted

Table 10.3: Assessment of New Policy E/1b Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension				
SA Obj	Score	Potential effect	Mitigation and enhancement	SCDC response
		<p>within 600m of the eastern edge of the site. This site does not benefit from direct access to the local highway network; as such the most logical point of access to the site would appear to be via the proposed Cambridge Biomedical Campus Phase 2 development. There is, therefore, a risk that the layout and access strategy for Cambridge Biomedical Campus Phase 2 could prejudice the ability of adequate access to this site being achieved, as such early discussions with the developer of Cambridge Biomedical Campus Phase 2 would be recommended to minimise this risk.</p> <p>With regard to rail access, a portion of this site may need to be safeguarded to facilitate the delivery of the proposed Addenbrooke's railway station (which is listed as a scheme in the County Council's Long Term Transport Strategy).</p>		

Table 10.3: Assessment of New Policy E/1b Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension				
SA Obj	Score	Potential effect	Mitigation and enhancement	SCDC response
23. Trans. Infr.	-	Significant congestion already occurs in this quadrant of Cambridge which is likely to be exacerbated by the full build out of the planned and approved Cambridge Biomedical Campus developments. Substantial sustainable transport improvements are identified through the City Deal Programme that may provide some headroom and help to support investment in travel by sustainable modes.	A Transport Assessment will need to carefully examine and clearly demonstrate how the site can be delivered without having an unacceptable impact on the surrounding transport networks.	Noted

10.3 Summary of the effects of the Local Plans

The tables below set out for both Local Plans what the significant sustainability effects would be if proposed modifications are made. The way that this has been done is slightly different between Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire because the Submission Draft Reports were produced by different parties.

The Cambridge SA made an assessment of how the plan would perform as a whole, whereas the South Cambridgeshire SA set out significant effects per section of the plan. Tables 10.3 to 10.12 have been amended to take into account the proposed modifications and modifications are noted in ***bold italic*** or as footnotes.

10.4 Likely significant cumulative effects

Cumulative effects are considered in two ways in SA:

- Cumulative effects considering the potential effects of other programmes and plans in combination with the effects of the Local Plan; and
- Cumulative effects of the policies / proposals within the plan and how they interact with each other.

The cumulative effects of the plans have already been assessed in the following sections of the Submission Draft SA reports:

- Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State – from page 490 onwards.
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report – Part 3.

The approach taken to cumulative effects assessment is slightly different in each SA. The Cambridge SA incorporates consideration of both aspects of cumulative effects assessment in the overall plan assessment itself, not carrying out a separate assessment. Therefore, Table 10.2 is effectively an assessment of the cumulative effects of the plan (with the proposed modifications).

The South Cambridgeshire SA presents separate cumulative effects assessments, one in relation to the effects in association with other plans and programmes (see Table 4.4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report – Part 3) and one in relation to how the policies within the plan will interact with each other to cause cumulative effects (see Table 4.5 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report – Part 3).

Both of these tables have been validated as part of this work to review whether the assessment has changed. It is confirmed that the cumulative assessment has not significantly changed in response to the proposed modifications or new evidence. This is due to the fact that the proposed modifications are relatively minor.

A summary of the key findings of the assessments is given below:

10.4.1 Effects of the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans in association with other plans and programmes

- A number of Area Action Plans (AAPs) have been adopted by the Councils (in areas like Cambridge East and Northstowe etc) or are under development or are proposed by the Local Plans. In most cases, these should guide development rather than require additional development not considered in the Local Plans. However, the SA did find some negative effects including effects on energy, water and waste generation from the Local Plans in association with Northstowe AAP, Cambridge East AAP, Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP and North West Cambridge AAP; and
- Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals and Waste LDF (Core Strategy 2011, Site Specific Proposals 2012) : There will be a minor negative effect on sand and gravel reserves due to

the potential sterilization of reserves at Waterbeach although this should be mitigated through good site planning;

- Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 3: Identifies a number of transport intervention across the Cambridge area to address existing issues and to accommodate growth. The LTP was subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment prior to its adoption. However, some additional conclusions have been added below in regard to this to aid clarity.

10.4.1.1 Consideration of A428 and A10 transport schemes

There is a need for particular consideration of cumulative transport impacts on the A428 and A10 corridors in the development of the transport strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, given the level of development proposed at Waterbeach, Bourn Airfield and Cambourne West.

Some transport schemes identified in the LTP providing wider benefits for the area would also be required to serve Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield on the A428 corridor and could potentially negatively impact on agricultural land, designated ecological sites, habitats, Green Belt and heritage assets depending on the routes selected (segregated bus priority measure between the junction of the A428/A1303 and the M11, may affect not only the Green Belt but also the American Cemetery, a registered park and garden, and a designated heritage asset as well as ancient woodland and BAP priority habitats). If works were able to be carried out on line rather than beyond the existing highway boundary this might alleviate some of the adverse effects. However, the schemes will help to reduce the need to travel by car thus having positive impacts on air quality, accessibility and transport objectives.

Some transport schemes identified in the LTP providing wider benefits for the area would also be required to serve Waterbeach new town on the A10 would negatively impact on agricultural land, Green Belt and heritage assets depending on the routes selected (Bus priority measures, Park & Ride, cycling and pedestrian improvements, and highways improvements on the A10 corridor, may have negative impacts in relation to greenfield land take (and specifically high quality agricultural land) and some of the schemes are located partly in the Green Belt. A busway using the Mereway route would have potential to negatively impact on heritage assets)). However, the schemes will help to reduce the need to travel by car thus having positive impacts on air quality, accessibility and transport objectives.

The following conclusions can be drawn:

- With regard to agricultural land, there will be a residual unavoidable permanent loss of agricultural land which is cumulatively likely to be significant across the plan area (and this was reflected in the overall assessment of the cumulative impact of the Local Plan (as highlighted below). The main impact, however, is from the overall level of development proposed within the plan, with the impact of the A428 and A10 being a fairly minor part of the whole;
- With regard to Green Belt, there will be some minor negative effects on Green Belt as some of the A428 and A10 schemes are partly located in the Green Belt. This is likely to cause minor residual negative impacts (and this is also reflected below in the assessment of the plan as a whole);
- With regard to the impacts on nature conservation and heritage, these are seen as minor negative and can be reduced through planning and environmental assessment procedures. If works were able to be carried out on line for the A428 schemes rather than beyond the existing highway boundary this might alleviate some of the adverse effects.

10.4.2 Cumulative effects of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan

- Although the plan has sought to minimise the loss of agricultural land, there will be a residual unavoidable permanent loss of agricultural land which is cumulatively likely to be significant across the plan area;
- The level of development in the Plan Area has the potential for negative effects on the Green Belt, in particular that which is surrounding Cambridge which is important for preserving the character of the City. The development strategy allows some development on the edge of Cambridge. Where this is demonstrated through the Green Belt Review to have detrimental impacts on the steers development away from the edge of Cambridge. With the mitigation and enhancement measures there are likely to be residual minor negative impacts;
- There will be a residual cumulative negative effect on waste generation and resource use across the plan area;
- There are likely to be significant negative cumulative effects on air quality which cannot be further mitigated;
- With the mitigation and enhancement measures there are likely to be positive synergistic effects on biodiversity in particular with regards the provision of green infrastructure networks in the plan area;
- With the mitigation and enhancement measures there are likely to be residual positive cumulative effects on health and wellbeing in the plan area; and
- There are likely to be cumulative minor negative effects on access to employment, services and facilities in the plan area. This is due to the fact that although new settlements offer the opportunity for focused investment in transport infrastructure, and measures to support sustainable transport modes, they will still generate a significant number of trips, and focus journeys onto a smaller number of transport corridors.

Table 10.4: Overall performance of the Cambridge Local Plan	
Table 10.4: Overall performance of the Cambridge Local Plan	
Sustainability theme	Overall performance of the plan
Communities and well being	Cambridge is an area facing significant changes in the future, and so development over the plan period must be capable of addressing the new and expanding demands that will be placed on the city and its infrastructure if current levels of community and wellbeing are to be maintained and improved. On the whole the plan is successful in this regard, with a number of policies addressing the protection of existing community facilities, although some policies could be strengthened in this respect; and the provision of new facilities to address emerging needs, including the securing of finances where appropriate. One of the most significant issues facing the city today and in future is that of housing, and the plan meets the identified housing need as set out in the SHMA and as such should lead to significant positive effects.
Economy	The plan as appraised should lead to significant positive effects in terms of encouraging economic growth through capitalising on the four strengths of Cambridge’s economy: higher and further education and the related research institutes; high-tech business; retail; and tourism. The plan proposes sustainable growth in all of these sectors and includes criteria to protect against negative or undesirable effects. Development in research and high-tech sectors should improve Cambridge’s competitiveness in terms of business, whilst retail growth and tourism development should increase the city’s attractiveness to shoppers, visitors and tourists. Support for the Universities and specialist tutorial colleges/language schools will also increase their value in the local economy providing that suitable accommodation is provided.
Transport	Overall the policies in the Plan are expected to have positive outcomes for the transport objectives. In particular the overall development strategy for the location of residential development seeks to ensure that new residential development is located in and around the urban area of Cambridge which should capitalise on the opportunity for new residential development to discourage private car use and encourage more sustainable modes of transport. This has been confirmed by the Local Plans CSRSM report that found that even the new settlement sites that were at a greater distance from Cambridge could implement site specific transport measures which would reduce the impact of growth, increasing the proportion of trips made by non-car modes, including shift towards Park & Ride. Policy 80 requires new development to prioritise access by sustainable modes of travel (walking, cycling and public transport) over car use which should also contribute to positive sustainability outcomes. In addition it requires major development on the edge of Cambridge and in the urban extensions to be supported by high quality public transport links that are within (or will be made to be within) highly walkable and cyclable travel distance of development thus helping to promote the use of more sustainable forms of transport. Given the constrained nature of Cambridge’s transport network the Plan seeks to make the best use of existing infrastructure by promoting a compact urban form; achieving a modal shift to sustainable transport and reducing the need to travel; all of which should to address historic rises in transport emissions.

<p>Water</p>	<p>Given that Cambridge is poised to see large amounts of growth, particularly in terms of residential development, it is important that the Plan pays close regard to preserving water supply and quality in the city. On the whole, it is successful in this regard, incorporating strong requirements on new development to incorporate water efficiency measures (although these have been relaxed as a result of the proposed modifications from 80 litres to 110 litres/person/day) and to adopt a water sensitive approach; plus where possible protect or improve the quality of Cambridge’s water courses.</p>
<p>Flood risk including climate change adaptation</p>	<p>Policies in the Local Plan do not allow for development to increase flood risk and they also seek to improve the baseline situation through infrastructure provision. Gardens and open spaces should be protected which will help protect against flood risk. SuDS schemes and multi-functional green and blue infrastructure should provide links and routes for species to migrate. ‘Climate-proof’ species and planting should ensure that landscaping is tolerant to heat and drought and also saturation. Protecting open space, trees, gardens and natural areas should help mitigate the urban heat island effect through encouraging transpiration, ‘urban cooling’ and providing shade. Encouraging sustainable design techniques in order to capture solar gain during winter and provide natural ventilation and cooling in the summer should help protect against heat stress for people, particularly vulnerable people, older and younger people. Measuring against the baseline situation, the plan should lead to significant positive effects in terms of climate change adaptation and flood risk by ensuring that new development is resilient to climate change and contributes towards reducing flood risk across the city.</p>
<p>Climate change mitigation and renewable energy</p>	<p>The plan will have a positive effect (<i>amended from significant positive effect</i>). Overall the plan will 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.</p> <p>The embodied energy of construction materials will be reused and recycled in new construction which will reduce emissions used in the mining and manufacturing of new construction materials. Transport improvements will shift priority from the car to increase use of the sustainable transport modes of walking, cycling and public transport, and development will be located in sustainable places that reduce the need to travel. In combination, all of these policies should lead to slight positive effects in terms of reducing emissions and increasing energy efficiency.</p> <p><i>Please note that the removal of the zero carbon requirements, relaxation of sustainable water use requirements from 80 litres to 110 litres/person/day and removal of considerations of allowable solutions are a major step backwards in terms of delivering sustainable development and they remove the clarity that the previous policies 27 and 28 provided. Therefore, the plan can no longer be considered to have a significant positive effect.</i></p>
<p>Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</p>	<p>In spite of the scale of new development proposed, taken as a whole the policies presented in the Local Plan are expected to result in positive effects in terms of the landscape, townscape and cultural heritage objectives. The plan contains a number of policies, particularly those in Section 7 (Protecting and Enhancing the Character of Cambridge) that should continue to provide a good level of protection to the designated Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and heritage assets in Cambridge. Many of the policies presented in Section 3 (City Centre, Areas of Major Change, Opportunity Areas and Site Specific</p>

	Proposals) include criteria that will ensure development is only supported where it can demonstrate that it will protect and enhance the character of specific areas in the city. In addition, the plan's policy on restricting development from the Green Belt except in very special circumstances (Policy 4), should help to preserve the setting and special character of Cambridge's historic centre.
Biodiversity and green infrastructure	Taken together, the policies set out in the Local Plan are likely to result in no net loss of biodiversity despite the scale of new development proposed and could lead to positive effects; with significant positive effects in terms of green infrastructure. Of importance is the Plan's focus on directing development into urban areas and brownfield sites, protecting biodiversity in the wider landscape and designated areas, and encouraging and protecting biodiversity in the built environment. The effect of the policies could be strengthened in some ways; in particular by bringing a greater focus on wider ecological network of the city, including highlighting the potential for achieving multiple benefits through the provision of strategic green infrastructure.
City centre	The policies set out to address development in the City Centre area, or that may have an effect on it through their general provisions, are on the whole likely to result in positive effects. This is as a result of a balancing of both the need to grow the local economy to take full advantage of the opportunities presented, and the need to protect and enhance the centre's assets, community, and infrastructure from the impacts of development and future demographic and economic change. The policies for the Opportunity Areas could however be improved by making stronger reference to the need for a built environment that prioritises sustainable means of transport and provides appropriate supporting infrastructure, with this being of particular importance given the poor air quality in the City Centre.
North Cambridge	The Local Plan should lead to significant positive effects in terms of most of the sustainability objectives identified in the North Cambridge Functional Area. The level of growth proposed at the Northern Fringe East and the associated transport improvements at Cambridge Science Park Station should help to achieve modal shift and lead to employment opportunities, particularly for those in the north east of the Functional Area that are amongst the most deprived in the city. A number of policies seek to protect and enhance the quantity and quality of provision and improve access to open space. Wider sustainable transport policies seek to achieve modal shift and in combination with historic environment and design policies should benefit conservation areas by reducing the impact of traffic and inappropriate development. Flood risk (in particular surface water flood risk) in the area should be reduced by policies requiring sustainable drainage infrastructure, attenuation features, wetland creation and permeable paving.
South Cambridge	The Local Plan should lead to significant positive effects in terms of all of the relevant sustainability objectives in the South Cambridge Functional Area. The level of growth proposed and the associated transport and community infrastructure should lead to the delivery of successful new communities that are integrated with other areas, particularly those in the east that are generally more deprived. Development requiring the release of the Green Belt is subject to policies that mitigate for the loss of land by improving the quality and public access to open space whilst ensuring there is no residual adverse landscape or visual

	<p>impact.</p> <p>Sustainable transport policies seek to achieve modal shift and in combination with historic environment policies should benefit conservation areas by reducing the impact of traffic and parking. And, finally, flood risk at Cherry Hinton should be reduced by requiring sustainable drainage infrastructure, attenuation features, wetland creation and permeable paving.</p>
<p>East Cambridge</p>	<p>The Local Plan has been appraised to lead to significant positive effects in terms of most of the sustainability objectives identified in the East Cambridge Functional Area. The level of growth proposed at sustainable locations should help address deprivation and encourage use of sustainable modes of transport. The Opportunity Area policies and wider design policies should ensure that the character of neighbourhoods is maintained and enhanced. Plan policies seek to protect and enhance the quantity and quality of open space provision and the creation of a new urban country park should improve access to and quality of provision.</p>
<p>West Cambridge</p>	<p>Both the policies put forward to address the development issues of West Cambridge specifically, and those wider policies of particular relevance to development in this area, are considered likely to result in positive effects overall.</p> <p>This is due to an appropriate balancing of growth and protection, with development only to be brought forward where it is demonstrated that social and environmental assets are to be preserved or enhanced. There is however some opportunity to tighten the criteria in some of the policies outlined, and to make explicit certain additional requirements.</p>

Table 10.5: Summary of the significant effects identified within the SA: Spatial Strategy

Table 10.5: Summary of the significant effects identified within the South Cambridgeshire SA: Spatial Strategy			
SA Objective	Significant beneficial effects	Significant negative effects	Outstanding mitigation and enhancement measures
1. Land / soil	Policy S/12	Policy S/5, Policy S/6,	The impacts of Policy S/5 are mitigated through the individual site allocation policies and the application of general protection policies within the Local Plan.
3. Pollution	None	Policy S/5	None
6. Green spaces	Policy S/6	None	None
7. Landscape and Townscape	Policy S/4	None	None
8. Heritage	Policy S/4	None	None
10. Climate change mitigation	Policy S/6	None	None
15. Housing	Policy S/5, Policy S/6 Policy S/8, Policy S/9 Policy S/10, Policy S/11, Policy S/12	None	None
17. Services	Policy S/6 Policy S/8 Policy S/12	None	None
19. Economy	Policy S/5	None	None
20. Work	Policy S/5, Policy S/6 Policies S/8 and S/9	None	None
21. Investment	Policy S/6 Policy S/7 Policies S/8 and S/9	None	None
22. Travel	Policy S/6	None	None
23. Trans. Infr.	Policy S/6 Policy S/7 Policy S/8 Policy S/12	None	None

Table 10.6: Summary of the significant effects identified within the SA: Strategic Sites

