

Cambridge City Council Draft SHLAA

Technical Appendix

ANNEX 15 Undevelopable Sites -Summary of reasons for rejection and maps of rejected sites

May 2012

Introduction

1. The Council have prepared a Draft Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which is the subject of public and stakeholder consultation from 30th September 2011. This document compliments the main SHLAA document, but owing to size limitations the Council have published this document as a separate technical Appendix.
2. It details 149 sites that were rejected in the SHLAA assessment process along with a summary of the reasons for rejection. Sites are listed in ward order. Ward maps and individual site maps are included at the end of this report.
3. The methodology and assessment process used to reach these conclusions are listed in Stages 7-8 of the main report and Annexes 1 and 1A..

Rejected Sites: As At May 29th 2012– Summary of conclusions

Site No. (ID)	Site Name	Ward	Site Area (ha)	Summary – reason for rejection
146	Land to R/O 33 - 37 Thorley Road	Abbey	0.24	Site 146 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it will result in the loss of a community facility (scout hut). The site also meets the criteria in Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space. Access to site also considered poor and narrow.
201	Beadle Industrial Estate	Abbey	1.52	Site 201 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it would result in the loss of a Protected Industrial Site (there is also considerable concern over the amount of land that falls within Flood Zone 2 and the impact that mitigating for this would have on the viability of development).
413	Open space north of	Abbey	0.30	Site 413 is not considered to be suitable for residential

	Fison Road			development as it meets the criteria in Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space.
419	Open space in front of 44 to 84 Ditton Lane	Abbey	0.26	Site 419 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it has a considerable number of amber scores against Level 1, 2 and 3 considerations. Notably the site is constrained by existing buildings, integrating the site into the existing area may prove difficult and the site contributes to the openness of the area
425	Open space in front of 15 to 21 Jack Warren Green	Abbey	0.15	Site 425 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as the impact of a new proposal on the existing properties will be hard to overcome; serves as public open space with amenity value. The site also meets the criteria in Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space.
426	Open space west of 82 to 114 Jack Warren Green	Abbey	0.24	Site 426 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space.
433	Open space between Wadloes Road and Headford Close	Abbey	0.32	Site 433 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: The shape of the site and the layout of the existing dwellings to the east at 1-20 Headford Close make it difficult to develop the site. Also the residential amenity of the existing properties, loss of trees and the spacious quality of the site and surroundings renders site undevelopable.
439	Car park east of Cambridge Technopark	Abbey	0.19	Site 439 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: Development of this site would relate poorly to the adjoining Cambridge Technopark buildings; would occupy one of its car parks; and, would suffer from noise disturbance from traffic travelling along the adjoining

				Newmarket Road.
440	Car park in front of Cambridge Technopark	Abbey	0.19	Site 440 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: Development of this site would relate poorly to the adjoining Cambridge Technopark buildings; would occupy one of its car parks; and, would suffer from noise disturbance from traffic travelling along the adjoining Newmarket Road.
447	Open space in front of 73 to 87 Peverel Road	Abbey	0.19	Site 447 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space.
448	Open space in front of 33 to 47 Peverel Road	Abbey	0.18	Site 448 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as because of its awkward shape; it also adds to the amenity of the local area. Site is also unsuitable for development because it meets criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space (currently unused open space, formally allotments).
450	Car park north of the Quorum	Abbey	0.44	Site 450 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it posts an amber score against Level 1 criteria - Green Belt. It adjoins the Green Belt to the west - Coldham's Common; and, a RED Score against the potential loss of the use of the site as an Office Location and a New General Industrial/Business Area as highlighted in the Cambridge Employment Land Review. Any development will result in the loss of tree cover on the site, and is likely to present a hard, as opposed to the present soft edge that could harm the open views of this land resulting in an adverse impact on the character and openness of the adjoining Green Belt.
451	Tree belt west of the	Abbey	0.34	Site 451 is not considered to be suitable for residential

