

# **CAMBRIDGE LOCAL PLAN – TOWARDS 2031**

## **Issues And Options 2**

Part 2 Site Options Within Cambridge –January 2013

## **Technical Background Document-Part 2**



## Table Of Contents

<b>SECTION</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	4
Identification of Sites within Cambridge	4
Site Assessment Process – Development of Sites Appraisal Pro-forma	5
Content and Use of Sites Appraisal Pro forma	6
Site Assessment	6
Proposed Cambridge City Sites Assessment Pro forma	8
<b>RESIDENTIAL SITE OPTIONS WITHIN CAMBRIDGE</b>	<b>25</b>
Site Number R1 – 295 Histon Road	26
Site Number R2 – Willowcroft, Histon Road	42
Site Number R3 – City Football Ground	58
Site Number R4 – Henry Giles House, Chesterton Road	75
Site Number R5 – Camfields Resource Centre and Oil Depot	91
Site Number R6 – 636-656 Newmarket Road, Holy Cross Church Hall, East Barnwell Community Centre and Meadowlands, Newmarket Road	108
Site Number R7 – The Paddocks, Cherry Hinton Road	125
Site Number R8 – 149 Cherry Hinton Road	141
Site Number R9 – Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road	157
Site Number R10 – Mill Road Depot and Adjoining Properties	173
Site Number R11 – Horizon Resource Centre, Coldhams Lane	191
Site Number R12 – Ridgeons, 75 Cromwell Road	208
Site Number R13 – 78 and 80 Fulbourn Road	225
Site Number R14 – BT Telephone Exchange and Car Park, Long Road	242
Site Number R15 – Glebe Farm	258
Site Number R16 – Cambridge Professional Development Centre, Paget Road	276
Site Number R17 – Mount Pleasant House	293
Site Number R18 – 21-29 Barton Road	310
Site Number R19 – 64-68 Newmarket Road	326
Site Number R20 – Abbey Football Stadium	342
Site Number R21 – 315-349 Mill Road	360
<b>RESIDENTIAL MOORINGS SITE OPTIONS WITHIN CAMBRIDGE</b>	<b>378</b>
Site Number RM1 – Fen Road	379

<b>UNIVERSITY SITE OPTIONS WITHIN CAMBRIDGE</b>	397
Site Number U1 – Old Press/Mill Lane	398
Site Number U2 – New Museums	414
<b>MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT SITE OPTIONS WITHIN CAMBRIDGE</b>	432
Site Number M1 – 379-381 Milton Road	433
Site Number M2 – Clifton Road Industrial Estate	450
Site Number M3 – Michael Young Centre	468
Site Number M4 – Police Station, Parkside	486
Site Number M5 – 82 – 90 Hills Road and 57-63 Bateman Street	504
<b>EMPLOYMENT SITE OPTIONS WITHIN CAMBRIDGE</b>	520
Site Number E1 – Orwell House, Orwell Furlong	521
Site Number E2 – St Johns Innovation Park	540
Site Number E3 – Merlin Place	559
Site Number E4 – Church End Industrial Estate	578
Site Number E5 – 1 and 7-11 Hills Road	595
<b>OTHER SITES CONSIDERED</b>	613

## **Introduction**

- 1.1 As part of preparing the new Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework requires local planning authorities to:
  - Indicate broad locations for strategic development on a key diagram and land-use designations on a proposals map;
  - Allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land, bringing forward new land where necessary, and provide detail on form, scale, access and quantum of development where appropriate;
  - Identify areas where it may be necessary to limit freedom to change the use of buildings, and support such restrictions with a clear explanation; and
  - Identify land where development would be inappropriate, for instance because of its environmental or historic significance.
- 1.2 This paper sets out the methodology for the assessment of the potential sites to be allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan – Towards 2031. It also contains the full assessments of all 34 sites within Cambridge City boundary that are considered to be suitable for allocation for either residential, mixed use, employment, university/college and residential mooring development
- 1.3 To properly evaluate the suitability and deliverability of sites a rigorous and transparent method of assessment has been carried out. This assessment has involved the use of a pro forma, assessing each site in relation to a number of social, economic, environmental, planning and site deliverability criteria.
- 1.4 The sites considered include those entirely within the City boundary. For the fringe sites which cross the boundary into South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC), a joint assessment has taken place. The two authorities have worked together to assess the potential for further development in the Green Belt at the edge of Cambridge, and the methodology followed is explained in detail in the Issues and Options 2 - Part 1 report.