Table 10.6: Summary of the significant effects identified within the South Cambridgeshire SA: Strategic Sites			
SA Objective	Significant beneficial effects	Significant negative effects	Outstanding mitigation and enhancement measures
1. Land / soil	SS/4	SS/3, SS/7 and SS/8	None.
2. Waste	SS/5, SS/6 and SS/8	None	None
5. Habitats	SS/5, SS/6, and SS/7	None	None
6. Green spaces	SS/5, SS/6, SS/7, SS/8	None	None
14. Open Space	SS/5, SS/7	None	None
15. Housing	SS/7	None	None
17. Services	SS/1, SS/2, SS/3, SS/6, SS/7, SS/8	None	None
19. Economy	SS/4, SS/5, SS/6, SS/7, SS/8	None	None
20. Work	SS/4, SS/5, SS/6, SS/7, SS/8	None	None
21. Investment	SS/5, SS/6, SS/7, SS/8	None	None
22. Travel	SS/1, SS/2, SS/4, SS/5, SS/6, SS/7, SS/8	None	None
23. Trans.Infr	SS/2, SS/3, SS/4, SS/5, SS/6, SS/8	None	None

Table 10.7: Summary of the significant effects identified within the SA: Climate Change

Table 10.7: Summary of the significant effects identified within the South Cambridgeshire SA: Climate Change			
SA Objective	Significant beneficial effects	Significant negative effects	Outstanding mitigation and enhancement measures
2. Waste	Policy CC/6	None	None
3. Pollution	Policy CC/7	None	None
10. Climate mitig.	Policy CC/1 ¹¹⁸ Policy CC/3	None	None
11. Climate adapt.	Policy CC/1 Policy CC/9	None	None

¹¹⁸ Please note that Policy CC/2 has been removed from this table as it will no longer cause a significant positive effect

Table 10.8: Summary of the significant effects identified within the SA: Delivering High Quality Places

Table 10.8: Summary of the significant effects identified within the South Cambridgeshire SA: Delivering High Quality Places			
SA Objective	Significant beneficial effects	Significant negative effects	Outstanding mitigation and enhancement measures
2. Waste	Policy HQ/1	None	None
5. Habitats	Policy HQ/1	None	None
6. Green spaces	Policy HQ/1	None	None
7. Landscape and Townscape	Policy HQ/1	None	None
8. Heritage	Policy HQ/1	None	None
9. Places	Policy HQ/1	None	None
10. Climate mitig.	Policy HQ/1	None	None
11. Climate adapt.	Policy HQ/1	None	None
13. Crime	Policy HQ/1	None	None
16. Inequalities	Policy HQ/1	None	None

Table 10.9: Summary of the significant effects identified within the SA: Protecting and Enhancing the Natural and Historic Environment

Table 10.9: Summary of the significant effects identified within the South Cambridgeshire SA: Protecting and Enhancing the Natural and Historic Environment			
SA Objective	Significant beneficial effects	Significant negative effects	Outstanding mitigation and enhancement measures
1. Land / soil	Policy NH/3	None	None
4. Prot. Sites	Policies NH/4 and NH/5 Policy NH/6 Policy NH/7	None	None
5. Habitats	Policies NH/4 and NH/5 Policy NH/6 Policy NH/7	None	None
6. Green spaces	Policy NH/6	None	None
7. Landscape and Townscape	Policy NH/2 Policies NH/8, NH/9 and NH/10 Policy NH/11	None	None
8. Heritage	Policy NH/8 Policy NH/14	None	None

Table 10.9: Summary of the significant effects identified within the South Cambridgeshire SA: Protecting and Enhancing the Natural and Historic Environment			
SA Objective	Significant beneficial effects	Significant negative effects	Outstanding mitigation and enhancement measures
	Policy NH/15		
11. Climate adapt.	Policy NH/6 Policy NH/15	None	None

Table 10.10: Summary of the significant effects identified within the SA: Delivering High Quality Homes

Table 10.10: Summary of the significant effects identified within the South Cambridgeshire SA: Delivering High Quality Homes			
SA Objective	Significant beneficial effects	Significant negative effects	Outstanding mitigation and enhancement measures
1. Land / soil	H2, H3, H4, H15, H16, H17 H1:a	None	None
2. Waste	H22	None	None
7. Landscape and Townscape	H2	None	None
9. Places	H2	None	None
12. Health	H4. H22	None	None
15. Housing	H8, H9, H10, H11, H12, H13, H14, H15, H16	None	None
16. Inequalities	H8, H9	None	None
17. Services	H7	None	None
21. Investment	H1	None	None
22. Travel	H7	None	None
23. Trans. Infr.	H1	None	None

Table 10.11: Summary of the significant effects identified within the SA: Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Table 10.11: Summary of the significant effects identified within the South Cambridgeshire SA: Building a Strong and Competitive Economy			
SA Objective	Significant beneficial effects	Significant negative effects	Outstanding mitigation and enhancement measures
1. Land / soil	E/1, E/3, E/4, E/5, E/7 E/8, E/11, E/15, E/16, E/18	None	None
5. Habitats	E/7	None	None
6. Green spaces	E/8	None	None
7. Landscape and Townscape	E/1, E/17	None	None
9. Places	E/1	None	None
19. Economy	E/1, E/1b , E/2, E21	None	None
20. Work	E/1, E/1b , E/2, E8	None	None
21. Investment	E/1, E/1b	None	None
22. Travel	E/1, E/2, E/8, E/16, E17, E19	None	None.
23. Trans. Infr.	Policy TI/1, Policy TI/8	None	None

Table 10.12: Summary of the significant effects identified within the SA: Promoting Successful Communities

Table 10.12: Summary of the significant effects identified within the South Cambridgeshire SA: Promoting Successful Communities			
SA Objective	Significant beneficial effects	Significant negative effects	Outstanding mitigation and enhancement measures
6. Green spaces	SC/7, SC/8	None	None
12. Health	SC/5, SC/14	None	None
14. Open space	SC/7, SC/8	None	None

Table 10.13: Summary of the significant effects identified within the SA: Transport and Infrastructure

Table 10.13: Summary of the significant effects identified within the South Cambridgeshire SA: Transport and Infrastructure			
SA Objective	Significant beneficial effects	Significant negative effects	Outstanding mitigation and enhancement measures
2. Waste	Policy TI/8	None	None
3. Pollution	Policy TI/2	None	Mitigation measure: Monitoring of car parking standards should be set up to

Table 10.13: Summary of the significant effects identified within the South Cambridgeshire SA: Transport and Infrastructure			
SA Objective	Significant beneficial effects	Significant negative effects	Outstanding mitigation and enhancement measures
			ensure standards are helping to meet the objectives of the Local Plan.
5. Habitats	Policy TI/8	None	None
6. Green spaces	Policy TI/8	None	None
10. Climate mitig.	Policy TI/4	None	None
11. Climate adapt.	Policy TI/8	None	None
12. Health	Policy TI/6, Policy TI/8	None	None
16. Inequalities	Policy TI/9	None	None
17. Services	Policy TI/8	None	None
19. Economy	Policy TI/4	None	None
22. Travel	Policy TI/1	None	None
23. Trans. Infr.	Policy TI/1, Policy TI/8	None	None

11. CONSULTATION AND NEXT STEPS

11.1 Introduction

This section of the report outlines:

- Details of the consultation period for this SA Addendum Report and how to submit comments;
- The next steps for the Local Plans; and
- The next steps for the SAs.

11.2 Consultation on the SA Addendum Report

This SA Addendum Report is classed as an Environmental Report under the terms of the SEA regulations¹¹⁹. Therefore, it is necessary to consult on the report before it is submitted back to the Local Plan Examination process. As well as being a requirement of the regulations, both Councils see consultation as a key part of the planning process.

This report is subject to consultation under Section 13 of the regulations referred to above. Section 13 states that the Councils must give an effective opportunity for consultees to express their opinion. No set time-frame is defined in the regulations, however, Planning Practice Guidance (available at <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk>) states that consultees must be given a minimum of 6 weeks to respond.

The Councils invited responses to the SA Addendum Report alongside modifications proposed to the Local Plans, and accompanied by the additional evidence documents prepared in response to the Inspectors' Letter. Consultees were advised that they may wish to comment on:

- The scope of the assessments. Section 3 sets out a modified SA framework that has been used to assess strategic issues and Section 6 sets out a new site pro-forma that has been used to re-assess all sites. These are based on frameworks / pro-forma that have been used before but have been merged to provide consistency;
- The results of the assessment. Updated work has been undertaken on development needs / growth targets (Section 4), the development sequence (Section 5), strategic development alternatives (Section 7) and sites (Section 6).

The above list is only a guide. Consultees are free to comment on any issue raised in the SA Addendum Report and the Councils will consider all responses.

The SA Addendum Report was subject to consultation between the following dates: 2nd December and 25th January 2016.

11.3 Updates following Consultation

Representations received were reported to meetings of both Councils in March 2016. Full representations can be viewed on the Councils' website¹²⁰.

Appendix 9 identifies the number of representations received through the consultation to each section of the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum, a summary of the key issues raised, an assessment of the issues raised, and any changes made.

A number of site specific comments were received to the scoring of individual criteria within site assessment proforma in Annex 1 of the SAA, and these are considered in Appendix 10. Where new sites or significant variations of sites have been submitted, for completeness these have

¹¹⁹ Statutory Instrument No. 1633. The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

¹²⁰ Representations to the Joint SAA November 2015 can be viewed here: <http://scambs.jdi-consult.net/localplan/>

been reappraised and added to Annex 1. Where changes have been made to existing proforma, these have been updated in Annex 1.

Annex 1 of the SAA included a summary spreadsheet, capturing the results of all the individual site assessments for easy comparison. This has been updated, to include the revised scores and new site assessments mentioned above.

As a result of the Proposed Modifications consultations, a small number of additional or amended proposed modifications were identified related to both Local Plans. A screening exercise has been undertaken (updating table 10.1 and 10.2 of Chapter 10 this SAA), which concluded that the additional changes do not impact on the outcome of the appraisal.

11.4 Update Regarding Habitats Regulations Assessment

In developing the Proposed Modifications the Councils considered whether they had any implications for the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Reports. The Councils consider that the proposed modifications do not amend the findings of these screening reports, both of which found that the Submission Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans would not have significant effects on the Natura 2000 or Ramsar sites identified. This conclusion remains the same taking into account the small number of additional or amended proposed modifications following the consultation.

In a letter dated 23 February 2016 Natural England provided confirmation that they were satisfied with the Councils' conclusions that the proposed modifications do not amend the findings of the HRA screening reports and that the Submission Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans including the Proposed Modifications are unlikely to have significant effects on Natura 2000 or Ramsar sites. A copy of this letter is included at appendix 11.

11.5 Next steps for the SAs

After the Public Examination the Councils may need to make some changes to the Local Plans based on the Inspector's recommendations. Planning Practice Guidance (available at <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk>) states that it is up to the local planning authority to decide whether SA reports should be amended following proposed changes to an emerging plan after Examination. A screening exercise will be undertaken by the Councils and if it is deemed that necessary changes are significant, and were not previously subject to SA, then further SA will be undertaken and the SA reports will be updated accordingly.

Once the Local Plans are adopted, Sustainability Appraisal (SA) adoption statements (one for each Local Plan) will need to be published in accordance with the SEA regulations. The regulations state that as soon as reasonably practicable after the adoption of a plan a statement should be produced and published setting out how environmental considerations and opinions expressed through consultation have been taken into account in the planning process.

The SEA regulations set out the particulars that should be covered by the statement as follows:

- How environmental (sustainability) considerations have been integrated into the Local Plan;
- How the Environmental (SA) Report has been taken into account;
- How opinions expressed in response to consultation have been taken into account;
- The reasons for choosing the Local Plan as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with; and
- The measures that are to be taken to monitor the significant environmental (sustainability) effects of the implementation of the Local Plan.

APPENDIX 1
AUTHORSHIP OF THE REPORT

The following table sets out which party was responsible for production of the different sections of the SA Addendum Report. Please note that only those sections produced by Ramboll Environ have been subject to the Ramboll Environ Quality Assurance procedures. The sections produced by the Councils have been subject to the Councils' own Quality Assurance procedures.

Table A.1: Authorship of the report	
Section of the report	Authorship
Section 1: Introduction	All sections produced by Ramboll Environ
Section 2: Background	All sections produced by Ramboll Environ
Section 3: Appraisal Methodology	All sections produced by Ramboll Environ
Section 4: Review of Development Needs	Sections 4.1 and 4.6 produced by Ramboll Environ Sections 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 produced by the Councils
Section 5: Strategic Development Sequence	Sections 5.1 and 5.4 produced by Ramboll Environ Sections 5.2 and 5.3 produced by the Councils
Section 6: Site Options	All sections produced by the Councils
Section 7: Strategic Development Alternatives	Sections 7.2 and 7.3 produced by the Councils Sections 7.1, 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 produced by Ramboll Environ
Section 8: Green Belt in the Sustainability Appraisal	All sections produced by Ramboll Environ
Section 9: Reasons for Selection of the Preferred Option	All sections produced by the Councils
Section 10: Proposed Modifications to the Plans	All sections produced by Ramboll Environ
Section 10: Consultation and Next Steps	Sections 11.1, 11.2 and 11.4 produced by Ramboll Environ Section 11.3 produced by the Councils
Appendix 1: Authorship of the Report	Produced by Ramboll Environ
Appendix 2: Relationship of Addendum to previous SA Work	Produced by Ramboll Environ
Appendix 3: Consideration of alternatives supporting the submitted plans – detailed tables	Produced by Ramboll Environ
Appendix 4: Consultation with key environmental bodies	Produced by the Councils
Appendix 5: Local Plan Evidence Review 2015	Produced by the Councils
Appendix 6: Joint Site Assessment Proforma	Produced by the Councils

Appendix 7: Site Appraisals – Edge of Cambridge	Produced by the Councils
Appendix 8: South Cambridgeshire Sites Tested which now have Planning Permission	Produced by the Councils

APPENDIX 2
RELATIONSHIP OF ADDENDUM TO PREVIOUS SA WORK

Table B.1: SEA regulation requirements	
An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme	<p>This can be found in the following SA reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). Section 2.3. • Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (March 2014). Section 2.7. <p>The background to the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans (including their vision and objectives) is also set out in Section 2 of this SA Addendum Report.</p>
An outline of the relationship with other relevant plans and programmes	<p>This can be found in the following SA reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). Part 2 of the SA report outlines the findings of the scoping process. The review of relevant plans and programmes is described in Section 6.1 of Part 2. • Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014). Part 3 of the SA report outlines the findings of the scoping process. This sets out the policy context (relevant plans, policies and programmes) for each SA theme.
The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme	<p>This can be found in the following SA reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). Part 2 of the SA report outlines the findings of the scoping process. Section 6.2 (and the topic appendices 1-13) describes the review of the current and future (without the plan) baseline environment. • Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014). Part 3 of the SA report outlines the findings of the scoping process. This sets out the current baseline situation and the situation without the plan (future baseline) for each SA theme.

Table B.1: SEA regulation requirements	
	<p>Section 3 of this SA addendum outlines new work on SA frameworks that has been undertaken and how this links to the scoping of sustainability issues that was carried out for both SA processes. In addition a number of new evidence studies have been undertaken in response to the Inspectors' concerns. This new evidence supplements the baseline data found in the above reports rather than superseding it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination – Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Further Evidence (2015); • Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study (2015); • Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Viability Update (2015); • Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Study (2015); and • Local Plans CSRM – Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Transport Report (2015).
Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC.	<p>This can be found in the following SA reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). Part 2 of the SA report outlines the findings of the scoping process. Section 6.2 (and the topic appendices 1-13) describes the review of the current and future (without the plan) baseline environment. This includes existing environmental problems and those related to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC. • Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014). Part 3 of the SA report outlines the findings of the scoping process. This sets out the current baseline situation and the situation without the plan (future baseline) for each SA theme. This includes those related to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC.
The environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental, considerations have been taken into	<p>This can be found in the following SA reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). Part 2 of the SA report outlines the findings of the scoping process. The review of relevant plans and programmes (and objectives) is described in Section 6.1 (and the topic appendices 1-13). • Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to

Table B.1: SEA regulation requirements	
account during its preparation	the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014). Part 3 of the SA report outlines the findings of the scoping process. This sets out the policy context (relevant plans, policies, programmes and objectives) for each SA theme.
The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors. (These effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects). The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected	<p>The results of the SA are set out in the following SA reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). Part 3 and the SA Addendum to Part 3 outlines the results of the various elements of the SA. Table 4.1 of Part 3 is particularly useful as it outlines where the results of the different elements of the SA can be found. Part 3 is broken down into appraisal of the development strategy options (Section 3.2.3), appraisal of site options (Section 3.2.4), appraisal of site packages (Section 3.2.5) and appraisal of the Proposed Submission Local Plan (Section 4). • Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014). Part 4 outlines the results of the various elements of the SA broken down into appraisal of the development strategy options (Section 4.2), appraisal of policy options (Section 4.3), appraisal of site options (Section 4.4) and appraisal of the Proposed Submission Local Plan (Section 4.5). <p>Some elements of this work have been superseded by work carried out for this SA Addendum Report and some have remained valid, despite this new work, as follows:</p> <p><u>Review of development needs</u></p> <p>Section 4 of this SA Addendum Report sets out a review of development needs. This section of the report confirms that the assessment of the housing requirements contained in the Submission Draft SA reports remain valid and these can be found on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 198 (paragraph 4.5.8) of the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State; and • Page 3-A210 – A230 (Appendix 5) of the South Cambridgeshire Submission SA report. <p>The work carried out for this SA Addendum Report confirms this assessment and does not supersede it.</p>

Table B.1: SEA regulation requirements	
	<p><u>Review of the strategic development sequence</u></p> <p>Section 5 of this SA Addendum Report sets out a review of the development sequence. It supersedes the assessment carried out in the following places in the Submission Draft SA reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 1 (Reviewing the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Cambridge Area) of the South Cambridgeshire Submission Draft SA report • The Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State¹²¹ in Section 4.2. <p>As well as the above reports it also supersedes the broad assessment that is included in the 2012 evidence document Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Sustainable Development Strategy Review (RD/Strat/040).</p> <p><u>Review of sites</u></p> <p>Section 5 of this SA Addendum Report outlines an assessment of sites. This assessment supersedes any previous site assessments contained in either of the Submission Draft SA reports.</p> <p><u>Review of strategic alternatives</u></p> <p>Section 6 of this SA Addendum Report assesses alternative strategies. This supersedes the assessment of alternative packages that was included as Appendix 4 of the South Cambridgeshire Submission Draft SA report.</p> <p><u>Review of Proposed Modifications</u></p> <p>A number of modifications have been proposed for the Local Plans. Section 10 of this report sets out in detail the implications of these changes to the Submission Draft SA reports.</p>
The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme	<p>This can be found in the following SA reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). Part 3 outlines mitigation measures with details included in the accompanying assessment appendices 5 and 6. • Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014). Part 4 outlines the results of the various

¹²¹ Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014) (Ref: RD/Sub/C/030 – Part 1 and RD/Sub/C/040 – Part 2).