	Quorum and garage on Barnwell Road			development as it posts an amber score against Level 1 criteria - Green Belt. It adjoins the Green Belt to the west - Coldham's Common; and, a RED Score against the potential loss of the use of the site as an Office Location and a New General Industrial/Business Area as highlighted in the Cambridge Employment Land Review. Any development will result in the loss of tree cover on the site, and is likely to present a hard, as opposed to the present soft edge that could harm the open views of this land resulting in an adverse impact on the character and openness of the adjoining Green Belt.
453	Open space west of Barnwell Road	Abbey	0.68	Site 453 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it posts a RED score against Level 1 criteria - Green Belt. It adjoins the Green Belt to the west - Coldham's Common. Any development will harm the open views of this land resulting in an adverse impact on the character and openness of the Green Belt. The site is also unsuitable for development because it is too narrow and the current site adds to the amenity of the area.
454	Garages and trees south of Barnwell Drive	Abbey	0.32	Site 454 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: The site forms the car park serving the adjoining car dealership. The car park is a fundamental requirement for the permitted use of the site as a car dealership, and its loss would give rise to additional on-street parking in the area. The site is close to Barnwell Road, which links major routes into and out of Cambridge; and, to Cambridge Airport. Residential development of the site would relate poorly to its surroundings. The new houses would be isolated from other developments, and occupants

				of any properties would experience a low level of amenity due to the proximity of the car dealership, road, and airport.
459	Workshops at 615 Newmarket Road	Abbey	0.73	Site 458 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it is used for Use Class B1(c), B2 and B8 purposes. Development that results in the loss of floorspace within Use Classes B1(c), B2 and B8 will not be permitted unless the criteria relating to unprotected sites outlined in the Policy are met. In addition, the site is overlooked from the rear aspects of dwellings to the east in Ditton Fields, and to the south in Newmarket Road.
463	Various warehouses, depot etc, Ditton Walk north	Abbey	1.14	Site 463 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it is in use for employment uses already and the site was identified in the ELR to be retained for employment use.
468	Open space with pond in Regatta Court	Abbey	0.15	Site 468 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it would result in the loss of the existing open space adjacent to the Green Belt which acts as the communal gardens for the Regatta Court Flats, and which make this a pleasant place to live. This loss of amenity would be detrimental to the amenities of occupants of the flats, and harmful to the immediate setting of this part of Cambridge due to the loss of trees on site which provide it with a soft edge to the adjoining playspace and countryside.
471	Depots west of 18 Stanley Road	Abbey	0.19	Site 471 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it is currently in use as an employment site and an electricity sub station adjoins.
475	Car park serving Comet and Staples	Abbey	0.35	Site 475 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it is a car park for the adjoining Comet electrical, and other stores - any development of the site

				would be poorly related to the existing store resulting in poor amenity levels for any occupant of the new dwellings. Residential development of the site in isolation, would render the continued operation of the store(s) very difficult. The retail uses of the site complement those of the larger area of the Cambridge Retail Park - Site 481; and, Tesco's Supermarket - Site 477.
476	Cheddars Lane Industrial estate	Abbey	2.08	Site 476 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it was identified in the ELR to be retained for employment use.
477	Tesco's car park	Abbey	1.35	Site 477 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it is the existing parking serving Tesco and is well used.
480	Open space at the end of Silverwood Close	Abbey	0.16	Site 480 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it would result in the loss of the landscaped area around which the original dwellings comprising this development are set.
481	Various warehouses, car parks etc at Cambridge Retail Park, west of the railway	Abbey	13.48	Site 481 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it would result in the loss of the Cambridge Retail Park, which makes a major contribution to the retail economy, and employment situation in Cambridge. Residential development of the site would mean the loss of the retail units and the jobs therein, and would diminish Cambridge's status as a regional shopping centre
863	Warehouse north of 133 Ditton Walk	Abbey	0.38	Site 863 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it is in use already and recommended in the ELR to remain in employment use.
889	Cambridge Technopark Newmarket Road	Abbey	0.70	Site 889 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: Although initially considered suitable,