## **Identification of Sites within Cambridge**

- 1.5 A number of sources were used to arrive at a list of sites to assess. These include the following sources, although this is not an exhaustive list:
  - Sites allocated in the existing adopted Local Plan 2006, associated Area Action Plans, and Supplementary Planning Documents, which have not been developed.
  - Sites identified in the following studies:
    - Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) May 2012.
    - Employment Land Review 2007 and 2012 update.

- Gypsy and Traveller Provision in Cambridge: Site Assessment
- Cambridge Hotel Futures: Headline Findings Issues & Options Report April 2012
- Other documents eg 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-July 2012.
- Any sites identified by the Council's own internal directorates, other Councils, statutory government agencies, and statutory undertakers.

### **Site Assessment Process – Development of Sites Appraisal Pro Forma**

- 1.6 To properly evaluate the suitability and deliverability of sites a rigorous and transparent method of assessment was required. This includes full evidence and justification. A pro forma was developed to assess each site. The purpose of the pro forma is to set out all of the constraints and other considerations that the Council has taken into account when deciding whether to consult on a site for allocation or not. If a site was found to have no development potential then it was not put forward for consultation.
- 1.7 The pro forma was developed to fully integrate the Sustainability Appraisal (SA), and the criteria in the pro forma take into account the social, environmental and economic sustainability themes identified in the SA Scoping Report. The Scoping Report set out a draft pro forma (in Chapter 16) which was subject to consultation with the statutory environmental consultees. The pro forma in the Scoping Report was the starting point for the development of the sites appraisal pro forma in Appendix 1. A copy of the final Pro Forma and methodology was taken to Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee for approval before work commenced in October 2012. Making sure that the criteria take into account the SA is the most effective way of ensuring that the SA is central to the appraisal of sites. Consultants URS, who are carrying out the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Local Plan review, have been involved in developing the pro forma to ensure that it meets the requirements of SA and the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive.
- 1.8 The pro forma was also developed to be compatible with the assessment of housing sites which was carried out in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The sites appraisal pro forma has however been taken a step further to include additional criteria and performance measures for each. As a result, all the housing sites identified by the SHLAA that are bigger than 0.5ha have been assessed again to see whether they have the potential for

allocation in the Local Plan using the sites appraisal pro forma. Sites smaller than 0.5ha are not considered to be strategic enough for allocation and can be dealt with through the normal development management process. The next update to the SHLAA will reflect this.

- 1.9 The sites appraisal pro forma also includes additional criteria relating to planning suitability of the site.

### **Content and Use of Sites Appraisal Pro forma**

- 1.10 The sites appraisal pro forma includes basic information about the site, including a map, site area, and current uses. It then includes a number of criteria relating to social, environmental and economic factors which relate to the location of the site, and criteria relating to the planning suitability of the site. The performance of the site in relation to the criteria will be assessed and a traffic light system of red (negative), amber, green (positive) has been used to provide a visual representation of the scoring of the site.
- 1.11 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). The Level 1 assessment and conclusion informed whether the Level 2 assessment needed to take place. If there was any uncertainty, for example mitigation measures might overcome problems identified with the site, a Level 2 assessment was carried out to ensure that the process is robust.
- 1.12 At the end of the Level 2 assessment a conclusion was drawn as to whether the site has significant development potential, some development potential or no development potential. The conclusion also discusses the most suitable use for the site and outlines pros and cons associated with the potential development of the site.
- 1.13 Broad viability assessment will be carried out as part of the review of the Local Plan and in relation to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). In addition housing sites which have been identified as having development potential will be subject to viability assessment. This will be carried out by consultants Dixon Searle and will involve using an accepted residual land value appraisal model. This will also evaluate all sites identified as being deliverable or developable in the Council's SHLAA.

### **Site Assessment**

- 1.14 The sites assessments have been undertaken by officers within the planning policy team, with assistance from other experts within the Council and at the County Council, and the Highways Agency. Areas of expertise that have been drawn upon include drainage and flooding,

biodiversity, landscape, urban design, historic environment, cycling, environmental health, and County Council expertise in highways, education, archaeology and minerals and waste.

- 1.15 Sites may be suitable for allocation for the following uses or a mix of these uses:
- Housing
  - Mixed Use
  - Employment
  - University/College
  - Hotel
  - Residential Mooring
  - Gypsy and Traveller sites
- 1.16 A long list of sites was drawn up and was initially reduced, by removing those sites which had already been consulted upon in the Issues and Options 1 consultation in June/July 2012, sites less than 0.5 hectares (apart from a small number of residential sites which due to their location could be developed at a high density), and those picked up through annual monitoring where planning permission had been granted .
- 1.17 All of these sites 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 have been subjected to sustainability appraisal.
- 1.18 In total 34 sites scored green or amber and are considered to be reasonable options for allocation. Of these there are:
- 21 residential site options
  - 5 mixed use site options
  - 5 employment site options
  - 2 universtiy site options
  - 1 residential moorings site option
- 1.19 The sites pro forma is presented in the following section followed by the completed technical assessment for each of the 34 options. The following section contains a list of sites that were not suitable for allocation including the reason for this as well as a table of SHLAA sites less than 0.5ha for information.