Table B.1: SEA regulation requirements	
	<p>elements of the SA broken down into appraisal of the development strategy options (Section 4.2), appraisal of policy options (Section 4.3), appraisal of site options (Section 4.4) and appraisal of the Proposed Submission Local Plan (Section 4.5) and this includes mitigation measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The only Local Plan modification that has necessitated a new assessment is that of the New Policy E/1b Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension and the mitigation measures suggested are included in Table 10.3
An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with	<p>This can be found in the following SA reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). Annex A sets out Council's reasons for choosing the alternatives dealt with. Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014). Part 4.5 sets out the Council's reasons for choosing the alternatives dealt with. The reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with as part of this SA Addendum Report are outlined in Section 9.
A description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information	<p>This can be found in the following SA reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). Part 3 of the SA report sets out the methodology used. Details are also set out in the Appendices 1, 4, 5 and 6 to Part 3. Difficulties encountered are set out in Section 2.7 of Part 3. Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014). Part 4: Results of the Sustainability Appraisal and the Proposed Monitoring Strategy (Sections 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5. Difficulties encountered are set out in Section 4.7 of Part 4. <p>The methodology employed for the work undertaken at this SA Addendum Report stage is set out in Section 3 of the SA Addendum report. This includes difficulties encountered in this stage of the assessment.</p>
A description of measures envisaged concerning	This can be found in the following SA reports:

Table B.1: SEA regulation requirements	
monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). Part 3 of the SA report sets out details of monitoring measures • Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014): Part 4: Results of the Sustainability Appraisal and the Proposed Monitoring Strategy (Section 4.8). <p>No additional monitoring requirements to those already proposed in the SA of the Submission Draft Local Plans are required to address any effects identified in this SA Addendum Report. Once the Local Plans are adopted a final monitoring programme will be included in the SA Adoption Statements (please see Section 10 of this report for more details).</p>
A non-technical summary (NTS) of the information provided under the above headings	<p>Please see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014): A separate NTS has been produced and is available at the following weblink: https://www.scambs.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/SA%20Non%20Technical%20Summary_0.pdf • Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014): Part 1 sets out the NTS <p>A Non-Technical Summary of this SA Addendum Report has also been produced and is available separately.</p>
The report must include the information that may reasonably be required taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment, the contents and level of detail in the plan or programme, its stage in the decision-making process and the extent to which certain matters are more appropriately assessed at different levels in that process to avoid duplication of the assessment	Both of the SA reports and the SA Addendum Report do this.

Table B.1: SEA regulation requirements	
<p>Consultation:</p> <p>Authorities with environmental responsibility, when deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information which must be included in the environmental report (Art. 5.4)</p> <p>Authorities with environmental responsibility and the public, shall be given an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan or programme and the accompanying environmental report before the adoption of the plan or programme</p>	<p>This can be found in the following SA reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). Consultation undertaken to date on the SA process is summarised in Part 3, Section 2.6. The SA and the Draft Local Plan has been subject to public consultation and consultation with the environmental authorities throughout the plan-making process. The consultation undertaken to date on the SA process is summarised in Part 3 of the SA Report in Section 2.6. • Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014). Details of the consultation carried out are outlined in Part 2: Introduction, Part 3: Scoping Report and Part 4: Results of the Sustainability Appraisal and the Proposed Monitoring Strategy. <p>Section 10 of this SA Addendum Report outlines the consultation that will be carried out at this stage of the SA work.</p>

APPENDIX 3
CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES SUPPORTING THE SUBMITTED PLANS – DETAILED TABLES

Consideration of Alternatives Supporting the submitted plans – detailed tables

Please note that these tables are set out in relation to each document in the Local Plan processes where alternatives could have been set out and assessed. For ease of reference, strategic issues are highlighted in blue and site level issues in green.

These tables relate to site options and strategy issues only. A large number of issues were considered at the issues and options stages and details of how SA considered reasonable alternatives for various issues can be found in the following documents:

- Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State – audit tables can be found in Section 4.5; and
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report – audit tables can be found in Appendix 3.

EVIDENCE DOCUMENTS

Table 2.1: Cambridge & South Cambridgeshire Sustainable Development Strategy Review (SDSR) (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Strategic Planning Unit, November 2012)¹²² https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/sustainable-development-strategy-review.pdf			
What reasonable alternatives were presented?	Outline the reasons for selecting these alternatives.	Were any alternatives labelled as not reasonable – what was the reasoning?	Outline the reasons for selecting the preferred approach¹²³
Section 4 of the SDSR sets out broad spatial options in the development sequence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the built up area of Cambridge; • On the edge of Cambridge; • One or more new settlements; • Within or adjoining market towns; and • At sustainable villages. 	Para 42 of the SDSR discusses the fact that the development sequence reflects the principles of sustainable development that were tested as part of the Local Plan examinations ¹²⁴ Given the local authorities’ commitment to these principles, this document follows a similar approach to the sequence of development.	No	The findings are that overall the most sustainable focus for development is within and on the edge of Cambridge; development in market towns scores broadly the same as development of new settlements, with recognition that large free-standing developments present delivery challenges over long timescales. Development at the more sustainable villages is confirmed as the least sustainable location which, depending on the scale of development involved, can be mitigated

¹²² Please note that this document is an evidence document only. It does not form part of the Local Plan.

¹²³ Please note that the performance of an option against SA criteria forms only one part of the decision making process. The purpose of SA is to provide information on the implications of different courses of action.

¹²⁴ The current sustainable development strategy was extensively scrutinised and challenged during its evolution through the regional plan and structure plan into the Cambridge Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (LDF). Independent planning inspectors confirmed it as the most sustainable development strategy for the two Districts to 2016 and beyond.

Table 2.1: Cambridge & South Cambridgeshire Sustainable Development Strategy Review (SDSR) (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Strategic Planning Unit, November 2012)¹²² https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/sustainable-development-strategy-review.pdf			
What reasonable alternatives were presented?	Outline the reasons for selecting these alternatives.	Were any alternatives labelled as not reasonable – what was the reasoning?	Outline the reasons for selecting the preferred approach¹²³
The Cambridgeshire authorities, together with Peterborough City Council, then agreed a Memorandum of Co-operation which was published in May 2013. The Memorandum demonstrates that the full objectively assessed needs of the Cambridge Sub-Region housing market area identified in the SHMA will be met.			by access to good quality public transport (<i>para 5.1 of the SDSR</i>). Para 5.3 of the SDSR also makes it clear that 'Detailed assessments will need to be undertaken in relation to development options and transport capacity at different locations, as well as critical policy issues such as the effect of development on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it'.'

ISSUES AND OPTIONS 1 – CAMBRIDGE

Table 2.2: Cambridge Local Plan - Towards 2031. Issues & Options Report (Cambridge City Council, June 2012) https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/docs/local-plan-review-issues-and-options-report.pdf			
What reasonable alternatives were presented?	Outline the reasons for selecting these alternatives.	Were any alternatives labelled as not reasonable – what was the reasoning?	Outline the reasons for selecting the preferred approach
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 2: 12,700 new homes to 2031 – „urban growth“ – only option that requires no development of Green Belt Option 3: Up to 14,000 new homes to 2031 – „the current development strategy“ Option 4: Up to 21,000 new homes to 2031 – „enhanced levels of urban 	Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State (July 2013, URS Limited) – para 4.5.6 sets out a detailed justification for the selection of these alternatives based on scenario’s suggested by the SHLAA figures, evidence presented in the East of England Plan review, Inner Green Belt Study Review 2012 and other capacity	No	The preferred approach chosen was 14,000 homes. Reasons for selection of the preferred approach are shown in para 4.5.7 onwards of the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State - Volume 1

Table 2.2: Cambridge Local Plan - Towards 2031. Issues & Options Report (Cambridge City Council, June 2012) https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/docs/local-plan-review-issues-and-options-report.pdf			
What reasonable alternatives were presented?	Outline the reasons for selecting these alternatives.	Were any alternatives labelled as not reasonable – what was the reasoning?	Outline the reasons for selecting the preferred approach
<p>and Green Belt growth"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 5: Up to 25,000 new homes to 2031 - „significantly increased levels of urban and Green Belt growth " 	evidence.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 6 – Plan for 10,000 new jobs to 2031 Option 7 – Plan for 15,000 new jobs to 2031 Option 8 – Plan for 20,000 new jobs to 2031 	Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State (July 2013, URS Limited) page 414 sets out a detailed justification for the selection of these alternatives based on forecast levels of jobs growth and considering how these will impact on Cambridge’s economy.	No	The preferred approach chosen was 22,100 jobs. Reasons for selection of the preferred approach are shown on page 414 of the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State - Volume 1
<p><u>Development Strategy</u></p> <p>Comments were sought in relation to whether the current development strategy remained the soundest basis for development in Cambridge for the period to 2031. The report looked at options for continued development within the urban area as well as exploring whether there should be further development on the edge in the Green Belt. This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether there should be more development than is already committed in the 2006 Local Plan on the edge of Cambridge? Should more land be released from the Green Belt? If so, where should this be? Ten 	<p>The ten broad locations, which covered the whole Inner Green Belt boundary surrounding Cambridge, were subject to appraisal as part of the Interim SA Report, which identified both positive and negative impacts associated with each of the broad locations (see Table 4.1, pages 158-164 of RD/Sub/C/030). At this stage, no decision was taken on whether any sites within the broad locations should be put forward for development.</p> <p>Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State (July 2013, URS Limited) (see Table on page 415) sets out a detailed justification for the</p>	No	<p>Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State (July 2013, URS Limited) (see discussion on page 415) sets out the reasoning for alternatives taken forward.</p> <p>As a result of the SA, and consultation responses to the Issues and Options Report, none of these areas were dismissed at this stage and sites within all of these areas were subsequently assessed.</p> <p>The preferred approach to the Development Strategy being taken forward by both authorities follows the sequence of:</p>

Table 2.2: Cambridge Local Plan - Towards 2031. Issues & Options Report (Cambridge City Council, June 2012) https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/docs/local-plan-review-issues-and-options-report.pdf			
What reasonable alternatives were presented?	Outline the reasons for selecting these alternatives.	Were any alternatives labelled as not reasonable – what was the reasoning?	Outline the reasons for selecting the preferred approach
broad locations ¹²⁵ around Cambridge were included in the consultation document.	selection of these alternatives. This document states “All possible locations at the edge of Cambridge (including areas which straddle the boundary with South Cambridgeshire District Council) were identified.”		1. Development within the existing urban area of Cambridge; 2. Development within the defined fringe sites on the edge of Cambridge; 3. Development within six small-scale Green Belt sites proposed to be released from the inner Green Belt boundary; 4. Development within existing and newly identified new settlement locations at Cambourne, Northstowe, Bourn Airfield and Waterbeach; and 5. Development in identified villages. Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State (July 2013, URS Limited) includes Section 4.2 on Reviewing the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Cambridge Area. This outlines in detail the reasons for selecting the preferred approach.

ISSUES AND OPTIONS 1 – SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE

¹²⁵ Broad Location 1: Land to the North & South of Barton Road, Broad Location 2: Playing Fields off Grantchester Road Newnham, Broad Location 3: Land West of Trumpington Road, Broad Location 4: Land west of Hauxton Road, Broad Location 5: Land South of Addenbrookes Road, Broad Location 6: Land South of Addenbrooke’s and Southwest of Babraham Road, Broad Location 7: Land between Babraham Road and Fulbourn Road, Broad Location 8: Land East of Gazelle Way, Broad Location 9: Land at Fen Ditton, Broad Location 10: Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road.

Table 2.3: South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Issues & Options Report (South Cambridgeshire District Council, July 2012): https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/local-plan-historic-consultations			
What reasonable alternatives were presented?	Outline the reasons for selecting these alternatives.	Were any alternatives labelled as not reasonable – what was the reasoning?	Outline the reasons for selecting the preferred approach
<u>Development Strategy (Issue 9)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge focus (would require a review of the Green Belt) • New Settlement focus • Sustainable Villages focus (would require a review of the Green Belt) • Combination of the above 	<p>The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report includes an Appendix 1 – Reviewing the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Cambridge Area (which is reviewed in more detail in the table below) and this sets out in detail why strategy options have been selected for testing.</p>	No	<p>The preferred approach to the Development Strategy being taken forward by both authorities follows the sequence of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development within the existing urban area of Cambridge; 2. Development within the defined fringe sites on the edge of Cambridge; 3. Development within six small-scale Green Belt sites proposed to be released from the inner Green Belt boundary; 4. Development within existing and newly identified new settlement locations at Cambourne, Northstowe, Bourn Airfield and Waterbeach; and 5. Development in identified villages. <p>The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report includes an Appendix 1 – Reviewing the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Cambridge Area. This outlines in detail the reasons for selecting the preferred approach.</p>
<u>Broad locations for growth in the Green Belt (Issue 12)</u> 10 broad locations have been identified	<p>For the purposes of completeness, all broad locations on the edge of the city are addressed in the consultation (para</p>	No	<p>As a result of the SA, and consultation responses to the Issues and Options Report none of these areas were</p>

Table 2.3: South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Issues & Options Report (South Cambridgeshire District Council, July 2012): https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/local-plan-historic-consultations			
What reasonable alternatives were presented?	Outline the reasons for selecting these alternatives.	Were any alternatives labelled as not reasonable – what was the reasoning?	Outline the reasons for selecting the preferred approach
at the edge of Cambridge. One of these falls entirely within the City boundary, three fall in South Cambridgeshire District Council and the others straddle the boundary.	4.28 of South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Issues & Options Report (South Cambridgeshire District Council, July 2012)).		dismissed at this stage and sites within all of these areas were subsequently assessed (further detail in Annex A Audit Trail Chapter 2 pages A112 to A119) ¹²⁶
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower housing growth - additional 4,300 dwellings (equal to 925 dwellings per year) or an additional target of 18,500 dwellings Medium housing growth - additional 6,800 dwellings (equates to 1,050 dwellings per year) or an additional target of 21,500 dwellings High housing growth - additional 9,300 dwellings (equate to 1,175 dwellings per year) or an additional target of 23,500 dwellings <p>(outlined as Issue 4)</p>	<p>The forecasting models and past trends in population growth have been used to identify housing options reflect the alternative jobs growth options set out at Issue 3, and the aim to achieve a better balance between homes and jobs (para 3.16 of South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Issues & Options Report (South Cambridgeshire District Council, July 2012)).</p> <p>Sections 3.18 to 3.20 outline the reasoning for selection of each of the three options.</p> <p>Further information on the forecasting, and how it has informed the options, can be found in the Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report.</p>	Forecasts for natural population growth over the new plan period would require an additional 8,400 dwellings to be built. However, to plan only for this level of growth would not support the predicted growth in the economy and would either stifle the economic growth or lead to increased commuting through the district with adverse impacts on sustainable development (para 3.17 of South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Issues & Options Report (South Cambridgeshire District Council, July 2012))	<p>The preferred approach chosen was 19,000 homes.</p> <p>This reflected the objectively assessed needs identified in the Cambridgeshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment for the District identified the Objectively Assessed Need as 19,000.</p> <p>Reasons for selecting the preferred approach are set out in Appendix 3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014), (and further detail in Annex A Audit Trail Chapter 2 pages A65 to A87)¹²⁷</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower jobs growth – 14,000 additional jobs over the Plan period 	See para 3.5 – 3.12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Issues &	No	The preferred approach chosen was 22,000 jobs.