				the owner is not interested in developing the site for residential.
46	West's Garage, 217 Newmarket Road	Abbey	0.33	Site 46 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because although initially considered suitable, the owner is not interested in developing the site for residential.
54	9-12 Gerard Close	Abbey	0.16	Site 54 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because although initially considered suitable, the owner is not interested in developing the site for residential.
150	Lock-up garages adjacent to 1 Rutland Close	Arbury	0.17	Site 150 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. It comprises three rows of garages in blocks that serve the adjoining flats, and are therefore, closely related to them for ease of access and security. This close relationship means that any new development would be poorly related to these adjoining flats owing to their height, scale and close proximity to the site. The loss of parking for flat occupants would also need to be addressed.
251	Open space and car park south of Borrowdale	Arbury	0.17	Site 251 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it would result in the loss of a useable open space and would be overlooked by nearby dwellings. The site also meets the criteria in Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
280	Green space at the end of Harris Road	Arbury	0.26	Site 280 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as although it is not currently Protected Open Space, the site does meet the criteria in Policy 4/2 of the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space.

302	Supermarkets, petrol station and car park at corner of Histon Road and Windsor Road	Arbury	0.69	Site 302 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it would result in the loss of a considerable amount of floorspace within A1 use and harm the vitality and viability of the Local Centre.
303	Chesterton Mills	Arbury	0.51	Site 303 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it would result in the loss of employment land in B1(c), B2, B8 use on an unsuitable site that was also identified for continued safeguarding in the Council's Employment Land Review, also there is a Grade II listed building onsite
316	Car park and land behind Arundal House Hotel	Arbury	0.35	Site 316 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it is the hotel car park and is needed by the hotel. There would be a problem of overlooking from the hotel itself, too.
868	Rear of gardens, 1-12 Linden Close	Arbury	0.17	Site 868 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as the site scores a considerable number of amber scores against Level 1, 2 and 3 considerations. Notably the site has access problems, will have problems integrating into the existing community and there are numerous trees onsite that are likely to have significant biodiversity value.
115	Surface Car Park at Castle Hill	Castle	0.33	Site 115 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it is overlooked on all sides (residential to the west of the site and offices to the east) so issues of overlooking would be significant. It is also felt that getting a housing scheme to work in design terms would be very difficult on this site and as such it is not considered to be suitable for development. In addition, Site 115 is retained on

				a 130 year lease and is unlikely to be available
383	Open space east of 42 Carisbrooke Road	Castle	0.25	Site 383 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. Any development would remove a positive feature from the street. Also development right next to the school playground could prove problematic. The site also meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space.
393	Car park south of Department of Zoology Field Station	Castle	0.38	Site 393 is not considered to be suitable for residential development due to incompatibility with surrounding uses.
395	Car park south of 76 Storey's Way	Castle	0.29	Site 395 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it would not fit in with surrounding uses or built form and there would be the loss of a well used car park.
398	Recreation ground on Shelly Row	Castle	0.13	Site 398 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. There would be a loss of open space and a well used play area. The site meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
400	Open space east of St Edmund's College	Castle	0.15	Site 400 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as the site meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space.
406	Car parks and open space east of Shire Hall	Castle	0.23	Site 406 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it would have a detrimental effect on the scheduled ancient monuments nearby also there would be a substantial loss of parking for the Council. Shire Hall is also a protected office site in ELR.
899	St Johns College Playing Fields	Castle	10.31	Site 899 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. The site is designated in the Local Plan as Protected Open Space. Any development will result