## 2. CITY SITES ASSESSMENTS

### Proposed Cambridge City Sites Assessment Pro forma

<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Site reference number(s):</b>	
<b>Site name/address:</b>	
<b>Functional area (taken from SA Scoping Report):</b>	
<b>Map</b>	
<b>Site description:</b>	
<b>Current use:</b>	
<b>Proposed use(s):</b>	
<b>Site size (ha):</b> X.XX	
<b>Assumed net developable area:</b>	
<b>Assumed residential density:</b>	
<b>Potential residential capacity:</b>	



<b>Site owner/promoter:</b>
<b>Landowner has agreed to promote site for development?:</b>
<b>Site origin:</b> SHLAA Call for Sites, Green Belt Assessment, ELR, Allocated Site , Other
<b>Relevant planning history:</b>

<b>Level 1</b>		
<b>Part A: Strategic Considerations</b>		
<b>Flood Risk</b>		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
<p>Is site within a flood zone?</p> <p><i>The assessment will address whether the proposed use is considered suitable for the flood zone with reference to the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</i></p> <p><i>In line with the requirements of the NPPF a sequential test will be applied when determining the allocation of new development in order to steer development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding (Zone 1).</i></p> <p><i>Sites that fall within Flood Zone 3 will only be considered where there are no reasonably available sites in Flood Zones 1 or 2, taking into account the flood risk vulnerability of land uses and applying the Exceptions Test as required.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Flood risk zone 3  <b>A</b> = Flood risk zone 2  <b>G</b> = Flood risk zone 1</p>	<p><i>Quantify extent of risk by proportion of site affected.</i></p>
<p>Is site at risk from surface water flooding?</p> <p><i>In addition to identifying whether site is in a high risk flood zone, consideration needs to be given to the risk of surface water flooding on the site. The Surface Water Management Plan for Cambridge (2011) shows that the majority of the City is at high risk of surface water flooding. Development, if not undertaken with due consideration of the risk to the development and the existing built environment, will further increase the risk. Consideration should also be given to the scope for appropriate mitigation, which could reduce the level of risk on site and potentially reduce flood risk elsewhere (for example from site run-off).</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = High risk,  <b>A</b> = Medium risk  <b>G</b> = Low risk</p>	<p><i>Take account of scope for appropriate mitigation, which could reduce the level of risk on site and potentially reduce flood risk elsewhere (for example from site run-off).</i></p>
<b>Land Use / Green Belt</b>		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
<p>Will allocation make use of previously developed land (PDL)?</p> <p><i>The NPPF promotes the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed, provided it is not of high environmental value.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Not on PDL  <b>A</b> = Partially on PDL  <b>G</b> = Entirely on PDL</p>	<p><i>Provide percentage of the amount of land on PDL.</i></p>

<p>Will the allocation lead to loss of land within the Green Belt?</p> <p><i>There is a small amount of Green Belt within the built up area of the City, such as Stourbridge Common, Coldham's Common and along the River Cam corridor. The Green Belt at the fringe of the City is considered in more detail in the joint pro forma with SCDC which looks at sites on the fringe of the City.</i></p>	<p><b>R =</b> Site is in the Green Belt  <b>G =</b> Site is not in the Green Belt</p>	<p><i>The NPPF emphasises the need to protect the Green Belt and states that inappropriate development in the Green Belt should not be approved except in very special circumstances.</i></p>
<p><b>Impact on national Nature Conservation Designations</b></p>		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
<p>Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)?</p> <p><i>The assessment will take into account the reasons for the SSSI's designation and the potential impacts that development could have on this.</i></p>	<p><b>R =</b> Site is on or adjacent to an SSSI with negative impacts incapable of mitigation  <b>A =</b>Site is on or adjacent to an SSSI with negative impacts capable of mitigation  <b>G =</b> Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts</p>	<p><i>Ecologist to complete.</i></p>
<p><b>Impact on National Heritage Assets</b></p>		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
<p>Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?</p> <p><i>Scheduling is the process through which nationally important sites and monuments are given legal protection. National planning policy requires substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, to be wholly exceptional. As such consideration needs to be given to the impact that development could have on any nearby SAMs, taking account of the proposed development use and distance from the centre of the site to it. Development that is likely to have adverse impacts on a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) or its setting should be avoided.</i></p>	<p><b>R =</b> Site is on a SAM or allocation will lead to development adjacent to a SAM with the potential for negative impacts incapable of mitigation  <b>A =</b>Site is adjacent to a SAM that is less sensitive / not likely to be impacted/ or impacts are capable of mitigation  <b>G =</b> Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM</p>	<p><i>Conservation Officers to complete</i></p>
<p>Would development impact upon Listed Buildings?</p> <p><i>Listed buildings are categorised as either Grade 1 (most important), Grade 2* or Grade 2. Consideration needs to be given to the likely impact of development on the building and its setting taking account of the listing category, the distance</i></p>	<p><b>R =</b> Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A =</b>Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for negative impacts capable</p>	<p><i>Conservation Officers to complete. Identify grade of buildings affected (Grade 1, 2*, or 2).</i></p>