¹²⁶ <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/draft-final-sustainability-appraisal-report-and-habitat-regulations-assessment-screening>

¹²⁷ <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/draft-final-sustainability-appraisal-report-and-habitat-regulations-assessment-screening>

Table 2.3: South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Issues & Options Report (South Cambridgeshire District Council, July 2012): https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/local-plan-historic-consultations			
What reasonable alternatives were presented?	Outline the reasons for selecting these alternatives.	Were any alternatives labelled as not reasonable – what was the reasoning?	Outline the reasons for selecting the preferred approach
<p>(700 jobs per year)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium jobs growth - 23,100 additional jobs over the Plan period (1,200 jobs per year) • High jobs growth - 29,200 additional jobs over the Plan period (1,500 jobs per year) <p>(outlined as Issue 3)</p>	<p>Options Report (South Cambridgeshire District Council, July 2012) for an outline of the reasoning for selection of the three options.</p> <p>In order to consider appropriate targets, the Council has explored evidence on how the economy is likely to develop over the next 20 years, and the impact this will have on the number of jobs. This is done through economic forecasting, using complex data on past growth rates, national and regional economic prospects, and growth sectors, to anticipate future growth.</p>		<p>The figure chosen is close to the medium option considered. The Council considers this will support the Cambridge Cluster and provide for the creation of a diverse range of local jobs.</p> <p>Reasons for selecting the preferred approach are set out in Appendix 3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014), (and further detail in Annex A Audit Trail Chapter 2 pages A51 to A65)¹²⁸</p>
<p>The council has identified a number of site options across the District for consultation that could potentially provide housing (para 5.3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Issues & Options Report (South Cambridgeshire District Council, July 2012))</p> <p>This draws on the SHLAA which selected 300+sites for assessment. All 300+ site proformas are included in annex B of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report</p> <p>A shortlist of 52 sites is then presented</p>	<p>Site options were identified through SHLAA (this ranges from sites for new settlements to small village sites)</p> <p>Sites were required to meet criteria for inclusion in SHLAA. Sites at Infill villages were not considered. SHLAA page 25 'the Council does not consider that in planning policy terms there is any realistic prospect of sites in the smallest villages in the district, with very limited local services and facilities and lacking for example even a primary</p>	<p>No – all 300+ sites that were submitted were subject to testing both through the SHLAA and the SA process.</p> <p>Sites capable of less than 10 dwellings, and sites at Infill villages were rejected and not tested through the SHLAA or SA.</p>	<p>The site testing was used to select the preferred sites. Summary tables drew on SHLAA and SA information, to determine if sites were red/amber/green (see Annex 2 of the Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report, and also included in South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report Annex B (M)). Red sites were rejected. Group Village sites were also rejected. Amber and green sites were subject to consultation through issues and options.</p>

¹²⁸ <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/draft-final-sustainability-appraisal-report-and-habitat-regulations-assessment-screening>

Table 2.3: South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Issues & Options Report (South Cambridgeshire District Council, July 2012): https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/local-plan-historic-consultations			
What reasonable alternatives were presented?	Outline the reasons for selecting these alternatives.	Were any alternatives labelled as not reasonable – what was the reasoning?	Outline the reasons for selecting the preferred approach
as part of Issue 16 of the issues and options report.	school, being suitable for allocation through the plan making process. Therefore the Assessment will not consider sites in Infill villages, as defined in the Core Strategy 2007.'		Please note that in addition to the above site testing further testing was carried out on 8 site packages (please see Appendix 4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report for the detailed results and Appendix 1, section 3.25 and 3.2.6 for a summary of the work that was completed). Option 8 (edge of Cambridge, Waterbeach New Town, Cambourne West and Village Focus) was selected as the preferred option. Appendix 1 section 3.2.6 sets out the reasons for selecting the sites selected.

Table 2.4: Issues and Options 2: Part 1 – Joint Consultation Development Strategy and Site options on the Edge of Cambridge (Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, January 2013)

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/issues-options-2-joint-consultation-document.pdf>

What reasonable alternatives were presented?	Outline the reasons for selecting these alternatives	Were any alternatives labelled as not reasonable - what was the reasoning?	Outline the reasons for selecting the preferred approach
<p>Chapters 1-8 of the issues and options report discusses the strategy and poses the question Question 1: Where do you think the appropriate balance lies between protecting land on the edge of Cambridge that is of high significance to Green Belt purposes and delivering development away from Cambridge in new settlements and at better served villages? Alternative strategies are not discussed.</p> <p>Chapter 9 of the document presents 41 sites within the ten broad locations already selected on the edge of Cambridge</p> <p>Question 3 asks “Do you have any comments on the sites rejected by the Council”.</p> <p>Rejected Green Belt sites were included within Appendices 3 and 4.</p>	<p>The selection had regard to the comments submitted in response to the summer 2012 consultation on ten broad locations in the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge. The sites assessed are those that were submitted to the Councils as part of their ‘call for sites’ when preparing their respective SHLAA and any land identified through the Inner Green Belt Study Review 2012 as fulfilling Green Belt purposes to a lesser degree (<i>para 9.1 of Issues and Options 2: Part 1 – Joint Consultation Development Strategy and Site options on the Edge of Cambridge (Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, January 2013)</i>).</p>	<p>Other sites in the Green Belt (other than those that were found through the Inner Green Belt Study Review 2012 to be fulfilling Green Belt purposes to a lesser degree). The reasoning for this is set out in <i>para 8.5 of Issues and Options 2: Part 1 – Joint Consultation Development Strategy (Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, January 2013)</i>. “On balance, the Councils have concluded that it is not appropriate at this time to consider large Green Belt releases on the edge of Cambridge that would cause significant harm to the Green Belt, but will work together to seek to maximise the delivery of housing in and on the edge of Cambridge that maintains Green Belt purposes”. Other references include: <i>South Cambs SA part 3 section 2.6.1</i> - The detrimental impacts of further major development on the edge of Cambridge was demonstrated in the Inner Green Belt Study Review 2012 and major extensions to Cambridge were rejected as reasonable options because of their impacts on the Green Belt and not consulted on in Issues and Options 2 in 2013.</p> <p>The sites were jointly assessed by the Councils using the fringe sites pro forma and those sites</p>	<p>Following this assessment, six sites were identified as having development potential. All six sites scored amber overall. Other sites were rejected at this stage. These were the sites consulted upon as part of the Issues and Options 2 consultation (see Section 3.1.3 of the Issues and Options 2, Part 1 Joint SA Report).</p> <p>These sites were selected and formed part of the Draft Plans. Rejected Green Belt site options were listed in Appendix 4, including summary reasons for rejection. Detailed site testing was included in the Technical Document to accompany the Issues and Options Report.</p>

Table 2.4: Issues and Options 2: Part 1 – Joint Consultation Development Strategy and Site options on the Edge of Cambridge (Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, January 2013)

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/issues-options-2-joint-consultation-document.pdf>

What reasonable alternatives were presented?	Outline the reasons for selecting these alternatives	Were any alternatives labelled as not reasonable - what was the reasoning?	Outline the reasons for selecting the preferred approach
		that scored either amber or green overall were taken forward as 'reasonable' options and those that scored red overall were considered 'unreasonable options' (Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State – para 4.4.12).	

ISSUES AND OPTIONS 2– CAMBRIDGE

Table 2.5: Cambridge Local Plan – Towards 2031. Issues And Options 2. Part 2 Site Options Within Cambridge (Cambridge City Council, January 2013)
<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/issues-options-2-joint-consultation-document.pdf>

What reasonable alternatives were presented?	Outline the reasons for selecting these alternatives	Were any alternatives labelled as not reasonable - what was the reasoning?	Outline the reasons for selecting the preferred approach
<p>From an initial shortlist of 59 sites, 34 reasonable site options were identified, of which 21 were new sites representing a mix of uses.</p>	<p>A number of sources were used to arrive at a list of sites to assess and this is reported in Section 1.5 of the Issues and Options 2, Part 2 document and also in paragraphs 4.4.15 – 4.4.22 of the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State (July 2013, URS Limited). This included the Inner Green Belt Boundary Study 2001, Green Belt Study 2002 and the Inner Green Belt Study Review 2012, any sites submitted by landowners and their agent and the SHLAA, which assessed around 900 sites and involved two calls for sites and three stages of public consultation including engagement with landowners, developers and agents. In accordance with guidance on SA of options¹²⁹ sites were progressively filtered and assessed.</p>	<p>A pro forma was developed to assess each site and this pro-forma included SA issues and was developed jointly with the SA consultants (<i>see para 1.7 of the Issues and Options 2, Part 2 document</i>).</p> <p>The first part of the pro forma is a high level sieve (Level 1). It contains the criteria which could potentially prevent any development of the site, for example the site is within the flood plain. If a 'show stopper' is identified, the site may not need to be progressed to assessment under the second part of the pro forma (Level 2) (<i>see Section 1.11 of the Issues and Options 2, Part 2 document</i>).</p> <p>All of those sites that proceeded through level 1 were then assessed by Cambridge City Council using the City Sites pro forma. Sites that scored 'amber' or 'green' as the overall conclusion across the Level 1 and Level 2 criteria are considered by the Council to be 'reasonable' options for allocation. All of these sites were then subjected to sustainability appraisal.</p>	<p>Of the 34 reasonable site options, a shortlist of 21 new residential sites were taken forward which contribute towards the overall supply in the urban area.</p> <p>Please note that between Issues and Options 2 and Proposed Submission, two additional sites were added (please see paragraphs 4.4.52 – 4.4.55 and tables 4.15, 4.16 and 4.17 of the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State (July 2013, URS Limited)). These sites were R44 Betjeman House and U3 Grange Farm. These were added following representations made to the Issues and Options 2 consultation and further discussions with landowners</p> <p>The sites which scored 'red' in</p>

¹²⁹ Planning Advisory Service. Principles of Plan Making. Chapter 6: The role of Sustainability Appraisal. Available at www.pas.gov.uk

Table 2.5: Cambridge Local Plan – Towards 2031. Issues And Options 2. Part 2 Site Options Within Cambridge (Cambridge City Council, January 2013)

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/issues-options-2-joint-consultation-document.pdf>

What reasonable alternatives were presented?	Outline the reasons for selecting these alternatives	Were any alternatives labelled as not reasonable - what was the reasoning?	Outline the reasons for selecting the preferred approach
			<p>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 the SA. These rejected sites and their reasons for rejection were included at Appendix 1 of the Issues and Options 2 Part 2 document (Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State (July 2013, URS Limited)– para 4.4.19)</p>

ISSUES AND OPTIONS 2 – SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE

Table 2.6: Issues and Options 2: Part 2: South Cambridgeshire Further Site Options (South Cambridgeshire District Council, January 2013)

https://www.scambs.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Pt2%20Front%20Cover%20&%20Contents_0.pdf

What reasonable alternatives were presented?	Outline the reasons for selecting these alternatives	Were any alternatives labelled as not reasonable - what was the reasoning?	Outline the reasons for selecting the preferred approach
<p>In this Part 2 of the Issues and Options 2 the Council has carefully considered the comments made in response to the 2012 Issues and Options consultation that suggest further potential site options for housing in the district (para 2.4 of the Issues and Options 2: Part 2: South Cambridgeshire Further Site Options (South Cambridgeshire District Council, January 2013))</p> <p>The new additional site options are all at the larger and better served villages (para. 2.7 of the Issues and Options 2: Part 2: South Cambridgeshire Further Site Options (South Cambridgeshire District Council, January 2013))</p>	<p>Key selection criteria are given as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether they are large enough to allocate in the Local Plan – a minimum of 10 dwellings; • Whether the proposal is in a sustainable location, meaning it is at a town or village having good services and facilities and has good access to public transport; • Whether development of the site would affect any townscape, biodiversity, heritage assets; • The viability of development; • Whether it could be relied upon to deliver over the plan period; and • Whether a site option would involve the loss of an existing employment area, in which case highlighting that this needs to be carefully balanced with wider employment objectives. 	<p>The council has taken the view that any new sites suggested at smaller villages (Group and Infill villages) are not considered suitable in principle for possible allocation. This takes account of the fewer services and facilities and less good public transport at these villages and also have been identified as having a significant number of dwellings potentially available at a range of sites in more sustainable locations (para. 2.7 of the Issues and Options 2: Part 2: South Cambridgeshire Further Site Options (South Cambridgeshire District Council, January 2013))</p>	<p>The SA assessment information was used to determine if sites were red/amber/green. Red sites were rejected. Amber and green subject to consultation through issues and options.</p> <p>10 new site options for consultation were outlined in Issue 1 of the Issues and Options 2: Part 2: South Cambridgeshire Further Site Options (South Cambridgeshire District Council, January 2013). Site options were</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne • Histon & Impington • Sawston (4 sites) • Melbourn (2 sites) • Waterbeach • Comberton

APPENDIX 4
CONSULTATION WITH KEY ENVIRONMENTAL BODIES

Throughout the SA process the Councils have consulted with the statutory bodies with environmental responsibilities: Environment Agency, Natural England, and English Heritage (now called Historic England), who have a key role in ensuring it addresses environmental issues appropriately.

The Councils individually consulted the key bodies on their Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Reports in 2011, prior to the Issues and Options process. Environmental bodies were also consulted at Issues and Options stage on the Initial / Interim Sustainability Appraisals, and on the Draft Final SA at the pre-submission stage. For completeness, the three key bodies were consulted in September 2015 on the new SA framework used to assess strategic issues and the new joint testing proforma used in the SA Addendum 2015. Their responses, and the Councils response is as follows:

<p>Natural England</p> <p>The site scoring criteria appear to address all the key environmental issues within our remit including protection of statutorily designated sites, protection and enhancement of biodiversity (including net gain, habitat restoration / reduction of habitat fragmentation), protected species, soils/BMV land, landscape, green infrastructure (including maintenance/enhancement of connectivity and access). Consideration of related issues such as maintenance / enhancement of air quality, noise, light and water pollution, recognition of the role of the Green Belt, preference for development on brownfield land (PDL), sustainable travel are all welcomed.</p> <p>It seems reasonable at this stage that criteria, such as those relating to minimising contributions to climate change and implementation of sustainable drainage, are considered N/A – presumably these will be tested at the more detailed stage of the plan making process.</p> <p>The only substantive comment I have is that the NPPF (Annex 2) defines BMV land Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) grades 1, 2 and 3a. Currently the site scoring table refers to BMV land as Grades 1 and 2 only hence it would seem appropriate to amend this to 'Grades 1, 2 and 3a' to reflect the NPPF definition.</p>
<p>RESPONSE: Comments noted.</p> <p>Maps produced by DEFRA identify that most of South Cambridgeshire's farmland is in the higher grades of the Agricultural Land Grades 1, 2 and 3a are the grades which comprise the best and most versatile land which is a national resource. The DEFRA maps do not divide zone 3 into a and b. The focus of the appraisal will be on grade 1 and 2. Loss of 20 hectares or more would be considered significant, reflecting the threshold used for referring planning applications to DEFRA.</p>

<p>Environment Agency</p> <p>Contamination – refer to as 'previously contaminative use'</p> <p>Contamination - Consider defining buffer zones e.g. site located on contaminated land, site located within 50m of contaminated lands; site within 100m of contaminated land; site within 250m of contaminated land; site within 500m of contaminated land</p> <p>Groundwater Protection Zones should also be identified as a criteria.</p>
--

RESPONSE: Comments noted

Contamination – Comments identify where there is suspected contaminated land within the vicinity as well as on the site itself. An additional criteria is not required.

Groundwater Protection zones was considered to inform the scoring of the water criteria.

Historic England

Historic England welcome the addendum which will help ensure consistency across sites tested. I can also advise that Historic England agree with the proposed joint scoring methods relating to the Historic Environment.

Historic England particularly welcomes the appraisal criteria relating to the Green Belt and the City's Historic Setting. In terms of the scoring method, we would question, for example, what would constitute a 'Significant Negative' and just a 'Negative' effect, likewise between the 'Minor Positive' and 'Significant Positive' effects, and consider it would be helpful to have some definition in this regard for clarity.

RESPONSE: Comments noted

Each of the scores is accompanied by a commentary. The SA provides more information for each site on why the scoring has been identified as significant or minor. It draws on other evidence where appropriate, such as the Inner Green Belt Review studies.

APPENDIX 5
LOCAL PLAN EVIDENCE REVIEW 2015

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination – Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Further Evidence

This builds on the Cambridge Sub Region Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), and applies further consideration to Planning Practice Guidance regarding market signals, particularly in relation to affordability, considers any implications of the 2012-based DCLG household projections, and whether any adjustment in the current identified housing requirement for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire is necessary.

Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study 2015

The study provides an independent assessment of the Inner Green Belt Boundary in relation to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. It explores the various qualities that can be attributed to the Cambridge Green Belt, and provides a methodology to assess how land in the Inner Cambridge Green Belt performs against Green Belt purposes.

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Viability Update 2015

This is an update of the viability assessments to ensure that the inputs and findings are consistent with other local plan evidence and studies, provides changes to any key inputs (such as land and build costs), and significant changes in funding such as the City Deal. It also considers the impacts of changes to government policy, for example the removal of the Code for Sustainable Homes. This work will join up with further work being undertaken on the Infrastructure Delivery Study.

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015

This is an update to the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Study, using up to date information on infrastructure delivery, costs, and sources of funding. It takes account of progress related to City Deal transport schemes, and the availability of City Deal funding, as well as providing more information related to the delivery of major development sites.

Local Plans CSRM Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Transport Report

This is a consolidated and enhanced Modelling Report / Local Plan Transport Assessment', pulling together existing evidence and new modelling work. This includes new (phase 2) model runs, which test development strategy options with significant edge of Cambridge development for comparison on like for like basis with new settlement or village focused development strategies.

Delivery of Major Transport Infrastructure

On the A428 corridor (Cambourne, Bourn Airfield) additional studies have been undertaken as part of City Deal work on options to deliver public transport / cycling improvements in advance of public consultation in the autumn. These identify route options and estimated costs. Additional work is being undertaken to provide further information on feasibility and delivery.

For the A10 north corridor (Waterbeach New Town), a transport study is commencing on transport infrastructure, phasing and delivery. This will be available to feed in to the plan making process in Spring 2016.