				<i>in the loss of Protected Open Space and a very significant archaeological site location. A section is within Flood Zone 3b and is unsuitable for development. Any development will harm the open views of this land resulting in an adverse impact on the character and openness of the north western edge of the City Centre.</i>
126	Land to the r/o 268 Queen Edith's Way	Cherry Hinton	0.33	Site 126 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as the land owner has no interest in its development
649	Open space west of Coldhams Lane Business Park	Cherry Hinton	11.56	Site 649 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. The site is identified for Employment Land purposes in the ELR, however, it presently contributes to the openness and setting of the City. It has an historical use as a landfill site following cessation of quarrying activities, and contamination and gas generation from decaying refuse are likely to be significant issues. It is considered unsuitable for housing purposes as any development would be poorly related to its surroundings. In addition, it falls in part, under the Cambridge Airport Flight Path Public Safety Zone.
672	Land R/O Next Generation Sports Centre	Cherry Hinton	0.44	Site 672 is not considered to be suitable for residential development due to its irregular shape and its position between tennis courts as part of the Next Generation Sports Centre and the Cambridge - Newmarket railway, where it acts as a buffer zone. Access to the site is also an issue. In addition, residential development would not sit well with the surrounding uses.
676	Various warehouses etc at Church End, Cherry Hinton	Cherry Hinton	5.32	Site 676 is not considered to be suitable for residential development, excluding the eastern part of the site that benefits from extant permission for residential development.

				See File Refs: 06/0063/OUT and 09/0403/REM. Whilst it is noted that part of the site benefits from an extant residential planning permission, it also encompasses the College Business Park - a Protected Industrial Site in the Local Plan 2006 - See Policy 7/3 - which is excluded from the site but bounded on 3 sides by it, is 3. It is considered that, on balance, the majority of the site is inappropriate for residential development.
681	Garages and open space between 98 to 111 and 114 and 131 Teversham Drift	Cherry Hinton	0.23	Site 681 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. The use of the site as the access road; garaging and parking areas; and informal landscaping associated with adjoining dwellings in Teversham Drift, plus its close proximity to adjoining dwellings, render it inappropriate for residential development.
686	Land north of Teversham Drift	Cherry Hinton	0.33	Site 686 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. The irregular shape and limited depth of the site (it is too long and narrow); its use as structural landscaping and informal amenity space plus its close proximity to adjoining dwellings, render it inappropriate for residential development.
690	Open space at Queen's Meadow	Cherry Hinton	0.23	Site 690 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. Any development of this site would result in the loss of the present open space and car parking area serving the adjoining dwellings in Queens Meadows. Whilst the site is large enough to accommodate new housing, the present space reflects the design and setting of the present development as a whole. Any new development on the site would appear out of keeping with the existing houses, resulting in a poor outlook from and a greatly diminished

				setting to these adjoining properties. The site also meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space.
691	Open space south west of 85 to 95 Kelsey Crescent	Cherry Hinton	0.19	Site 691 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. Any development of this site would result in the loss of the present open space area serving the adjoining dwellings in Kelsey Crescent, and would integrate poorly with surrounding amenity space including the play park and neighbouring School fields (which are in South Cambs. District). The amenity area forms an important part of the overall amenity/playspace that serves the area as a whole.
701	Open space south of Langdale Close	Cherry Hinton	0.18	Site 701 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. Development of this site would integrate poorly with surrounding residential development due to it being overlooked from the front aspects of adjoining 3-storey flats to the north-east in Langdale Close. It provides the amenity area and setting serving these adjoining dwellings. Access to the site is also poor.
703	Playground south of 14 and 16 Tenby Close	Cherry Hinton	0.31	Site 703 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it is part of a school, and the site meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space.
709	Car parks west of 5 to 13 Lisle Walk	Cherry Hinton	0.20	Site 709 is unsuitable for residential development as it would be overlooked from surrounding dwellings in Welstead Road, Lisle Walk and Sunmead Walk; would result in a loss of amenity space and TPO'd trees; and, car parking between existing dwellings.
731	Car park north of the	Cherry	0.17	Site 731, the Red Lion car park, would be unacceptable for