<p><i>from the listed building, the proposed use, and the possibility of mitigation.</i></p>	<p>of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings</p>	
<b>Part B: Deliverability and Viability Criteria</b>		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
<p>Is the site allocated or safeguarded in the Minerals and Waste LDF?</p> <p><i>Reference needs to be made to the Minerals and Waste LDF in order to determine whether development of the site could prejudice any future Minerals and Waste sites. NB: Land that falls within an 'Area of Search' should be flagged up, but this would not necessarily rule out the allocation of a site.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Site or a significant part of it falls within an allocated or safeguarded area, development would have significant negative impacts  <b>A</b> = Site or a significant part of it falls within an allocated or safeguarded area, development would have minor negative impacts  <b>G</b> = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.</p>	<p><i>County Minerals &amp; Waste Staff to complete</i></p>
<p>Is the site located within the Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone (PSZ) or Safeguarding Zone (SZ)?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Entire site is within the PSZ or SZ  <b>A</b> = Part of site within PSZ or SZ  <b>G</b> = Site is not within the PSZ or SZ</p>	<p><i>Location within a zone will not in itself prevent development, it depends upon the nature of the development and its height.</i></p>
<p>Is there a suitable access to the site?</p> <p><i>The assessment needs to consider whether the site is capable of achieving appropriate access that meets County Highway standards for scale of development.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = No  <b>A</b> = Yes, with mitigation  <b>G</b> = Yes</p>	<p><i>CCC Highways to complete</i></p>
<p>Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the local highway capacity?</p> <p><i>Consideration should be given to the capacity of the local highway network and the impacts the development is likely to have on it.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects incapable of appropriate mitigation.  <b>A</b> = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.  <b>G</b> = No capacity constraints identified that cannot be fully mitigated</p>	<p><i>CCC Highways to complete</i></p>
<p>Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the strategic road network capacity?</p> <p><i>Consideration should be given to the capacity of the strategic road network and the impacts the development is likely to have on it.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects incapable of appropriate mitigation.  <b>A</b> = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.  <b>G</b> = No capacity constraints identified that cannot be fully mitigated</p>	<p><i>Highways Agency for strategic roads</i></p>
<p>Is the site part of a larger site and could it prejudice development of any strategic sites?</p> <p><i>Comments should flag up</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Yes  <b>G</b> = No</p>	

<p><i>whether the site is part of a larger development site or whether it is located in close proximity to a strategic site. Consideration of this at allocation stage can help ensure coordination of development.</i></p>		
<p>Are there any known legal issues/covenants that could constrain development of the site?</p> <p><i>A summary of any known legal issues that could constrain the development of the site should be given. Issues that should be considered are; whether the site is in multiple ownership, the presence of ransom strips, covenants, existing use agreements, owner agreement or developer agreement.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Yes  <b>G</b> = No</p>	<p><i>Multiple owners, ransom strips, covenants, existing use agreements etc</i></p>
<p>Timeframe for bringing the site forward for development?</p> <p><i>Knowledge of the timeframe for bringing forward development will help inform whether allocation of the site would have the potential to contribute to the Council's required land supply for housing/employment land etc.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Beyond 2031 (beyond plan period)  <b>A</b> = Start of construction between 2017 and 2031  <b>G</b> = Start of construction between 2011 and 2016</p>	<p><i>Beyond plan period, or construction likely to start first 5 years, or within 5-19 years</i></p>
<p>Would development of the site require significant new / upgraded utility infrastructure?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Yes, significant upgrades likely to be required but constraints incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> = Yes, significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = No, existing infrastructure likely to be sufficient</p>	<p><i>Improved utility infrastructure is likely to be required as follows.</i>                  Electricity                  Gas                  Water                  Waste water                  Broadband</p> <p><i>If any mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the developer.</i></p>
<p>Would development of the site be likely to require new education provision?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = School capacity not sufficient, constraints cannot be appropriately mitigated.  <b>A</b> = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated  <b>G</b> = Non-residential development / surplus school places</p>	<p><i>To be completed by County Education Schools Planning Officer</i></p>
<b>Level 1 Conclusion</b>		
<p>Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)</p> <p><i>Include an assessment of the suitability of the proposed use. Also whether the development of</i></p>	<p><b>RR</b> = Very significant constraints or adverse impacts  <b>R</b> = Significant constraints or adverse impacts</p>	<p>Add brief commentary here</p>