APPENDIX 6
JOINT SITE ASSESSMENT PROFORMA

JOINT SITE ASSESSMENT PROFORMA

Site Information	
Development Sequence	e.g. Edge of Cambridge (Broad Location 1), Rural Centre
Site reference number(s):	
Consultation Reference numbers:	
Site name/address:	
Map:	
Site description:	
Current use(s):	
Proposed use(s):	
Site size (ha): South Cambridgeshire: Cambridge:	
Potential residential capacity:	

LAND			
PDL	Would development make use of previously developed land?		RED = Not on PDL AMBER = Partially on PDL GREEN = Entirely on PDL
Agricultural Land	Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?		RED = Significant loss (20 ha or more) of grades 1 and 2 land AMBER = Minor loss of grade 1 and 2 land GREEN = Neutral. Development would not affect grade 1 and 2 land.
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		RED = Site or a significant part of it falls within an allocated or safeguarded area, development would have significant negative impacts AMBER = Site or a significant part of it falls within an allocated or safeguarded area, development would have minor negative impacts GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.
POLLUTION			

Air Quality	Would the development of the sites result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?		<p>RED = Site lies near source of air pollution, or development could impact on air quality, significant adverse impacts</p> <p>AMBER = Site lies near source of air pollution, or development could impact on air quality adverse impacts.</p> <p>GREEN = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact.</p>
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		<p>SUB INDICATOR: Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?</p> <p>RED = Within or adjacent to an AQMA, M11 or A14</p> <p>AMBER = <1000m of an AQMA, M11 or A14</p> <p>GREEN = >1000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14</p>
Pollution	Are there potential odour, light, noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator (including compatibility with neighbouring uses)?		<p>RED = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>AMBER = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation</p> <p>GREEN = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation</p> <p>DARK GREEN = Would remove existing significant source of pollution.</p>
Contamination	Is there possible contamination on the site?		<p>RED = 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</p> <p>AMBER = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development (potential to achieve benefits subject to appropriate mitigation)</p> <p>GREEN = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination</p>
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		<p>RED = Development has potential to effect water quality, with significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation.</p> <p>AMBER = Development has potential to affect water quality, with minor negative impacts incapable of</p>

			<p>mitigation. GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation DARK GREEN = Would remove existing source of water pollution with significant positive impact</p>
BIODIVERSITY			
Designated Sites	<p>Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)</p>		<p>RED = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species and impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation AMBER = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation GREEN = Does not contain, is not adjacent to designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species, or local area will be developed as greenspace. No or negligible impacts</p>
Biodiversity	<p>Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets, and maintain connectivity between green infrastructure)?</p>		<p>RED = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links incapable of appropriate mitigation AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation GREEN = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links</p>
TPO	<p>Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?</p>		<p>RED = Development likely to have a significant adverse impact on the protected trees incapable of appropriate mitigation AMBER = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation GREEN = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees</p>
Green Infrastructure	<p>Will it improve access to wildlife</p>		<p>RED = Development involves a loss of existing green infrastructure which is</p>

	and green spaces, through delivery of and access to green infrastructure?		incapable of appropriate mitigation. AMBER = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation GREEN = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure
LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		RED = Significant negative impact on landscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible. AMBER = negative impact on landscape character, incapable of mitigation. GREEN = No impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local landscape character, or provide minor improvements) DARK GREEN = Development would relate to local landscape character and offer significant opportunities for landscape enhancement
Townscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?		RED = Significant negative impact on townscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible. AMBER = negative impact on townscape character, incapable of mitigation. GREEN = No impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local townscape character, or provide minor improvements) DARK GREEN = Development would relate to local townscape character and offer significant opportunities for townscape enhancement
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		DARK RED: Very high and high impacts on Greenbelt purposes (very significant negative impact) RED = High / medium impacts on Greenbelt purposes (significant negative impact) AMBER = Medium and medium/minor impacts on Greenbelt purposes GREEN = No or negligible impact or positive impact on Green Belt purposes
Heritage	Will it protect or		RED = Site contains, is adjacent to, or

	enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments)?		within the setting of such sites, buildings and features, with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation AMBER = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such sites, buildings and features, with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation GREEN = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, sites or features, and there is no impact to the setting DARK GREEN = Significant opportunities for enhancement
CLIMATE CHANGE			
Renewables	Will it support the use of renewable energy resources?		AMBER = Standard requirements for renewables would apply GREEN = Development would create additional opportunities for renewable energy. DARK GREEN = Development would create significant additional opportunities for renewable energy.
Flood Risk	Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding, and account for all costs of flooding (including the economic, environmental and social costs)?		RED = Flood Zone 3 / high risk AMBER = Flood Zone 2 / medium risk GREEN = Flood Zone 1 / low risk
HUMAN HEALTH AND WELL BEING			
Open Space	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space?		RED = 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, or would lead to loss of openspace without suitable replacement. AMBER = The site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of OS. GREEN = Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite DARK GREEN = Development would create the opportunity to deliver significantly enhanced provision of new

			public open spaces in excess of adopted plan standards.
Distance: Outdoor Sport Facilities	How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?		RED = >3km AMBER = 1 - 3km GREEN = <1km; or allocation is not housing
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		RED =>800m AMBER =400 -800m GREEN =<400m
Gypsy & Traveller	Will it provide for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?		RED = Would result in loss of existing sites AMBER = No Impact GREEN = Would deliver additional pitches
Distance: District or Local Centre	How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?		R =>800m A =400 - 800m G =<400m
Distance: City Centre	How far is the site from edge of defined Cambridge City Centre?		R =>800m A =400 - 800m G =<400m
Distance: GP Service	How far is the nearest health centre or GP service?		R =>800m A =400 - 800m G =<400m
Key Local Facilities	Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?)		RED = Development would result in loss of an existing facilities, major negative impact. AMBER = No impact on facilities (or satisfactory mitigation proposed). GREEN = New local facilities or improved existing facilities are proposed of significant benefit
Community Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		RED = Allocation would lead to loss of community facilities GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement /appropriate mitigation possible
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing		RED = Limited scope for integration with existing communities / isolated and/or separated by non-residential land uses

	communities?		<p>AMBER = Adequate scope for integration with existing communities</p> <p>GREEN = Good scope for integration with existing communities / of sufficient scale to create a new community.</p>
ECONOMY			
Deprivation (Cambridge)	Does it address pockets of income and employment deprivation particularly in Abbey Ward and Kings Hedges? Would allocation result in development in deprived wards of Cambridge?		<p>AMBER = Not within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.</p> <p>GREEN = Within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Local Super Output Areas (LSOA) within Cambridge</p>
Shopping	Will it protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres?		<p>RED = Significant negative effect on vitality or viability of existing centres.</p> <p>AMBER = Negative effect on vitality or viability of existing centres.</p> <p>GREEN = No effect or would support the vitality and viability of existing centres</p>
Employment - Accessibility	How far is the nearest main employment centre?		<p>How far is the nearest main employment centre?</p> <p>RED = >3km</p> <p>AMBER = 1-3km</p> <p>GREEN = <1km or allocation is for or includes a significant element of employment or is for another non-residential use</p>
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		<p>R = Significant loss of employment land and job opportunities not mitigated by alternative allocation in the area (> 50%)</p> <p>A = Some loss of employment land and job opportunities mitigated by alternative allocation in the area (< 50%).</p> <p>G = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development</p> <p>GG = Development would significantly enhance employment opportunities</p>
Utilities	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and		<p>RED = Significant upgrades likely to be required but constraints incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>AMBER = Significant upgrades likely to</p>

	infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?		be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation GREEN = Existing infrastructure likely to be sufficient
Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education capacity?		RED = School capacity not sufficient, constraints cannot be appropriately mitigated. AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated GREEN= Non-residential development / surplus school places
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		R =>800m A =400 - 800m G =<400m
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		R = Greater than 3km A =1 to 3 km G = Within 1km (or site large enough to provide new)
TRANSPORT			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		DARK RED = no cycling provision and traffic speeds >30mph with high vehicular traffic volume. RED = 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. AMBER = Medium quality off-road path. GREEN = 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. DARK GREEN = Quiet residential street designed for 20mph speeds, high quality off-road paths with good segregation from pedestrians, uni-directional hybrid cycle lanes. GG = Quiet residential street designed for 20mph speeds, high quality off-road paths with good segregation from pedestrians, uni-directional hybrid cycle lanes.

HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		RED = Service does not meet the requirements of a high quality public transport (HQPT) AMBER = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances GREEN = High quality public transport service
Sustainable Transport Score (SCDC)	Scoring mechanism has been developed to consider access to and quality of public transport, and cycling. Scores determined by the four criteria below.		RED = Score 0-4 from 4 criteria below AMBER = Score 5-9 from 4 criteria below YELLOW = Score 10-14 from 4 criteria below GREEN = Score 15-19 from 4 criteria below DARK GREEN = Score 19-25
Distance: bus stop / rail station			R= Beyond 1000m (0) A = Within 1000m (2) 0 = Within 800m (3) G = Within 600m (4) GG = Within 400m (6)
Frequency of Public Transport			R= Less than hourly service (0) A = Hourly service (2) 0 = 30 minute frequency (3) G = 20 minute frequency (4) GG = 10 minute frequency or better (6)
Public transport journey time to City Centre			R= Greater than 50 minutes (0) A = 41 to 50 minutes (2) 0 = 31 to 40 minutes (3) G = 21 to 30 minutes (4) GG = 20 minutes or less (6)
Distance for cycling to City Centre			R= 20km + (0) A = 15k m to 20km (2) 0 = 10km to 15 km (3) G = 5km to 10km (4) GG = Up to 5km (6)
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		R = >800m A = 400 - 800m G = <400m
Access	Will it provide safe access to the		RED = Insufficient capacity/ access. Negative effects incapable of

	highway network, where there is available capacity?		appropriate mitigation. AMBER = Insufficient capacity / access. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation. GREEN = No capacity / access constraints identified that cannot be fully mitigated
Non-Car Facilities	Will it make the transport network safer for public transport, walking or cycling facilities?		RED = Significant negative impact to public transport, walking or cycling facilities AMBER = No impacts GREEN = Significant improvements to public transport, cycling, walking facilities

APPENDIX 7
SITE APPRAISALS – EDGE OF CAMBRIDGE

SITE APPRAISALS – EDGE OF CAMBRIDGE

In January 2013, the Councils Jointly consulted on an Issues and Options 2 Part 1 report¹³⁰. This was accompanied by a Technical Background Document providing an assessment of 41 sites on the edge of Cambridge¹³¹. These sites were identified taking account of developer proposals following a 'call for sites' as part of the SHLAA process, as well as additional potential options. Sites were also broken down into separate parcels where they crossed the district boundary

The sites have been reviewed to reflect the latest proposals, and to ensure only reasonable options are subject to further assessment.

New Assessment Proformas has been completed for the following sites:

Sites identified in Submission Local Plans:

- Land North of Worts' Causeway CC930 (GB1)
- Land South of Worts' Causeway CC929 (GB2)
- Fulbourn Road West (2) CC932 (GB3)
- Fulbourn Road West (1) CC933 (GB4)
- Fulbourn Road East SC300 (GB5)
- Land south of the A14 and west of Cambridge Road SC298 (GB6)

Developer proposals (as submitted in Proposed Submission Representations)

- North of Barton Road CCSC1001 (previously SC232, SC921, SC299, CC927)
- South of Barton Road CCSC1002 (SC232)
- South of Addenbrooke's Road CCSC1004 (SC105, CC878, SC294, SC295)
- South of Trumpington Meadows CCSC1003 (SC068, SC069, CC915a, CC914b)
- Between Fulbourn Road and Babraham Road CCSC1005 (CC911, SC111, SC284)
- Land at Fen Ditton CCSC1006 (SC160, SC161)

Other Sites:

- Grange Farm CC916
- Land West of Trumpington Road CC924
- Land West of Trumpington Road CC928
- Land East of Hauxton Road CC904
- Land South of Addenbrookes and Southwest of Babraham Road CC925
- Land south of Cambridge Road Fulbourn, Cambridge SC283
- Land east of Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton (land south and east of 42 Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton) SC036
- Land south of the A14 and west of Cambridge Road SC298 (part)

New or Amended Sites proposed through consultation (added March 2016):

- Land South of Worts' Causeway CC929a
- Cambridge South East - Land West of Lime kiln Road and Cherry Hinton Road CCSC1005a
- Grange Farm CC916a

¹³⁰ Issues and Options 2 Part 1 Joint Consultation on Development Strategy and Site Options on the edge of Cambridge
<https://www.scams.gov.uk/content/issues-options-2-jan-feb-2013>

¹³¹ Cambridge Local Plan Towards 2031, South Cambridgeshire Local Plan – Issues and Options 2: Part 1 – Joint Consultation on Development Strategy & Site Options on the Edge of Cambridge – Technical Background Document Part 1
<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/background-documents>

- Land North of Barton Road and Grange Farm CCSC1001a

A number of sites previously tested on the edge of Cambridge during the Issues and Options 2 process have not been included in this further assessment, as there are clear reasons for rejection which mean they are not reasonable options for further assessment. A summary of these sites is provided in the table below.

Site Number	Location	Site Name	Reasons for Rejection
CC926	Broad Location 1	Barton Road North 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway access constraints if this site is developed as a standalone development rather than a larger site (with site CC927 or with allocated site 7.09 which is in the same ownership) • Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan & Submitted Local Plans as protected open space and of environmental importance which cannot be appropriately replaced.
CC927	Broad Location 1	Barton Road North 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway access constraints if this site is developed as a standalone development rather than a larger site (included in Land North of Barton Road (Developer Proposal))
CC921	Broad Location 1	Land North of Barton Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway access constraints if this site is developed as a standalone development rather than a larger site (included in Land North of Barton Road (Developer Proposal))
CC895	Broad Location 2	Downing Playing Field Grantchester Road, Newnham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence of landowner intention to develop • Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan & Submitted Local Plans as protected open space and of environmental importance which cannot be appropriately replaced.
CC896	Broad Location 2	Pembroke Playing Field Grantchester Road, Newnham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence of landowner intention to develop • Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan & Submitted Local Plans as protected open space and of environmental importance which cannot be appropriately replaced.
CC897	Broad Location 2	St. Catherine's Playing Field Grantchester Road, Newnham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence of landowner intention to develop • Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan & Submitted Local Plans as protected open space and of environmental importance which cannot be appropriately replaced. • Inadequate vehicular access.
CC901	Broad	West's Renault	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence of landowner intention to

Site Number	Location	Site Name	Reasons for Rejection
	Location 2	RUFC Grantchester Road, Newnham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop Identified in City Council Open Space & Recreation Strategy and 2006 Local Plan & Submitted Local Plans as protected open space and of environmental importance which cannot be appropriately replaced. Significant parts of the site are in functional floodplain (3b) and is therefore unsuitable for development.
SC294	Broad Location 5	Land East of Hauxton Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highway access constraints if this site is developed as a standalone development rather than a larger site with land south of Addenbrooke's Road (included in larger site subject to separate assessment)
SC295	Broad Location 5	Land East of Hauxton Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highway access constraints if this site is developed as a standalone development rather than a larger site as part of land south of Addenbrooke's Road (included in larger site subject to separate assessment)
SC296	Broad Location 8	Land East of Gazelle Way, Teversham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very significant archaeology constraints
SC161	Broad Location 9	High Street Fen Ditton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant negative impact on Listed Buildings Significant Conservation constraints
SC060	Broad Location 9	Land south of Shepherds Close, Fen Ditton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant negative impact on Listed Buildings Significant Conservation constraints
SC061	Broad Location 9	Land off High Ditch Road, Fen Ditton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant Conservation constraints Small expansion of Group village (10 dwellings), rather than an edge of Cambridge site.
SC254	Broad Location 9	Land between 12 & 28 Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small expansion of Group village rather than an edge of Cambridge site.
SC339	Broad Location 9	High Ditch Road, Fen Ditton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant negative impact on Listed Buildings Significant Conservation constraints Small expansion of Group village rather than an edge of Cambridge site.

**APPENDIX 8
CAMBRIDGE AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE SITES TESTED WHICH
NOW HAVE PLANNING PERMISSION**

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE SITES TESTED WHICH NOW HAVE PLANNING PERMISSION							
Site Number or Existing Policy Number	Settlement	Category of Settlement	Site Address	Site Size	Site Option Reference	Policy No.	Updated
Site 261	Barrington	New Settlement	Land at Barrington Quarry	404.99			Part of site has resolution to Grant. Part of site has planning permission.
Site 234	Cottenham	* Rural Centre	Land at the junction of Long Drove and Beach Road, Cottenham	1.63			Planning Permission granted and is being built.
Site 186	Great Shelford & Stapleford	Rural Centre	Granta Terrace, Stapleford	1.63	20 (I&O 2012)		Planning permission granted
Site 187	Great Shelford & Stapleford	Rural Centre	29 - 35 and 32 London Road, Great Shelford	0.55	19 (I&O 2012)		Planning Permission granted and is being built.
Site 046	Histon & Impington	Rural Centre	Land at SCA Packaging Ltd, Villa Road, Impington	2.25	16(I&O 2012)		Planning Permission granted and now built
Site 130	Melbourn	Minor Rural Centre	Land to Rear of Victoria Way, off New Road, Melbourn	2.29	31 (I&O 2012) H/1 e		Planning Permission granted and work started on site
Site 235	Melbourn	Minor Rural Centre	36 New Road, Melbourn	0.71	30 (I&O 2012) H/1 e		Resolution to grant planning permission.
Site132	Milton	*Minor Rural Centre	The Former EDF Depot & Training Centre, Ely Road, Milton.	8.53			Planning Permission granted. Only the restoration of North Lodge is outstanding
Site 287	Swavesey	* Minor Rural Centre	Land adj to Fen Drayton Road, Swavesey	1.30			Part of the site has Planning Permission
Site 089	Waterbeach	Minor Rural Centre	Cody Road, Waterbeach	1.86	48 (I&O 2012)		Planning Permission granted
Site 189	Waterbeach	Minor Rural Centre	Land to the west of Cody Road, Waterbeach	1.86	48 (I&O 2012)		Planning Permission granted

Site 206	Waterbeach	Minor Rural Centre	Land at Bannold Road and Bannold Drove, Waterbeach	1.77	49 (I&O 2012)		Planning Permission granted
Site 115	Fen Ditton	Group Village	Blue Lion PH, 2 Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton	0.38			Planning Permission granted and built.
Site 175	Foxton	Group Village	Moore's Farm, Fowlmere Road, Foxton	0.69			Planning Permission (slightly different boundaries)
Site 322	Waterbeach	Minor Rural Centre	Waterbeach, Land north of Bannold Road	4.01	H9 (I&O 2013 part 2)		Planning Permission
Site 337	Waterbeach	Minor Rural Centre	Waterbeach, Land adjacent to Bannold Road	6.21			Parts of site have Planning Permission
Site 338	Waterbeach	Minor Rural Centre	Waterbeach, Bannold Road	1.42			Planning Permission
Policy SP/10, site 2 (Site Specific Policies DPD)	Papworth Everard	Minor Rural Centre	Papworth Everard West Central			H/3	Land South of Church lane has planning permission
Policy SP/8 (Site Specific Policies DPD)	Hauxton	Group Village	Former Bayer CropScience Site			H/2	Phase 1 has planning permission , outline planning permission for remainder has lapsed

CAMBRIDGE CITY SITES TESTED WHICH NOW HAVE PLANNING PERMISSION

Site Number or Existing Policy Number	Area of the City	Site Address	Site Size	Updated
R3	North Cambridge (West Chesterton)	City Football Ground	1.71 ha	Site has planning permission for 106 residential units (14/0790/FUL)
R9	East Cambridge (Petersfield)	Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road	1.23 ha	Site has planning permission for 43 residential units (11/1294/FUL)
R41	East Cambridge	Land north of Coldham's Lane	1.26 ha	Site has outline planning permission for 57 dwellings (14/0028/OUT)
R42c	South Cambridge (Trumpington)	Glebe Farm	1.00 ha	The final phase of the site now has planning permission and is under construction (14/1792/FUL)
M3	South Cambridge (Queen Edith's)	Michael Young Centre, Purbeck Road	1.3 ha	Site has outlined permission and reserved matters permission (13/1250/OUT and 14/1648/REM)

**APPENDIX 9
REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING CONSULTATION ON THE
SAA AND COUNCILS' ASSESSMENT**

Introduction			
Representations Received	Support: 4	Object: 3	Total: 0
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England SAA provides a comprehensive assessment of the effects of the local plans with the Proposed Modifications. We are satisfied that this has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations. • Historic England - We find this work comprehensive and helpful. • Support for overall conclusions of the SA Addendum. • Supports the preferred development approach ion the Local Plans. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeks to justify the existing development strategy. 		
Councils' Assessment	<p>Support for the SA process undertaken noted.</p> <p>The SA appropriately considers a range of sites and strategy alternatives related to the development sequence, and provides information on the economic, social and environmental impacts of the different options. Taking account of the information provided, the reasons for the Councils preferred approach is provided.</p>		
Approach to SAA Addendum section.	No change.		