	pub at 20 and 22 Mill End Road	Hinton		residential development because: The Red Lion is a Grade II Listed Building; Its setting and character would be harmed as a result of the development, especially if the protected trees on site were affected. Also, there would be issues of noise in relation to the public house. Development would result in the loss of the pub car park, and give rise to additional on-street car parking in an area where parking restrictions are already in force along the High Street.
742	Open space behind 66 to 80 Colville Road	Cherry Hinton	0.28	Site 742 is considered to be unacceptable for residential development. There is no direct access from the site to the public highway. The site is landlocked. The only possible vehicular access would be via the Baptist Church car park (Site 743) and this is very narrow. It is also overlooked from the rear aspects of the adjoining 3-storey dwellings at 66 to 80 Colville Road.
754	Open space north of Fulbourn Road	Cherry Hinton	1.02	Site 754 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it adds to the character and amenity of the area, and meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as protected open space.
920	Blue Circle Site - Coldhams Lane	Cherry Hinton	9.11	Site 920 is not considered to be suitable for residential development because of the site's serious contamination issues, protected open space and City Wildlife site designations.
79	Flats on Fanshawe Road, Cambridge	Coleridge	0.94	Site 79 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
86	Flats on Davy Road	Coleridge	1.19	Site 86 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space

800	Land with trees east of Sycamore Close	Coleridge	0.28	Site 800 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it is landlocked with no direct access to any public highway and is surrounded by residential properties and their rear gardens. It is likely that the mature trees on site support a range of small mammals (Bats) and birds for nesting/roosting. The wildlife/amenity value of this site should be carefully assessed, if it were to be considered for development. As it stands, any development of the site would destroy these characteristics, which would be unacceptable.
812	Car park north of Purbeck Road	Coleridge	0.21	Site 812 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: The site forms the car park serving Hills Road Sixth Form College. If developed the parking facility would be lost and the new houses would be poorly related to the College buildings. They would also be isolated from any other residential development.
813	Car park west of the Travelodge, Hills Road	Coleridge	0.15	Site 813 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: It forms the car park serving the Travel-Lodge Hotel. If developed the parking facility would be lost and the new houses would be poorly related to the 5-storey Hotel building. They would also be isolated from any other residential development. There would also be the likelihood of excessive noise from traffic on Hills Road, and the adjoining railway.
814	Multi storey car park at the Leisure Park, Clifton Road	Coleridge	0.22	Site 814 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: It forms a multi-storey car park that serves the Cambridge Leisure Park complex (Hotel/Cinema/Theatre/'The Junction'/Shops). Its loss would have a direct adverse impact on the viability of the complex.

				Any houses would be isolated, and would have poor amenities due to the proximity of the Complex and the adjacent Cambridge - London railway line
823	Play area north of 30 Ashbury Close	Coleridge	0.18	Site 823 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: The site provides a well-used, publically available, recreation ground with fixed play equipment, and amenity area. If developed, this area along with its mature trees would be lost.
826	Play area between Neville Road and Lichfield Road	Coleridge	0.25	Site 826 is unsuitable for residential development because of access problems and loss of open space and recreation facilities
874	Rustat House, Rustat Avenue	Coleridge	0.68	Site 874 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it would result in a loss of employment land, something the ELR advises against.
890	Vetinary Clinic 89a Cherry Hinton Road	Coleridge	0.20	Site 890 is unsuitable residential development as it is already has planning consent for 14 apartments
63	Lock up garages adjacent to 2 Derwent Close	Coleridge	0.19	Site 63 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because of issues relating to car parking, site contamination and overlooking onto neighbouring properties. It is also unachievable as many garage lease/freeholders are unwilling to relinquish their garages. Anglian Water's Pumping Station is also represents a further constraint upon the sites development.
854	Railway sidings west of Rustat Road	Coleridge	2.11	Site 854 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because the railway is too close to satisfactorily overcome noise and design issues.
237	Nuffield Road Industrial Area	East Chesterton	6.66	Site 237 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it was identified in the recent Employment