<i>this site for this use would be in line with emerging policy in the Local Plan – from the Issues and Options Report and key issues emerging from consultation responses.</i>	<b>A</b> = Some constraints or adverse impacts <b>G</b> = Minor constraints or adverse impacts <b>GG</b> = None or negligible constraints or adverse impacts	
---	--	--

<b>Level 2</b>		
<b>Accessibility to existing centres and services</b>		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
How far is the site from edge of defined Cambridge City Centre?  <i>A key element of sustainable development is ensuring that people are able to meet their needs locally, thus helping to encourage a modal shift. This criteria has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site. Sites located closer to the City Centre, where the majority of services are located, are expected to score more highly in sustainability terms.</i>	<b>R</b> = >800m <b>A</b> = 400-800m <b>G</b> = <400m	<i>City Centre boundary shown on Proposals Map in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.</i>
How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?  <i>A key element of sustainable development is ensuring that people are able to meet their needs locally, thus helping to encourage a modal shift. Criteria measuring the distance of a site from its nearest district/local centre has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site and to determine the appropriate density of development of a site.</i>	<b>R</b> = >800m <b>A</b> = 400-800m <b>G</b> = <400m	<i>District and Local Centre boundaries shown on Proposals Map in Cambridge Local Plan 2006.</i>
How far is the nearest health centre or GP service?  <i>Local services are essential to the quality of life of residents and employees. In planning for new development, consideration needs to be given to the proximity of development to local services so that new residents can access these using sustainable modes of transport. As such, measuring the distance of a site from the nearest health centre/GP service has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site.</i>	<b>R</b> = >800m <b>A</b> = 400-800m <b>G</b> = <400m	
Would development lead to a loss of community facilities?	<b>R</b> = Allocation would lead to loss of community facilities <b>G</b> = Development would not	

	lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement /appropriate mitigation possible	
<p>How far is the nearest secondary school?</p> <p><i>In planning for new development, consideration needs to be given to the proximity to schools so that new residents can access these using sustainable modes of transport. As such, measuring the distance of a site from the nearest secondary school has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site. Development will also be required to contribute to the provision of new local services.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;3km  <b>A</b> = 1-3km  <b>G</b> = &lt;1km or non-housing allocation</p>	<p><i>Name the school. National standards require free school transport for specified groups of pupils if over 2 miles (3.2 km from home to school).</i></p>
<p>How far is the nearest primary school?</p> <p><i>In planning for new development, consideration needs to be given to the proximity to schools so that new residents can access these using sustainable modes of transport. As such, measuring the distance of a site from the nearest primary school has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site. Development will also be required to contribute to the provision of new local services.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;800m  <b>A</b> = 400-800m  <b>G</b> = &lt;400m or non-housing allocation</p>	<p><i>Name the school.</i></p>
<b>Accessibility to outdoor facilities and green spaces</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Is the site defined as protected open space or have the potential to be protected	<p><b>R</b> = Yes  <b>G</b> = No</p>	
If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space	<p><b>R</b> = No  <b>G</b> = Yes</p>	<i>The site owner must provide details of how this can be achieved</i>
If the site does not involve any protected open space would development of the site be able to increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space /outdoor sports facilities and achieve the minimum standards of onsite public open space provision?	<p><b>RR</b> = No, the site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of OS and is located in a ward or parish with identified deficiency.</p> <p><b>R</b> = No, the site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of OS.</p> <p><b>G</b> = Assumes minimum on-</p>	<p>Includes all types of public open space and outdoor sports facilities. Use a GG entry when this opportunity has been identified in a SHLAA submission or where such provision could connect existing open spaces or utilise significant areas of land in Flood Zone 2 or 3.</p> <p><i>The site owner must provide details of how onsite</i></p>