Chapter 3. Appraisal Methodology			
Representations Received	Support: 0	Object: 10	Total: 10
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Histon and Impington Parish Council site specific comments on sites in the village, particularly regarding flooding and drainage risk being understated. • The further evidence does not adequately address the issues raised by the Inspectors • Plans don't achieve the 'right balance' across the development hierarchy. Over reliant on new settlements. Options discounted due to Green Belt on edge of Cambridge and Better Served villages. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear how competing issues are resolved and issues weighted. • Inaccuracies and inconsistencies in assessment of reasonable alternatives give bias to new settlements. • Site specific comments on a number of sites, questioning specific site scores, or highlighting potential to mitigate impacts. • Should have used more quantitative data • Does not adequately consider climate change
<p>Councils’ Assessment</p>	<p>The SA methodology has been clearly set out in the SAA, and meets the requirements of the SEA regulations.</p> <p>Chapter 1 of the SAA provide clear guidance on the relationship with the SAA and previous stages of the assessment.</p> <p>Climate change has been considered appropriately in the SA. The scoping process is clear why transport issues were addressed as a separate topic, and links to climate change appropriately highlighted.</p> <p>A qualitative approach is appropriate depending on the issue being considered. It is impractical use quantitate data for all criteria at a strategic level which is appropriate to this stage of the plan making process. The SAA does not weight issues, but instead provides an objective assessment of the different sustainability impacts. The SAA also compares actual development opportunities and sites identified as available for development, reflecting the requirement only to consider reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>Comments on site specific scores are addressed to comments made on the SAA Annex 1. The assessments considered opportunities to mitigate impacts identified (See SAA section 6.5). Assumptions regarding mitigation measures are clearly stated, including stating the situation without mitigation where appropriate.</p> <p>The SAA (section 9) clearly sets out reasons for the Councils preferred approach, and the range of issues considered. This includes how the issue of Green Belt was considered. The SA process has been undertaken appropriately.</p>
<p>Approach to SAA Addendum section.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Chapter 4. Review of Development Needs			
Representations Received	Support: 0	Object: 1	Total: 1
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated evidence base of which SAA is based is flawed. SA fails to provide critical analysis of this evidence. • As need is higher than in Councils evidence, there will be a need for further appraisal • Consideration may need to be given to ensuring all policies of two plans have been subject to consistent SA. • No assessment as to whether a higher housing requirement would deliver significant beneficial impacts that would support the housing-related sustainability objectives. 		
Councils' Assessment	<p>The NPPF requires Councils to plan for Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN). The Councils considered higher targets earlier in the plan making process, but determined that the OAN identified by the SHMA was the appropriate policy response. The Inspector asked Councils to review specific issues related to affordability. The evidence was prepared, and the impacts of policy changes reflecting these were subject to assessment.</p> <p>The SA consultants tested options identified by the Councils, and utilised supporting studies that had been commissioned to support the Local Plans prepared by specialist consultants. The Councils consider that the work on Objectively Assessed Needs is a sound evidence base.</p> <p>The SAA devised a joint SA framework that has been used to assess issues that are of joint issues of strategic importance. It is not necessary to use this framework to assess individual policies as these policies will not be applied jointly.</p> <p>The SA of Development Needs options has been appropriately undertaken.</p>		
Approach to SAA Addendum section.	No change.		

Chapter 5. Strategic Development Sequence			
Representations Received	Support: 0	Object: 24	Total: 24
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that benefits of new settlements are under-played in the appraisal of the development sequence. • Does not acknowledge existing new settlements do not deliver policy compliant levels of affordable housing, and have higher infrastructure requirements • Employment development will focus on Cambridge • Congestion encourages more journeys to be undertaken by walking and cycling, which is more likely to occur from Edge of Cambridge (EoC) Sites. • Plans don't achieve the 'right balance' across the development hierarchy. Over reliant on new settlements. Options discounted due to Green Belt on edge of Cambridge and Better Served villages. • Inaccuracies and inconsistencies in assessment of reasonable alternatives give bias to new settlements. • Not all land at different levels of sequence has the same impacts (e.g. landscape impact, air quality). • Fails to adequately consider benefit of development at villages. 		
Councils' Assessment	<p>The appraisal of the stages of the development sequence appropriately compared the sustainability impacts of the options available, including development at villages.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.4.1 notes that because of the very broad strategic nature of the development sequence, the SA has been carried out to a broad level of detail. There are clearly site by site variations, which are reflected in the individual site assessments. The reasons for scoring are provided in the commentary.</p> <p>Housing objective is scored same for new settlements and other locations, for the reasons stated in table 5.1. Viability and Infrastructure evidence demonstrates there ability to deliver affordable housing. Access to employment is appropriately considered, highlighting that Cambridge likely to be most significant job location, but new settlements and other locations can be developed as mixed use locations providing opportunities</p>		

	<p>to live and work in the same place. The Sustainable Travel objective (22) appropriately identifies the benefits and disbenefits of each location, including infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>Table 5.1 highlights potential impacts of general development locations on air quality. Site specific assessments considered whether development is in or near to an AQMA, and whether development would impact on air quality / AQMA. Not as simple as saying edge of Cambridge is good, as it would introduce traffic directly into an area where air quality is an issue.</p> <p>With regard to green infrastructure, table 5.1 highlights that both urban extensions and new settlements have potential to deliver significant elements of green infrastructure. This reflects the site options considered.</p>
<p>Approach to SAA Addendum section.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<p>Chapter 6. Site Options</p>			
<p>Representations Received</p>	<p>Support: 0</p>	<p>Object: 11</p>	<p>Total: 11</p>
<p>Main Issues</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hardwick Parish Council, Caxton Parish Council – Councils own evidence shows edge of Cambridge more sustainable and cost effective than new settlements. Bourn Airfield should score negatively on sustainable transport. • Perverse assessments of North Cambourne when compared with Bourn Airfield. Failed to consider benefits of extension to existing urban area. Plan should require a Cambourne AAP to consider development of the area around Cambourne. • Plans don't achieve the 'right balance' across the development hierarchy. Over reliant on new settlements. Options discounted due to Green Belt on edge of Cambridge and Better Served villages. • Should compare sites without mitigation. • SA does not take positive approach to looking for solutions to constraints • Transport modelling which informed the SA grouped sites together, or included transport measures that were not appropriate. 		

<p>Councils' Assessment</p>	<p>Assessments of different options were made against the same set of objectives and criteria. Reasons for individual scores are provided in the commentary and the joint site assessment proforma (SAA Appendix 6).</p> <p>It is appropriate for an SA to consider opportunities for mitigation. Assumptions regarding mitigation measures are clearly stated, including stating the situation without mitigation where appropriate.</p> <p>The Assessments were appropriately informed by the Inner Green Belt Study 2015.</p> <p>Transport measures identified as potential mitigation were considered in consultation with the Local Highways Authority. Highway measures identified for individual sites were considered necessary mitigation were the sites to be developed. This reflected the approach taken in the separate Transport Report. Through that process, sites were grouped to enable appropriate modelling of strategic choices.</p> <p>Cambourne North has been considered through the plan making process but rejected due to impacts identified. Both Bourn Airfield and North Cambourne have been subject to the same site appraisal process, and included in the SAA Annex 1. The assessment of North Cambourne is considered an appropriate appraisal of the option, including applying appropriate consideration to the relationship with Cambourne, and the severance provided by the A428.</p> <p>Sites at Group Villages were not subject to assessment in the SAA as this option for allocation for growth was considered but rejected (see SAA paragraph 6.2.3.4).</p> <p>Comments on individual site scores are addressed against the comments on SAA Annex 1.</p> <p>Where variations of sites have been submitted, for completeness these have been appraised. One new site has also been tested and new site proforma created, although technically this has been submitted too late in the plan making process to be considered duly made.</p>
<p>Approach to SAA Addendum section.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Chapter 7. Strategic Development Alternatives			
Representations Received	Support: 0	Object: 19	Total: 19
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More consistent evidence base needed to compare options on an equitable basis. • Concern that benefits of Waterbeach New Town are under-played in the appraisal, particularly transport related. • Social and economic benefits of edge of Cambridge development dismissed. • Sites at edge of Cambridge and villages dismissed at an early stage due to Green Belt. • Should consider releasing and safeguarding green belt land for longer term. • The proportion of affordable housing provided at planned and proposed new settlements would not be 'significant'. • Should include options that consider north of Cambourne, and specific sites on the edge of Cambridge. • Many hypothetical packages available. 		
Councils' Assessment	<p>As section 7.2 states, the aim of this part of the SAA was to consider the broad strategy options, informed by the site appraisals, to provide an appropriate coverage of the broad strategic alternatives that could be delivered through strategic choices available to the Local Plans.</p> <p>The packages that have been assessed include adequate consideration of the benefits and disbenefits of new settlements, and edge of Cambridge development. It is impractical to test an infinite combination of alternative strategies. A relevant case would be the Ashdown Forest Economic Development LLP v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Wealden District Council & South Downs National Park Authority [2014] EWHC 406 (Admin)) (21 February 2014). The judge in this ruling stated "As to the substance of the work to be done by a local planning authority under Article 5 in identifying reasonable alternatives for environmental assessment, the necessary choices to be made are deeply enmeshed with issues of planning judgment, use of limited resources and the maintenance of a balance between the objective of putting a plan in place with reasonable speed... and the objective of gathering relevant evidence and giving careful and informed consideration to the issues to be determined. The effect of this is that the planning authority has a substantial area of</p>		

	<p>discretion as to the extent of the inquiries which need to be carried out to identify the reasonable alternatives which should then be examined in greater detail.”</p> <p>The appraisal is considered robust.</p>
Approach to SAA Addendum section.	No change.

Chapter 8. Green Belt in the SA			
Representations Received	Support: 1	Object: 13	Total: 14
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirms it is valid to give weight to impact on Green Belt as appropriate SA objective <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree with conclusions of the Inner Green Belt Study, therefore appraisal unsound. • Green Belt was not identified as an SA objective at earlier stages • After rejecting land in GB, a further stage of the assessment process should have considered whether the preferred development strategy would deliver sustainable development. • Appraisal adopts broad brush approach to dismissing large areas of land due to location of Green Belt despite Inner Green Belt Study acknowledging areas which are acknowledged as contributing significantly to sustainability objectives and less to Green Belt Objectives are capable of release. • Approach to Green Belt precludes proper consideration of reasonable alternatives. • Report does not take into account Green Belt impacts of Transport Infrastructure needed to support new settlements. 		
Councils' Assessment	<p>Green Belt issues were identified as being within the scope of both the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Appraisals from the earliest stages of the SA process (the 2012 Scoping Reports).</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the SAA considers how Green Belt should be addressed in the SA, and confirms it is an appropriate Sustainability Objective to be included in the scope.</p> <p>The SAA directly compares sites in the Green Belt with sites outside the Green Belt, using the same assessment criteria.</p>		

	<p>The Inner Green Belt Study 2015 was commissioned from specialist consultants, and is appropriately drawn on by the SAA. Issues raised with regard to this study have been considered separately. (note decision over turned at Court of Appeal on a fact specific point and not one which alters this general principle found by the Judge at first instance).</p> <p>The impact of transport infrastructure is referred to in various places in the SA (see Table 7.2). The appraisal states that 'In order to make a full assessment it is considered necessary to assess the environmental effects of associated transport schemes when assessing options dealing with Waterbeach, (i.e. schemes on the A10 corridor) and Cambourne and Bourn Airfield (i.e. schemes on the A428 corridor). This inclusion of the effect of transport schemes as part of the assessment of local plan options is carried out on a precautionary basis since it should be noted that these transport improvements are not proposed solely because of any Local Plan allocation since they also are also considered necessary to address existing issues. They have been identified as schemes for consideration though the City Deal process. In particular, the public transport scheme between the A428 and Cambridge including new Park and Ride has been identified as a phase 1 priority. The effects of these schemes have been assessed as part of the Local Transport Plan 3 Strategic Environmental Assessment and appropriate mitigation measures suggested within that assessment.'</p> <p>The appraisal appropriately tested potential sites, including potential opportunities for mitigation, such as landscaping or green infrastructure. This was also informed by the representors submissions.</p>
<p>Approach to SAA Addendum section.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<p>Chapter 9. Preferred Approach</p>			
<p>Representations Received</p>	<p>Support: 0</p>	<p>Object: 9</p>	<p>Total: 9</p>
<p>Main Issues</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No information about how weighting of different issues has been applied. • Appraisal adopts broad brush approach to dismissing large areas of land due to location of Green Belt despite 		

	<p>Inner Green Belt Study acknowledging areas which are acknowledged as contributing significantly to sustainability objectives and less to Green Belt Objectives are capable of release.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans don't achieve the 'right balance' across the development hierarchy. Over reliant on new settlements. Options discounted due to Green Belt on edge of Cambridge and Better Served villages. • Balance between weighting given to sustainability and weighting given to the protection of the Green Belt should be reviewed. • Significant sustainability advantages of locating development on the edge of Cambridge have been identified and acknowledged, but then dismissed by the Council in the development strategy. Contrary to NPPF. • There are inconsistencies and disparities between the assessment of new settlements when compared to the assessment of urban fringes sites.
<p>Councils' Assessment</p>	<p>Following the SA/SEA process, during plan making the Councils have identified a range of options and alternatives, tested their relative merits against a set of sustainability objectives to consider the magnitude of impacts, and considered mitigation opportunities. Having considered the results of the SAA, and the range of other evidence and issues considered through the plan making process, section 9 sets out the Councils preferred approach and their reasons for choosing it. This meets the requirements of the SEA Directive.</p> <p>Options that would require Green Belt review have been appropriately compared with options outside the Green Belt, supporting the consideration required by paragraph 84 and 85 of the NPPF. The decision of the Councils regarding weight given to green belt versus other issues has been clearly explained (SAA section 9.4).</p>
<p>Approach to SAA Addendum section.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<p>Chapter 10. Proposed Modifications to the Plans</p>			
<p>Representations Received</p>	<p>Support: 2</p>	<p>Object: 7</p>	<p>Total: 9</p>
<p>Main Issues</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England – Support for conclusions regarding ecological networks. Accept in absence of suitable alternatives for large scale development loss of best and most versatile agricultural land inevitable. Plan should include appropriate policies to seek to give preference to 		

	<p>areas of poorer quality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for conclusions regarding land south of CBC <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trumpington Residents Association – Potential impact of Policy E1/b South of CBC on Green Belt will be more negative than states in table 10.3 Plans don't achieve the 'right balance' across the development hierarchy. Over reliant on new settlements. Options discounted due to Green Belt on edge of Cambridge and Better Served villages.
Councils' Assessment	<p>Comments regarded agricultural land are noted. The Submitted Local Plans include suitable policies to address this issue.</p> <p>The Green Belt conclusions on Land South of CBC (PM/SC/8/A - Policy E1/b) reflect the findings of the Inner Green Belt Study 2015.</p> <p>Comments regarding the balance of development are addressed under the reasons for the preferred approach (SAA section 9).</p>
Approach to SAA Addendum section.	No change.

Chapter 11. Consultation and next steps			
Representations Received	Support: 0	Object: 5	Total: 5
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plans don't achieve the 'right balance' across the development hierarchy. Over reliant on new settlements. Options discounted due to Green Belt on edge of Cambridge and Better Served villages. 		
Councils' Assessment	Comments regarding the balance of development are addressed under the reasons for the preferred approach (SAA section 9).		
Approach to SAA Addendum section.	No change.		