				Land Review (ELR) to be retained in employment use.
238	Cowley Road Business Park	East Chesterton	8.50	Site 238 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as it was identified in the recent Employment Land Review (ELR) to be retained in employment use.
364	Car park in front of Elizabeth House	East Chesterton	0.42	Site 364 is not suitable for residential development as it would result in loss of parking for the offices. The 4 storey office building constrains the site physically, also residential development would not sit well so close to the office building. There are also TPO'd trees on site. Also part of office site is protected in the ELR.
879	72-76 St Andrew's Road	East Chesterton	1.31	Site 879 is considered to be unacceptable for residential development. The Employment Land Review identifies it as an office employment site which should be retained.
39	Land adjacent to and behind 195 High Street, East Chesterton	East Chesterton	0.39	Site 39 was initially considered to be suitable for development but the mutiplicity of ownerships and poor access along with parking displacement will mean very unlikely to happen. Would not accord with new advice on garden development.
379	Petrol station and garage, Elizabeth Way	East Chesterton	0.29	Site 379 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: Although the site was initially considered suitable, the leaseholder has a long lease and doesn't want to surrender it for residential development
352	Shirley Infants School, Green End Road	East Chesterton	0.91	Site 352 although assessed as suitable previously its development is no longer acheivable as the landowner has indicated they wish to retain site for educational use. Site to be removed from SHLAA.
38	Land to the r/o 1-3 Kendal Way	East Chesterton & Kings	0.22	Site 38 is not considered to be suitable for residential development. Given that the site is in the process of being converted into allotments (and given that the site has been

		Hedges		considered to be unsuitable for housing by the Council's Housing Department), it is considered that it is not suitable for housing
119	Surface car park adjacent to Colleges Nursery, Campkin Road	Kings Hedges	0.16	Site 119 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as the loss of car parking could have a negative impact on the adjacent community facilities and potential highways implications. It is felt that this site could be more usefully safeguarded for the expansion of the community facility
213	Kirkwood Road Business Estate	Kings Hedges	2.68	Site 119 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as the site was identified in the recent Employment Land Review (ELR) to be retained in employment use and is a protected industrial site.
223	Play area and car parks by North Arbury Chapel, Cameron Road	Kings Hedges	0.27	Site 119 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as the site is actually below 0.25 ha and meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
225	Open space at Hanson Court	Kings Hedges	0.42	Site 225 is not suitable for residential development because it constitutes amenity space, and is constrained by existing buildings, access is also difficult. The site meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
227	Open space south of Hanson Court	Kings Hedges	0.20	Site 227 is not suitable for residential development because integrating any development into the surrounding residential development may be difficult - the site has existing buildings fronting onto the site from two sides, and the site has amenity value. The site meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
228	Open space south of	Kings	0.30	Site 228 is not suitable for residential development because

	Turpyn Court	Hedges		Integrating the development into the surrounding residential development may be difficult - the site has existing buildings fronting onto the site from two sides, and the site has amenity value. The site also meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
229	Garages between Whitfield Close and Crowland Way	Kings Hedges	0.23	Site 229 is not suitable for residential development because it is too narrow and access would be problematic. Also, a small part of the site already has a permission for two dwellings.
233	Open space and garages south of Woodhouse Way	Kings Hedges	0.37	Site 233 is not suitable for residential development because it would involve loss of open space and a recreation facility. The site also meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
281	Playground at Arbury Court	Kings Hedges	0.43	Site 281 is not suitable for residential developments as it meets the criteria in the Local Plan for designation as Protected Open Space
285	Garages behind 2 to 36 Cratherne Way	Kings Hedges	0.21	Site 285 is not suitable for residential development because it is narrow and constrained by existing buildings and it constitutes access to adjoining properties
298	Land in the centre of Ramsden Square	Kings Hedges	0.29	Site 298 is not suitable for residential development because it would result in the loss of open space and the site adds to the character and amenity of the local area. The site also meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
230	Garages south of Hawkins Road	Kings Hedges	0.25	Site 230 is no longer achievable as the Council as land owner has decided to not pursue the site in its housing programme. The site is also now considered to be unsuitable for residential development because of its shape, community integration and access difficulties