	<p>site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite</p> <p><b>GG</b> = Development would create the opportunity to deliver significantly enhanced provision of new public open spaces in excess of adopted plan standards</p>	<p><i>provision will be provided where there are doubts over onsite provision, especially in wards with existing OS deficiencies.</i></p>
<p>How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?</p> <p><i>A key objective of national planning policy is for planning to promote healthy communities. Good accessibility to sports facilities is likely to encourage healthier lifestyles. Inclusion of criteria that measures distance from the site to outdoor sports facilities has therefore been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site. The assessment should also give consideration as to whether the size of the site and scale of development are likely to require a contribution to the provision of new local services such as new outdoor sports facilities via S106 contributions.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;3km  <b>A</b> = 1 - 3km  <b>G</b> = &lt;1km; or allocation is not housing</p>	
<p>How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?</p> <p><i>Proximity to high quality play spaces makes an important contribution to the health and well-being of children. As such, measuring the distance of a site from the nearest children's play space has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site. The assessment should also give consideration as to whether the size of the site and scale of development are likely to require a contribution to the provision of new local services such as new play space via S106 contributions</i></p>	<p><b>A</b> = &gt;400m from children and teenager's play space  <b>G</b> = &lt;400m; or allocation is not housing</p>	
<p>How far is the nearest accessible natural greenspace of 2ha?</p> <p><i>Proximity to high quality open spaces makes an important contribution to the health and</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;400m  <b>G</b> = &lt;400m; or allocation is not housing or employment</p>	<p><i>Based upon Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGST).</i></p>



<p><i>well-being of communities. In planning for new development, consideration needs to be given to the proximity of development to parks/open space/multi-functional greenspace so that new residents can access these using sustainable modes of transport. As such, measuring the distance from the site to such spaces (as identified in the Council's Open Space Strategy) has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site.</i></p> <p><i>The assessment should also give consideration as to whether the size of the site and scale of development</i></p>		
Supporting Economic Growth		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
<p>How far is the nearest main employment centre?</p> <p><i>National planning policy promotes patterns of development which facilitate the use of sustainable modes of transport. Proximity between housing and employment centres is likely to promote the use of sustainable modes of transport. Criteria has therefore been included to measure the distance between the centre of the site and the main employment centre to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;3km  <b>A</b> = 1-3km  <b>G</b> = &lt;1km or allocation is for or includes a significant element of employment or is for another non-residential use</p>	<p><i>City centre, established business estates and key office locations and local centres in City as defined in Employment Land Review (ELR)</i></p>
<p>Would development result in the loss of employment land identified in the Employment Land Review?</p> <p><i>The ELR seeks to identify an adequate supply of sites to meet indicative job growth targets and safeguard and protect those sites from competition from other higher value uses, particularly housing. Proposals for non employment-uses for sites identified for potential protection in the ELR should be weighed up against the potential for the proposed use as well as the need for it.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Significant loss of employment land and job opportunities not mitigated by alternative allocation in the area (&gt; 50%)  <b>A</b> =Some loss of employment land and job opportunities mitigated by alternative allocation in the area (&lt; 50%).  <b>G</b> = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development</p>	<p><i>Retained business estates, office locations and other portfolio sites defined in ELR</i></p>
<p>Would allocation result in development in deprived areas of Cambridge?</p> <p><i>The English Indices of Deprivation 2010 are measures of multiple deprivation at the small area level. The model of multiple deprivation which</i></p>	<p><b>A</b> = Not within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.  <b>G</b> = Within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within</p>	

<p><i>underpins the Indices of Deprivation 2010 is based on the idea of distinct domains of deprivation which can be recognised and measured separately. These domains are experienced by individuals living in an area. Inclusion of this criteria will identify where development may benefit areas where deprivation is an issue.</i></p>	<p>Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.</p>	
<b>Sustainable Transport</b>		
<p><b>Criteria</b></p>	<p><b>Performance</b></p>	<p><b>Comments</b></p>
<p>What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site?</p> <p><i>National Planning Policy promotes the need to support a pattern of development which facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport. Access between residential, employment and retail uses and high quality public transport routes is pivotal to achieving that aim. As such the inclusion of criteria that measures the distance of a site from the nearest high quality public transport route will provide an indication of the sustainability of the site. In assessing the performance of this criteria, reference should be made to the Cambridge City Local Plan definition of 'high quality public transport routes'.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Service does not meet the requirements of a high quality public transport (HQPT)  <b>A</b> =service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances  <b>G</b> = High quality public transport service</p>	<p><i>Based upon the assessment which has been made by the City, using HQPT definition in the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan.</i></p>
<p>How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?</p> <p><i>National Planning Policy promotes the need to support a pattern of development which facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport. Access between residential, employment and retail uses and high quality public transport routes is pivotal to achieving that aim. As such the inclusion of criteria that measures the distance of a site from the nearest train station will provide an indication of the sustainability of the site.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;800m  <b>A</b> =400 - 800m  <b>G</b> = &lt;400m</p>	<p><i>State distance from approximate centre of site including proposed Cambridge Science Park Station.</i></p>
<p>What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?</p> <p><i>National Planning Policy stresses the importance of developments being located and designed where practical to give</i></p>	<p><b>RR</b> = No cycling provision and traffic speeds &gt;30mph with high vehicular traffic volume.</p>	<p><i>Describe in commentary. City Cycling Officer to complete taking into account speed of traffic and accident records and width of facility and nature of any sharing with</i></p>