Appendices			
Representations Received	Support: 0	Object: 4	Total: 4
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable 		

	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coalition of Parish Councils - using the Councils own information, that edge of city sites are more sustainable and cost-effective than new settlements. New settlements will not contribute to transport objective. • Plans don't achieve the 'right balance' across the development hierarchy. Over reliant on new settlements. Options discounted due to Green Belt on edge of Cambridge and Better Served villages. • There are inconsistencies when looking at the assessment of individual urban fringe sites. • Cambridge South should score less reds than South of CBC which has been included in the plan.
<p>Councils' Assessment</p>	<p>The potential greater benefits of edge of Cambridge locations to some sustainability objectives are acknowledged in the review of the development sequence (SAA section 5) site assessments (Section 6 and Annex 1) and strategic alternatives (Section 7). They also highlight potential disbenefits compared with other location for some sustainability objectives. The transport benefits of edge of Cambridge are acknowledged, as are the opportunities for focused infrastructure investment provided by new settlements. Informed by this, the SAA sets out the Councils preferred approach and reasons for this (SAA Section 9).</p>
<p>Approach to SAA Addendum section.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<p>Annex 1</p>			
<p>Representations Received</p>	<p>Support: 0</p>	<p>Object: 29</p>	<p>Total: 29</p>
<p>Main Issues</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to scoring of individual criteria on the following sites: <u>Local Plan Allocations:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bourn Airfield (Policy SS/6) - Site SC057 & 238 ○ Land south of Addenbrooke's and southwest of Babraham Road (Policy E/1B) ○ Fulbourn Road East (Policy E/2) - Site GB/5 / SC300 <u>Strategic / Edge of Cambridge Sites:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ North Cambourne - Site SC265 ○ Land north of Barton Road (Broad Location 2) - Site CCSC1001 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Land South of Barton Road (Broad Location 1) - Site CCSC1002 ○ Land to the south of Addenbrooke's Road, Cambridge (Broad Location 5) - Site CCSC1004 ○ Land west of Hauxton Road, Trumpington (Broad Location 4) – SC068 ○ Land at Fen Ditton (Broad Location 9) - Site CCSC1006 ○ Land east of Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton (Broad Location 9) - Site SC036 <p><u>Sites at Rural Centres:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Land south of Great Shelford Caravan and Camping Club, Cambridge Road, Great Shelford - Site SC188 ○ Land to the north of Mingle Lane and east of Hinton, Great Shelford– Sites SC207 & SC212 ○ Impington Lane, Histon - Site SC114 ○ Buxhall Farm, Histon - Site SC133 ○ Land west of 113 Cottenham Road, Histon - Site SC306 <p><u>Sites at Minor Rural Centres:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Land north of Elbourn Way, Bassingbourn - Site SC 219 ○ Land East of Bush Close, Comberton - Site SC255 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● New sites or significant variations to (with new site proforma): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Land South of Worts' Causeway (Policy GB2) – slightly revised boundary to include Newbury Farm - Site CC929a ○ Cambridge South East - Land west of Limekiln Road and Cherry Hinton Road (Broad Location 7) - Site CCSC1005a – Revision to CCSC1005 / smaller site ○ Grange Farm (Broad Location 1) - smaller development area - Site CC916a ○ Land North of Barton Road (Broad Location 2) and Grange Farm (Broad Location 1) – Site CCSC1001a ○ Land north of Babraham Road, Sawston (Policy H/1b) – increased development - Site SC313a ○ New site - Land at Hallmark Hotel, Bar Hill – Site SC340 ○ Land at Fulbourn Old Drift (south of Cambridge Road and north of Shelford Road), Fulbourn – smaller site - Site SC037a ○ Land north of Cambridge Road, Fulbourn – employment use - Site SC038a
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Land west of A10, Milton – employment use – Site SC327a ○ Land South of Hale Road, Swavesey – smaller site – Site SCC071a ○ Land east of Cherry Hinton Road, Teversham – revised boundary – Site SC098a ○ Land south of Bourn Bridge Road, Little Abington – smaller site – Site SC025a ● Object to non-appraisal of Land off Highfields Road, Caldecote due to Group village status.
<p>Councils’ Assessment</p>	<p>Comments relating to the scoring of individual criteria of specific sites have been considered (in Appendix 1). In a small number of cases some minor amendments are proposed to either the criterion score and/or the accompanying descriptive wording in the site assessment proforma.</p> <p>Where representors have proposed new sites or significant variations to sites the Councils have prepared new site proforma (see Appendix 2). This includes a site assessment of the amended Cambridge Local Plan Policy GB2, to incorporate a small parcel of land at Newbury Farm. This did not change the site scoring compared to the original GB2 proforma. The wording of the policy is not proposed to be changed other than the site area.</p>
<p>Approach to SAA Addendum section.</p>	<p>Make the stated revisions to the site assessment proforma and include new site proforma within the Councils’ Sustainability Appraisals.</p> <p>Include a new proposed modification to the Cambridge Local Plan, to include a small parcel of land at Newbury Farm within site allocation GB2 (Mod reference PM/CC/B/B).</p>

**APPENDIX 10
COUNCILS' ASSESSMENT OF OBJECTIONS TO SCORING OF
INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA FOR SPECIFIC SITES**

Local Plan Allocations:

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Bourn Airfield (SC057 & 238) The Taylor Family & Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd (Andrew Martin Planning Ltd) Rep 65828	Agricultural land – representor considers it is incorrect to say the majority of the site is grade 2. Survey work undertaken confirmed that only 7% of the site was grade 2.	Agricultural land scores Red (loss 20 ha or more of grades 1 and 2 land). Acknowledge the promoter has undertaken a survey which shows a smaller area falls within grades 1 and 2 which would reduce the score from Red to Amber. Criteria based on consistent Councils information. No change to score.	Amend site assessment Agricultural Land wording to note promoter's study.

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land south of Addenbrooke's and southwest of Babraham Road (Policy E/1B) Trumpington Residents Association Rep 65371	Green Belt - Distances from historic core irrelevant. Site would be incursion beyond the otherwise consistent boundary which follows the well established natural line of a watercourse and cycle path/footpath. It would produce an angular edge to the City rather than creating a soft edge as the Study argues. Buildings on the site would be visible from White Hill and Magog Down. Landscape - development would have a significant negative impact on the local landscape. Heritage - ignores the highly detrimental impact on the Nine Wells nature reserve, an important environmental and historic resource.	The Inner Green Belt Study 2015 identified potential for limited development (in Sector 10) on the northern and eastern parts, if well planned and designed. It also stated the new urban edge should be planted to create a soft green edge to the city, to help integrate built form and to minimise the urbanising effects of development on the countryside. Score of Amber for the revised E1/B site boundary reflects the results of Inner Green Belt study 2015. Nine Wells is not designated a heritage site, therefore it is not a heritage issue. Impacts are considered under Designated Sites which scores Amber, and mitigation will be	No change.

		required.	
--	--	-----------	--

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Fulbourn Road East – Policy E/2 (GB/5) (SC300) Commercial Estates Group (Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners)	Air Quality & Pollution should score Green – suitable controls can be put in place to ensure mitigation. Land uses will be in similar use classes. Larger site makes better use of land on edge of City and helps minimise car trips.	Air Quality & Pollution score Amber, which recognises the impacts from existing / proposed commercial uses, which can be mitigated. With a larger site there will be similar commercial uses and therefore impacts. Possibility of more impacts from additional traffic.	No change.
Rep 66023	Designated Sites should score Green – can provide enhancement in variety & quality of habitats & Green Infrastructure links.	Designated Sites scores Amber – this recognises there are designated sites nearby which may be impacted upon, but that these impacts are mitigatable. Green Infrastructure is a separate consideration / score, which scores Green in recognition of proposed improvements.	

Strategic / Edge Cambridge Sites:

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
North Cambourne (SC265) (Comparison with Bourn Airfield (SC057 & SC238)) Martin Grant Homes & Harcourt Developments (UK) Ltd (Savills)	Pollution should score Amber. North Cambourne is an enlarged settlement so more journeys will be by foot / cycle to facilities in Cambourne. Should be green but for being close to commercial uses and a motorcross - these can be mitigated.	Pollution scores Red. Acknowledge in the assessment that the promoter proposes to relocate motorcross which would improve the score from Red to Amber. No change to score.	Amend site assessment Pollution wording to note the intention to move the motorcross.
Rep 66038	Landscape description reads as Amber. Promoter proposes space for country park	Landscape scores Red – which reflects the elevation and open character of the site.	No change.

	to mitigate impacts. Should score Green or at worst Amber.	Development would urbanise the rural approach to Knapwell and swamp the village.	
	Climate Change should score Green, consistent with Bourn Airfield. Similar scale of development.	Climate Change scores Amber. Acknowledge the scale of development is similar to Bourn Airfield which has been scored Green. The promoters of Bourn Airfield stated they would deliver additional opportunities for renewable energy, hence the difference in score.	No change.
	Open Space should score GG to reflect the greater opportunities.	Open Space scores Green - consistent with other sites.	No change.
	Access to services & facilities – both sites rated the same but site has better access / integration to Cambourne.	Access to services & facilities – both sites will provide new services & facilities and have access to Cambourne.	No change.
	Integration should score Green, the same as Bourn Airfield. Site will integrate with Cambourne. Bourn Airfield scores Green yet a stand alone settlement.	Integration scores Red – despite proposed new green bridges across the A428, the trunk road still forms a (real and perceived) separation from Cambourne.	No change.
	Economy should score the same as Bourn Airfield (GG). Whilst site does not propose commercial uses, it has potential and has synergies with Cambourne.	Economy scores Green. The promoter does not propose employment on site. The Employment Accessibility criterion considers links to other employment sites.	No change.
	Education should score Green, the same as Bourn Airfield. The development will include a secondary school on site. Bourn Airfield promoters have not confirmed provision (which would take land away from other uses).	The site proforma for Site 265 Land to the North of the A428 Cambourne states for 'distance to secondary school' - <i>'Potential to provide new secondary school, or be served by existing Cambourne site, depending whether this</i>	No Change.

		<p><i>development would take place in combination with others. Promoter proposes new secondary school on-site'.</i></p> <p>This results in the same score as Bourn Airfield, where delivery of a new secondary school was also assumed.</p>	
	<p>Transport should score similar to Bourn Airfield. Scores fail to recognise provision of Park & Ride, which would make the site better than Bourn Airfield.</p>	<p>Sustainable Transport scores are only 1 point different, which reflects the greater distance to Cambridge from Cambourne North. The assessments consistently reflect the relative opportunities of the two sites to connect into, and benefit from, the transport improvements proposed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
<p>Land north of Barton Road (Broad Location 2): CCSC1001)</p> <p>North BRLOG (Bidwells)</p> <p>Rep 66190, 66222</p>	<p>Cycle Routes score should be Green.</p> <p>Southern section of the site connects to an off-road (i.e. traffic free) shared use unsegregated cycle / pedestrian path along Barton Road (1.75m width) and can access residential streets with a 20mph speed limit.</p>	<p>Cycle Routes scores Amber although it would currently score Red (was updated from Red).</p> <p>There is potential for cycle access via quiet residential streets, as shown on the Cambridge Cycle Map. The score should be revised from Amber to Green.</p>	<p>Amend site assessment Cycle Routes score from Amber to Green.</p>
	<p>Frequency of public transport – potential to improve bus routes means it should have scored higher.</p> <p>Accessible to a 20 minute frequency service via access to Grange Farm site and Uni4 route.</p>	<p>Frequency of Public Transport scores Amber (30 minute frequency).</p> <p>HQPT score was updated from Red to Amber in recognition of the possibility of securing more frequent services. The County Council advised on the potential bus frequencies that would serve the development. The representor refers to there being better services (of 20minute frequency), on Grange Road), outside the site. Although a more frequent service, it also significantly further from the site. The scoring of the site remains appropriate. However, a reference can be added that more frequent bus services are available from Grange Road..</p>	<p>Amend site assessment Frequency of Public Transport wording to note that higher frequency services are available outside the site (including at Grange Road).</p>
	<p>Site would include strategic landscaping and other landscape enhancement measures, alongside open space and recreation facilities. A wildlife reserve and</p>	<p>Biodiversity scores Amber due to existing features.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure scores Green in recognition of the provision of 72ha.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	country park would be provided as part of the Site to enhance ecology.	public open space and new habitat.	
	The Site would have no significant effect on the purposes of the Green Belt, as it has only a localised effect on the setting of the City and would not lead to coalescence with outlying villages.	Green Belt scores RR – any development would be detrimental to setting of City and obstruct key views. Appropriately reflects findings in the Inner Green Belt Study 2015.	No change.
	Any development on the Site would not be at risk of flooding or cause increased flood risk to others.	Flood risk scores Amber - recognising the existing risks affecting the site, but which can be mitigated.	No change.
	Areas of greatest archaeological potential are outside or on the northern and western edges of the site. Any development would avoid such area. No archaeological constraints to the principle of development.	Heritage scores Amber. This score recognises previous finds in the area and seeks assessment to inform planning application and ensure appropriate mitigation.	No change.

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
South of Barton Road (Broad Location 1) (CCSC1002) South BRLOG (Bidwells) Rep 66156	The air quality, noise and pollution matters do need to be investigated further, but built development at the Site would be located away from the M11.	AQMA correctly scores Red as the site is adjacent to M11. Acknowledge the promoter intends to locate development away from the M11, which could reduce the score from Red to Amber. Noise scores Amber due to traffic on M11 & Barton Road, from Laundry Farm and the Animal Breeding Centre. The site assessment recognises it is possible to mitigate Air Quality, noise and pollution	Amend site assessment AQMA wording to record promoter's intention to locate development away from the M11.

		impacts.	
	Initial ecological surveys of the Site have been undertaken, and the existing features would be retained and enhanced within the proposed development.	Ecology scores Amber, which recognises that development could mitigate impacts. Development located away from the M11 would avoid harm to CWS.	No change.
	The landscape, townscape and Green Belt impacts could be addressed through strategic landscaping and green infrastructure measures.	Landscape & Townscape both score Red and Green Belt scores Red Red, in recognition of the rural character of the landscape and importance for the setting of the City.	No change.
	The Site would be well-related to the employment and research facilities at West Cambridge and at Addenbrookes/Cambridge Biomedical Campus once the planned Western Orbital Route is delivered.	Employment Accessibility scores Green.	No change.
	The Site is located adjacent to existing cycle and bus routes, and the proposed development is capable of delivering improvements to public transport and cycling facilities.	Cycle Routes scores Amber due to the medium quality path available, although it recognises there is potential for improvement HQPT score was updated from Red to Amber to reflect the site could improve services to 20 minute frequency.	No change.
	Development would provide new local and community facilities and connect with existing and planned services and facilities in neighbouring areas and City Centre, making it more likely	Key Local Facilities scores Green, reflecting that new or improved facilities are proposed. Sustainable Transport scores GG, recognising the opportunities for non-car modes.	No change.

	that residents would use non-car modes of transport.		
	The planned City Deal projects in the vicinity of the Site have not been included within the assessment process. Site would derive sustainability benefits from the Western Orbital Route projects.	Allowance has been made for City Deal within the site assessments. However, the Barton Road corridor has less scope than others for substantial improvement for cycle and public transport.	No change.

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land to the south of Addenbrooke's Road, Cambridge (Developer Proposal) (Broad Location 5) (CCSC1004) Pigeon Land & LIH (Code) Reps 65411, 65569	Air Quality should score Green – edge of Cambridge location, with greater opportunities for modal shift.	Air Quality – score of Amber consistent with other sites of this size and location.	No change.
	AQMA should score Amber – built development will be restricted within 1,000m of the M11.	AQMA correctly scores Red, site boundary adjoins the M11. Acknowledge the promoter's intentions to restrict development within 1,000m of the AQMA.. No change to score.	Amend site assessment AQMA wording to record promoter's intention to restrict development within 1,000m of the AQMA.
	Landscape should score Amber – opportunity to create a soft edge to River Cam, M11 & Hauxton Road. No development will be on the higher ground.	Landscape scores Red – this is a large, open and visible site. It will not be possible to mitigate the impacts of development to avoid significant impact.	No change.
	Townscape should score Green – opportunity to create a soft green edge. No development will be on the higher ground. Can be compatible with local townscape character.	Townscape scores Red – due to impacts on the setting of the City, despite avoiding development on the higher ground.	No change.
	Green Belt should	Green Belt scores Red –	No change.

	score Amber – land is not the same importance across the whole site. Masterplan can take account of GB purposes, coalescence, etc. Can create a positive green approach.	Inner Green Belt Study 2015 states that there should be no release in this sector. Development would impact on openness and coalescence.	
	Cycle Routes should score Green – there has been an underestimation of good routes nearby and the possibility of upgrade.	Cycle Routes would currently score Red but the assessment acknowledges improvements can be made, therefore the score is Amber.	No change.

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land west of Hauxton Road, Trumpington (Developer Proposal) (Broad Location 4) (SC068)	AQMA should score Green – nearest AQMA is within City or A14. Illogical as proximity to M11 duplicates Air Quality criteria.	AQMA scores Red – Site is adjacent to the M11. Consistent with approach to other sites adjacent to A14 or M11, and appropriately described in the setting criteria.	No change.
Grosvenor Developments Ltd and USS (Savills) Rep 66117	Landscape should score Amber – there are no distinctive qualities and/or important views identified in the Green Belt study.	Landscape and Townscape score Red – Trumpington Meadows has formed a new edge with green foreground. There may be a need for noise mitigation measures – detrimental impact. Development would block views to the City. Negative impacts on Green Belt purposes.	No change.
	Townscape should score Amber – there is no negative impact. Inconsistent approach to other areas (within proximity to roads).		
	Green Belt should score Amber – critique of GB study (within other reps).	Green Belt scores RR – it is unlikely that any development within this sector could be accommodated without substantial harm to the Green Belt purposes. Encroachment onto the River Cam green corridor. Appropriately reflects findings of Inner Green Belt Study 2015.	No change.
	Renewables should	Renewables scores	No change.

	score Green – the policy requires renewables.	Amber – standard score.	
	Utilities should score Green – some upgrades are required, but not considered to be significant.	Utilities scores Amber – which reflects the advice received from the utility companies.	No change.
	Cycle Routes should score GG – possible to use quiet residential streets to access the guided busway.	Cycle Routes scores Green – which acknowledges that links could be made to the guided busway. However, there are poor connections via Trumpington.	No change.
	HQPT should score Green – site is within 400m of Park & Ride.	HQPT scores Amber – Park & Ride service does not continue into the evening and therefore does not meet definition of HQPT.	No change.
	Access should score Green - access can be achieved via Trumpington Meadows.	Access scores Amber – which recognises there will still be significant pressure on roads in this area.	No change.
	Non car facilities should score Green – easy access to bus and cycle facilities.	Non car facilities scores Amber – which reflects the Cycle Routes and HQPT scores. Poor cycle connections via Trumpington and no HQPT.	No change.