				<i>the development would create.</i>
236	<i>Vindis Garage Milton Road</i>	<i>Kings Hedges</i>	<i>0.44</i>	<i>Site 236 is not achievable for residential development because the landowner has confirmed the existing use is likely to continue.</i>
923	<i>Land at George Nuttall Close</i>	<i>Kings Hedges</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>Site 923 is not suitable for residential development because one part of the site is in use as entrance/amenity space for existing flats. The other section represents an entrance to a car park built on seriously contaminated land.</i>
109	Lion Yard/Grand Arcade Multi-Storey Car Park	Market	0.36	Site 109 is not suitable for residential development because it is one of the main multi-storey car parks serving the City Centre and the Grand Arcade, and its loss could have a negative impact on the viability of the City Centre. As such, it is not considered to be suitable for development. Site is also in the CPZ.
110	Park Street Multi-Storey Car Park	Market	0.26	Site 110 is not suitable for residential development because it is one of the main multi-storey car parks serving the City Centre and the Grand Arcade, and its loss could have a negative impact on the viability of the City Centre. As such, it is not considered to be suitable for development. Site is also in the CPZ.
112	Grafton Centre East Multi-Storey Car Park	Market	0.46	Site 112 is not suitable for residential development because it is one of the main multi-storey car parks serving the City Centre and the Grafton Centre, and its loss could have a negative impact on the viability of the City Centre. As such, it is not considered to be suitable for development. Site is also in the CPZ.
113	Grafton Centre West Multi-storey car park,	Market	0.30	Site 113 is not suitable for residential development because it is one of the main multi-storey car parks serving the City

	Fitzroy Lane			Centre and the Grafton Centre, and its loss could have a negative impact on the viability of the City Centre. As such, it is not considered to be suitable for development. Site is also in the CPZ.
565	Car park behind 1 Regent Street	Market	0.19	Site 565 is unsuitable for residential development given the sites main function as a car park serving the adjoining office/commercial premises at 1 Regent Street (a protected office site in the ELR), and the proximity of adjoining buildings (one listed Grade II) which area of differing heights and scale, it is unsuitable for residential development. It would also result in the loss of car parking within the Controlled Parking Zone.
568	Open space and car park in front of The Judge Institute of Management Studies	Market	0.26	Site 568 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development. It lies adjacent to Grade II Listed Buildings which overlook the site. Residential development is likely to result in an adverse impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Buildings (Judge Institute of Management Studies) which overlook the site, and on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Development would result in the loss of car parking within the Controlled Parking Zone.
572	Car park behind the Royal Cambridge Hotel	Market	0.21	Site 572 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it would result in overlooking from the adjacent 3-storey, Grade II Listed, Royal Cambridge Hotel, and the University's Engineering Building to the west; the potential loss of mature trees on site; an adverse impact on the setting of the Listed Hotel building; and, on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
140	Lock-up garages to R/O 33 -56 Eltisle	Newnham	0.39	Site 140 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it is used for Use Class B1 purposes -

	Avenue			Motor vehicle repair workshops and MOT Testing Stations. Policy 7/3 indicates that development that results in the loss of floorspace within Use Classes B1(c), B2 and B8 will not be permitted unless residential more appropriate
142	Land to R/O St Marks Vicarage, Barton Road	Newnham	0.17	Site 142 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: The site is landlocked with no direct vehicular access to the public highway. It is directly overlooked from 3 sides, and features a number of TPO'd trees which would be lost as a result of any development.
190	Hockey Ground at Cranmer Road	Newnham	0.35	Site 190 is unsuitable for residential development because it meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space, and would result in partial loss of a community facility.
484	Car parks at Thirkill Court	Newnham	0.44	Site 484 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it would not sit well with the surrounding University uses. Access would be down a private access road and the site is currently in use for parking.
489	Car parks in front of Manor Court and Grange Court	Newnham	0.27	Site 489 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it would integrate poorly with surrounding residential development. The site is directly overlooked by the adjoining 5-storey blocks of flats at Manor Court and Grange Court immediately to the south. The TPO'd trees on site would be lost, as would the car parking area serving the adjoining flats. Overall, there would be harmful visual impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
490	Area of trees east of Pinehurst	Newnham	0.29	Site 490 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it would result in the loss of a