<p><i>priority to pedestrian and <b>cycle movements</b>. The inclusion of criteria that measures the distance of a site from the nearest cycle route will provide an indication of the sustainability of the site.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = No cycling provision or a cycle lane less than 1.5m 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.</p> <p><b>A</b> = Medium quality off-road path.</p> <p><b>G</b> = Quiet residential street speed below 30mph, cycle lane with 1.5m minimum width, high quality off-road path e.g. cycleway adjacent to guided busway.</p> <p><b>GG</b> = Quiet residential street designed for 20mph speeds, high quality off-road paths with good segregation from pedestrians, uni-directional hybrid cycle lanes.</p>	<p><i>pedestrians.</i></p>
--	--	----------------------------

**Air Quality, pollution, contamination and noise**

Criteria	Performance	Comments
<p>Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?</p> <p><i>The planning system has a role to play in the protection of air quality by ensuring that land use decisions do not adversely affect, or are not adversely affected by, the air quality in any AQMA, or conflict with or render ineffective any elements of the local authority's air quality action plan. There is currently one AQMA within Cambridge. Inclusion of criteria that measures the distance between the site and the AQMA, as well as between the site and roads with the highest traffic volumes causing poor air quality, will provide an indication of the sustainability of the site.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Within or adjacent to an AQMA, M11 or A14</p> <p><b>A</b> = &lt;1000m of an AQMA, M11 or A14</p> <p><b>G</b> = &gt;1000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14</p>	<p><i>Environmental Health to complete and consider scope for appropriate mitigation</i></p>
<p>Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?</p> <p><i>National planning policy requires preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of air pollution.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Significant adverse impact</p> <p><b>A</b> = Adverse impact</p> <p><b>G</b> = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact</p>	<p><i>Environmental Health to complete and consider scope for appropriate mitigation</i></p>

<p>Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</p> <p><i>National planning policy requires preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of noise pollution.</i></p> <p><i>Criteria has been included to assess whether there are any existing noise sources that could impact on the suitability of a site, which is of particular importance for residential development. The presence of noise sources will not necessarily render a site undevelopable as appropriate mitigation measures may be available, and will also depend on the proposed development use.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation  <b>G</b> = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation</p>	<p><i>Environmental Health to complete and consider scope for appropriate mitigation</i></p>
<p>Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation  <b>G</b> = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation</p>	<p><i>Environmental Health to complete and consider scope for appropriate mitigation</i></p>
<p>Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation  <b>G</b> = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation</p>	<p><i>Environmental Health to complete and consider scope for appropriate mitigation</i></p>
<p>Is there possible contamination on the site?</p> <p><i>Contaminated land is a material planning consideration, and Land Use History Reports are available from the Council's Environmental Health Scientific Team. The presence of contamination will not always rule out development, but development should not be permitted in areas subject to pollution levels that are incompatible with the proposed use. Mitigation measures can be implemented to overcome some contaminated land issues, although this may have an impact on the economic viability of the development. Further investigation will be required to</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = All or a significant part of the site within an area with a history of contamination which, due to physical constraints or economic viability, is incapable of appropriate mitigation during the plan period  <b>A</b> = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development  <b>G</b> = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination</p>	<p><i>Environmental Health to complete and consider scope for appropriate mitigation</i></p>