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land at Fen Ditton (Broad Location 9) (CCSC1006) The Quay Estate (Carter Jonas) Rep 65948	AQMA should score Amber – the parcels of land under consideration not adjacent to A14.	AQMA scores Red as the larger site boundary is adjacent to A14. Acknowledge the promoter is proposing a smaller area, which is not adjacent to but is within 1,000m of the AQMA, which would change the score from Red to Amber. No change to score.	Amend site assessment AQMA wording to record that development would not be adjacent to the A14, but within 1,000m.
	Land Contamination should score Green –	Land Contamination scores Amber.	Amend site assessment

	agricultural land and the old railway is not within smaller parcel of land.	Acknowledge that the railway crossing is not within the smaller site, which would change the score from Amber to Green. No change to score.	Land contamination wording to record that the railway crossing is not within the smaller area.
	Biodiversity should score Green - drains, hedges and field margins are likely to remain. New development is likely to introduce new habitats and opportunities that will enhance the biodiversity value of the Site.	Biodiversity scores Amber – reflects existing features but that the impacts of development are mitigatable. Consistent approach with other sites.	No change.
	Landscape should score Green - consistency with larger developments.	Landscape and Townscape both score Red – this reflects the specific sensitivities of this location.	No change.
	Townscape should score Amber or Green		

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land east of Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton (Broad Location 9) (SC036) Ely Diocesan Board of Finance (Carter Jonas) Rep 66120	Landscape, townscape, heritage and Green Belt impacts could be addressed through strategic landscaping and green infrastructure measures.	Landscape and Townscape impacts score Red, Green Belt scores Red Red (Heritage scores Red) – in recognition of the importance of this land to the separation of the village from Cambridge and for the setting of the City and rural setting and dispersed linear character of Fen Ditton. Appropriately reflects findings in the Inner Green Belt Study 2015.	No change.

Sites at Rural Centres:

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
<p>Land south of Great Shelford Caravan and Camping Club, Cambridge Road, Great Shelford (SC188)</p> <p>Shelford Investments Ltd (Carter Jonas LLP)</p> <p>Rep 66159, 66165</p>	<p>The site is not part of the wider landscape but is related to the urban area. Land to north released from the Green Belt and is currently being developed.</p> <p>Development would have no adverse impact on the compactness or setting of Cambridge and would not lead to merging of villages</p> <p>Landscape improvements could be undertaken to protect the special character of Cambridge and its setting.</p> <p>Green Belt scored Amber, making it a candidate for Green Belt release.</p>	<p>Landscape scores Amber – development would result in further encroachment of the built area into the transitional area of enclosed fields that provide a softer edge to the village.</p> <p>Townscape scores Red – would create development contrary to the ribbon development character of this part of the village.</p> <p>Green Belt scores Amber. Inner Green Belt Study 2015 refers to a lack of a strong landscape structure and increased risk of urban sprawl if development is extended into sub area 9.1 in the future. Development would reduce separation between the City and Great Shelford and affect a key approach into City. No release should be contemplated in this area.</p>	No change.

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
<p>Land to the north of Mingle Lane and east of Hinton Way, Great Shelford (SC207 & SC212)</p>	<p>Promoter submitted a Stage 1 Development Framework and Vision document for a site which comprises sites SC207 & SC212 combined.</p>	<p>The original site assessments score red for Landscape, Townscape, Green Belt, Integration with Existing Communities and Access, which makes them unsuitable</p>	No action.

Scott Properties (Barton Wilmore) Rep 65991		for further consideration.	
---	--	----------------------------	--

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land north of Impington Lane, Impington (SC114) Histon & Impington Parish Council Rep 66188	Misclassification - exactly the same description of flood risk as site SC112, though it is to the east of it.	For sites SC112 & SC114 Flood Risk scores Green. The originally submitted SHLAA sites (SC112 and SC114) were both much larger and wrapped around the back of Merrington Place, where land is within FZ2 & 3. Smaller sites were allocated.	Amend site assessments Flood Risk wording to reflect the smaller allocation.

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Buxhall Farm (SC133) Histon & Impington Parish Council Rep 66187	Misinformation about the Proposed Use. Discussion with the applicant (Cambridgeshire County Council) confirmed the intended development, would solely be housing, and possibly a primary school - but none of the other uses suggested.	Site assessment was based on information provided by promoter at the time, which is reflected in the SHLAA. Potential Residential Capacity reflected constraints - 187 dwellings. If the promoter did not provide wider facilities and services, the Key Local Facilities and Community Facilities criteria may have scored Amber rather than Green.	No change.

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land west of 113 Cottenham Road, Histon (SC306) Mr C Meadows (Carter Jonas) Rep 65859	Woodland area on western part of site would be retained. Development would not be visible from surrounding landscape.	Landscape scores Amber – as the site is still exposed to wider countryside, to north west.	No change.
	Site makes a limited contribution to purposes of Green Belt. Scored Amber. Landscape improvements would protect the factors that define the special character of Cambridge and its setting.	Green Belt scores Amber – reflects the fact that land is within the Green Belt, but does not have a significant impact on it.	No change.
	Possible to create a new access if the existing dwelling is demolished, with the existing access retained and upgraded to provide a pedestrian and secondary access.	Access scores Red – which is based on the track being unsuitable. Acknowledge that the promoter is proposing access via demolition of a property (although the site boundary does not include any property), which would change the score from Red to Amber. No change to score.	Amend site assessments Access wording to reflect that access may be possible (subject to further investigation).

Sites at Minor Rural Centres:

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land north of Elbourn Way, Bassingbourn (SC219) Mr Roger Warboys (Carter Jonas) Rep 65871	Assessment concludes development would have a significant negative impact on historic assets that are incapable of satisfactory mitigation. We disagree. The impact could be addressed through careful design and layout of development	Heritage scores Red – due to significant negative impacts on the settings of Listed Buildings, Conservation Area and earthwork remnants of a moat, which it is not possible to mitigate.	No change.

	with additional landscaping to minimise visual impacts.		
--	---	--	--

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land East of Bush Close, Comberton (SC255)	Biodiversity low - would add planting and native landscaping.	Biodiversity scores Amber - reflecting there are existing features but assumes neutral impact overall. Consistent approach.	No change.
Hopkins Homes Rep 66084	Negative impact on Green Belt purposes - enclosure and by existing development and boundary planting neutralises impact. No encroachment towards city.	Green Belt scores Amber - reflects the fact that land is within Green Belt, but that it does not have a significant impact on it.	No change.
	Distances to GP, City centre and employment misleading.	Distances to facilities and services and schools - consistent approach across all site assessments.	No change.
	Schools - will help internalise trips within village.		
	Transport - no cycle lanes is common. Public transport to city / employment etc. Safe highway access & good access to strategic routes. Fronts byway 7.	Cycle Routes scores Red - reflecting the lack of provision. Public Transport - scores reflect existing poor provision. Access scores Red - as it is not possible to provide safe access to site.	No change.
	Drainage & infrastructure - can be addressed.	Flood Risk & Utilities score Green.	No change.

New sites or significant variations to sites (with new site proforma)

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land south of Wort's Causeway	It is the County's wish and intent to include the 0.9ha farmstead	New site assessment undertaken to include Newbury Farm. Minor	A new Modification is proposed

(GB2) (CC929a) Cambridgeshire County Council Rep 66227	(Newbury Farm) in any master planning exercise for GB1 and GB2 so that the farmstead may, when available, be fully integrated into the development.	difference with the original site assessment. Redevelopment of the farm removes a potential source of noise, although this does not change the overall Pollution score.	to include Newbury Farm within GB2 (PM/CC/B/B)
--	---	---	--

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Cambridge South East - Land west of Limekiln Road and Cherry Hinton Road (Broad Location 7) (CCSC1005a)	Representors propose a smaller site 1,300 houses, primary school, local centre & associated works.	New site assessment undertaken on smaller site.	
	Agricultural Land score should change to Amber as it is a smaller site.	Agricultural Land scores Red – the site contains 25ha. grade 2 land, a significant loss.	No change.
Commercial Estates Group (Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners) Rep 66022 Cambridgeshire County Council (Strategic Assets Team) (Carter Jonas) Rep 66127	Air quality, noise and pollution matters need to be investigated in more detail, but development could be separated from the source of these pollutants.	Air Quality scores Amber – due to traffic and static emissions. Impacts are mitigatable. Pollution scores Amber – noise from roads and farms (if they remain). Impacts are mitigatable.	No change.
	Air Quality should change to Amber – smaller site does not require major link road through the site.		
	Existing nature conservation interest at the site and in surrounding area would be protected, retained and enhanced as part of development.	Designated Sites & Biodiversity both score Amber – which reflects that there are several designated areas in the vicinity, but that it should be possible to mitigate impacts. Consistent approach with other sites of this nature.	No change.
	Biodiversity should score green – ecological surveys will be undertaken prior to development – full mitigation / enhancement.		
	Landscape should change to Amber – the	Landscape and Townscape score Red	No change.

	<p>site is situated on low lying / less sensitive areas adjacent to urban area</p> <p>Townscape should score Green – as the site will be an extension of the urban area of Cambridge in area of poor townscape quality. Would improve approach to City.</p>	<p>due to the importance of this land as supportive landscape which should be kept largely open.</p> <p>Development would interrupt key views to the historic core and setting of the City from the west and south.</p>	
	<p>Green Belt should score Amber – Inner Green Belt Study 2015 states that a small scale release of land not extending up slopes of Gogs is appropriate.</p>	<p>Green Belt scores Red Red – based on the findings of the Inner Green Belt Study 2015. The site extends across a wider area than referred to in the Green Belt Study, and encroaches onto land which is of significance to the setting of the City.</p>	No change.
	<p>Impact on archaeological interest at the site and in the surrounding area can be addressed through a programme of archaeological works prior to development.</p>	<p>Archaeology scores Amber – which reflects the need for a predevelopment survey to be undertaken.</p>	No change.
	<p>Flood Risk should score Green as the site is within Flood Zone 1 and not at risk of flooding. Mitigation measures can be provided to address surface water drainage impacts on the surrounding area.</p>	<p>Flood Risk scores Amber – as it is a significant site for surface water flooding. Could offer benefits depending on densities and Green Infrastructure.</p>	No change.
	<p>Education –a primary school proposed.</p>	<p>Education scores Amber as the site does not address impact on Secondary education.</p>	No change.
	<p>Site accessible by public transport and cycling, and development at the site would provide improvements to public transport including a link to Park & Ride site,</p>	<p>Frequency of Public Transport scores Green. Only parts of the site have access to HQPT. Park & Ride services do not meet HQPT (no evening service). At best the site itself will</p>	No change.

	and to nearby walking and cycling facilities. Frequency of Public Transport should score GG.	achieve a 20 minute frequency. Improvements in walking and cycling opportunities will be required.	
	Access should score Green as a link road is not required. The development of a traffic calmed environment would ensure effects minimised.	Access scores Amber reflecting the significant congestion that already occurs in the vicinity of the site, the scale of development and the need for appropriate mitigation.	No change.

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Grange Farm (Broad Location 1) (CC916a) St John's College (Savills) Rep 66036	Residential development on eastern part of the site whilst western part will provide scope for structural landscaping.	New site assessment undertaken for smaller development area (Part A).	
	Green Belt should score Amber. Landscape and visual Assessment of the Grange Farm site and review of Cambridge Inner Green Belt Study submitted with rep.	Green Belt scores Red Red – which reflects the importance of this area to the setting the western part of the City, including through the retention of open countryside close to the centre of the City and prevents sprawl to the M11. Appropriately reflects findings in the Inner Green Belt Study 2015.	No change.

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land North of Barton Road (Broad Location 2) and Grange Farm (Broad Location 1) (CCSC1001a) North BRLOG (Bidwells) Rep 66190	A coordinated development comprising Land North of Barton Road and Grange Farm.	New site assessment undertaken for combined site. Site assessment scores red for Air Quality, AQMA, Landscape, Townscape, and Green Belt scores Red Red.	No action.

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land north of Babraham Road, Sawston (Policy H/1b) (SC313a) Hill Residential Rep 65498	An increase in the housing allocation on site H1:b from 80 dwellings to 120 dwellings.	New site assessment undertaken for increased development on the site, which did not result in any changes to the scores.	No action.

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land at Hallmark Hotel, Bar Hill (SC340) Hallmark Hotels Rep 65975	New site at Bar Hill	New site assessment undertaken. Site assessment scores red for Air Quality, AQMA, Pollution, Integration with Existing Communities.	No action.

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land at Fulbourn Old Drift (south of Cambridge Road (Part of SC037) and north of	Built development should be located towards the edge of Fulbourn on site 037.	New site assessment undertaken for the smaller site (SC037). (No change proposed to Site 038)	
	The landscape, townscape, heritage	Landscape, Townscape, Green Belt and Heritage	No change.

Shelford Road) Fulbourn (SC038) (SC037a) Ely Diocesan Board of Finance, (Bidwells) Rep 66118	and Green Belt impacts could be addressed through strategic landscaping and green infrastructure measures, and through careful design and layout.	all score Red – in recognition of the importance of this land to the setting of the City, Fulbourn village and two Conservation Areas, as well as for the avoidance of coalescence. Appropriately reflects findings in the Inner Green Belt Study 2015.	
--	---	--	--

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land north of Cambridge Road, Fulbourn (SC038a) Ely Diocesan Board of Finance, (Bidwells) Rep 66118	Site is now promoted for employment development for office and research and development uses as an extension to Capital Park.	New site assessment undertaken for employment uses.	
	Landscape, townscape, and Green Belt impacts could be addressed through strategic landscaping and green infrastructure measures.	Landscape, Townscape and Green Belt all score Red, Heritage scores Amber - in recognition of the importance of this land in ensuring the separation of the City and Fulbourn, as well as the setting of the Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area. Appropriately reflects findings in the Inner Green Belt Study 2015, which identified there should be no Green Belt release in this sub area.	No change.

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land west of A10, Milton ((SC327a) Ely Diocesan Board of Finance, (Bidwells) Rep 66119	Site is now promoted for employment/sui generis uses.	New site assessment undertaken for employment uses.	
	Landscape, Townscape, and Green Belt impacts could be addressed through strategic landscaping and green infrastructure	Landscape, Townscape, and Green Belt score Red as development would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape and townscape of this area,	No change.

	measures.	as it would result in considerable encroachment of built development into the open farmland to the west of the village.	
--	-----------	---	--

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land South of Hale Road, Swavesey (SC071a) Laragh homes Reps 66058-9	Suggested developing part of the site (Part A).	New site assessment undertaken for the smaller site (part of site 071). Site assessment scores red for Landscape, Townscape, Flood Risk and Integration with Existing Communities.	No action.

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land east of Cherry Hinton Road, Teversham (SC098a) Pembroke College & Balaam Family Rep 65654		New site assessment undertaken for revised site area. Site assessment scores red for Landscape, Townscape, Green Belt, Heritage, Integration with Existing Communities and Access.	No action.

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land South of Bourn Bridge Road, Little Abington (SC025a) Abington Lea Ltd (Savills) Rep 65886	Promoter has put forward a smaller site.	New site assessment undertaken for the smaller site (part of site 025). Site assessment scores red for Landscape, Townscape, and Heritage impacts. It also in a location with poor access to non-car modes.	No action.

Non-appraisal of Land off Highfields Caldecote:

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
--------------------------	---------------------	--------------------	--------

<p>Land off Highfields Road in Caldecote</p> <p>Cala Homes (North Homes Counties) Ltd (Carter Jonas LLP)</p> <p>Rep 65848</p>	<p>SAA Report does not assess land off Highfields Road in Caldecote because the Council decided not to allocate land within Group Villages, except for the parish council-led allocations.</p>	<p>The Council did not consider sites at Group Villages, as there was sufficient available housing land available in higher order, more sustainable, locations.</p>	<p>No action.</p>
---	--	---	-------------------

APPENDIX 11

LETTER FROM NATURAL ENGLAND REGARDING HABITATS DIRECTIVE ASSESSMENT

Date: 23 February 2016
Our ref: 177244
Your ref: [Click here to enter text.](#)



Emma Davies
Senior Sustainability Officer (Design and Construction)
Planning Policy
Environment Department
Cambridge City Council

Customer Services
Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

BY EMAIL ONLY

T 0300 060 3900

Dear Ms Davies

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans proposed modifications and Habitats Regulations Assessment

Thank you for consulting Natural England on the above in your email of 14 January 2016.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

You will be aware that Natural England has recently responded to the Cambridge and South Cambridge Local Plans Proposed Modifications consultation. In developing these modifications we note that the Councils have considered whether they have any implications for the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Reports already developed for the submission plans. Having recently reviewed the Proposed Modifications I can confirm that we are satisfied with the Councils' conclusions that the proposed modifications do not amend the findings of the HRA screening reports and that the Draft Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans are unlikely to have significant effects on Natura 2000 or Ramsar sites.

I hope these comments are helpful. For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter only please contact Janet Nuttall on 0300 060 1239. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Yours sincerely

Janet Nuttall
Sustainable Land Use Adviser



Natural England is accredited to the Cabinet Office Service Excellence Standard