<i>establish the nature of any contamination present on sites and the implications that this will have for development.</i>		
<b>Protecting Groundwater</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>Would development be within a source protection zone (EA data)?</p> <p><i>Groundwater sources (e.g. wells, boreholes and springs) are used for public drinking water supply. These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area.</i></p>	<p><b>A</b> = Within SPZ 1  <b>G</b> = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace</p>	<p><i>Explain significance in comments box</i></p>
<b>Protecting the townscape and historic environment</b> ( <i>Landscape addressed by Green Belt criteria</i> )		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>Would allocation impact upon a historic park/garden?</p> <p><i>Historic parks and gardens that have been registered under the 1983 National Heritage Act have legal protection. There are 11 historic parks and gardens in Cambridge. National planning policy requires substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, including historic parks, to be wholly exceptional. As such this criteria has been included to allow consideration of whether development on the site would have an adverse impact on a historic park or garden its setting.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such areas with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such areas with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin such areas, and there is no impact to the setting of such areas</p>	<p><i>Conservation officer to complete</i></p>
<p>Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?</p> <p><i>The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, imposes a duty on planning authorities to designate as conservation areas 'areas of special architectural or historic interest that character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance'. Cambridge's Conservation Areas are relatively diverse. As such consideration needs to be given to the potential impact that development may have on the setting, or views into and out of a Conservation Area.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such an area with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such an area with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin such an area, and there is no impact to the setting of such an area</p>	<p><i>Conservation officer to complete</i></p>
<p>Would development impact upon buildings of local interest</p>	<p><b>A</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential</p>	<p><i>Conservation officer to complete</i></p>

<p><i>There are over 1,000 buildings in Cambridge that are important to the locality or the City's history and architectural development. Local planning policy protects such buildings from development which adversely affects them unless:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>The building is demonstrably incapable of beneficial use or reuse;</i></li> <li>- <i>or there are clear public benefits arising from redevelopment.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>As such the presence of a locally listed building on a site would not necessarily rule development; however detailed justification would be required to demonstrate acceptability of schemes at the planning application stage.</i></p>	<p>for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings</p>	
<p>Would development impact upon archaeology?</p>	<p><b>A</b> =Known archaeology on site or in vicinity  <b>G</b> = No known archaeology on site or in vicinity</p>	<p>County Archaeological staff to complete.</p>
<b>Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>Would development impact upon a locally designated wildlife site i.e. (Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site)</p> <p><i>Sites of local nature conservation include Local Nature Reserves, County Wildlife Sites and City Wildlife Sites. Local authorities have a Duty to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in exercising their functions. As such development within such sites, or that may affect the substantive nature conservation value of such sites, will not normally be permitted. Where development is permitted, suitable mitigation and/or compensatory measures and nature conservation enhancement measures should be implemented.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site and impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> =Contains or is adjacent to an existing site and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Does not contain, is not adjacent to or local area will be developed as greenspace</p>	<p>Ecology Officer to complete</p>
<p>Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?</p> <p><i>Green infrastructure plays an important role in delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities. As such criteria has been included to assess the</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Development involves a loss of existing green infrastructure which is incapable of appropriate mitigation.  <b>A</b> =No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate</p>	<p>Ecology Officer to complete</p>

<p><i>opportunity that development on the site could have on creating and enhancing green infrastructure delivery.</i></p>	<p>mitigation  <b>G</b> = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure</p>	
<p>Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)</p> <p><i>A number of Biodiversity Species and Habitat Action Plans exist for Cambridge. Such sites play an important role in enhancing existing biodiversity for enjoyment and education. National planning policy requires the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets.</i></p> <p><i>As such development within sites where BAP priority species or habitats are known to be present, or that may affect the substantive nature conservation value of such sites, will not normally be permitted. Where development is permitted, suitable mitigation and/or compensatory measures and nature conservation enhancement measures should be implemented.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> =Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links</p>	<p>Ecology Officer to complete</p>
<p>Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?</p> <p><i>Trees are an important facet of the townscape and landscape and the maintenance of a healthy and species diverse tree cover brings a range of health, social, biodiversity and microclimate benefits. Cambridge has in excess of 500 TPOs in force. When considering sites that include trees covered by TPOs, the felling, significant surgery or potential root damage to such trees should be avoided unless there are demonstrable public benefits accruing from the development that outweigh the current and future amenity value of the trees.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Development likely to have a significant adverse impact on the protected trees incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> =Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees</p>	<p>Tree Officers to complete</p>
<p><b>Any other information not captured above?</b></p>		
<p> </p>		

<b>Level 2 Conclusion</b>		
<b>Level 2 Conclusion</b> (after allowing scope for mitigation)	<b>R</b> = Significant constraints or adverse impacts <b>A</b> = Some constraints or adverse impacts <b>G</b> = Minor constraints or adverse impacts	
<b>Overall Conclusion</b>	<b>R</b> = Site with no significant development potential (significant constraints and adverse impacts) <b>A</b> = Site with development potential (some constraints or adverse impacts) <b>G</b> = Site with development potential (few or minor constraints or adverse impacts)	<i>Housing sites ranked A or G will be taken forward for viability assessment by consultants.</i>
<b>Viability feedback (from consultants)</b>	<b>R</b> = Unlikely to be viable, <b>A</b> = May be viable <b>G</b> = Likely to be viable	