				substantial number of mature trees. This would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and to the spacious quality of the adjoining development to the west which forms the larger part of the site. The site also meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space .
483	Open space north of the Paul Mellon building	Newnham	0.35	Site 483 was initially considered to be suitable for residential development, however there is no interest from the landowner in residential development.
898	Trinity Old Fields Grange Road	Newnham	3.9	Site 898 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development. Any development will result in the loss of Protected Open Space and have an adverse impact on the character and openness of the locality. There is also no evidence of the landowners intentions to develop open market housing therefore it cannot be judged to be achievable.
900	Corpus Christi College Playing Fields to west Leckhampton House	Newnham	4.29	Site 900 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development. Any development will harm the open views of this land resulting in an adverse impact on the character and openness of the locality. There is also no public highway access to this site. There is also no evidence of the landowners intentions to develop open market housing therefore it cannot be judged to be achievable.
912	Owlstone Croft	Newnham	0.96	Site 912 (former Site 28) is not suitable for open market residential development because of its potential impacts upon the character of the Conservation Area; the lack of consideration of ecology impacts upon the adjacent Paradise Nature Reserve and Cam corridor;

				<i>concerns over safe access and egress by large numbers of walkers from the Nature Reserve; difficult vehicular access issues as a result of restricted road widths in adjoining streets, and heavy reliance on on-street parking. The development for open market housing will also result in the loss of much needed student accommodation. The development is also not achievable as the proposed access is in multiple ownership and support for alterations is not likely to be forthcoming.</i>
877	Land at Wilberforce Road	Newnham	0.60	Site 877 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development. Any development will result in the loss of Green Belt.
182	Emmanuel Sports Ground & City Hockey Club	Newnham	6.44	Site 182 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development. Planning Inspector for the 2006 Local Plan concluded that there was "No reasonable prospect of it [the site] coming forward for college or university faculty development" or that it was suitable for open market housing. He concluded the site's environmental and recreational value merited protection under Policy 4/2.
95	Former Cambridge Regional College/Ragged School site, Young Street	Petersfield	0.35	Site 95 is not considered to be suitable for residential development as the site has been acquired by Anglia Ruskin University who intend to develop the site for educational use.
111	Queen Anne Multi-storey Car Park, Gonville Place	Petersfield	0.38	Site 111 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development. The site provides car parking for the City Centre, as well as Parkside Pools and Kelsey Kerridge

				leisure centre. Loss of this car parking could impact on the viability of the uses that the car park serves as well as impacting on the viability of the City Centre. Site is in the CPZ. Redevelopment of this site would also result in the loss of a significant leisure facility and would be contrary to Policy 5/11. It is felt that it would difficult to relocate this facility to a location of equal accessibility.
522	Communal open space in the centre of St Matthew's Gardens	Petersfield	0.44	Site 522 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development. This is due to its primary function as a strategically important formal landscaped amenity area serving the adjoining St Matthew's Gardens development. Site will be allocated for Protected Open Space
527	Offices, warehouse/industrial buildings and car parking west of 13 to 37 Gwydir Street	Petersfield	0.23	Site 527 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development due to its primary function for employment/business uses, with associated car parking, it is desirable to safeguard it for employment use given the shortage of this space in the City. Site also identified in ELR.
540	Tree belt and service road east of York Street	Petersfield	0.28	Site 540 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because due to the narrowness of the site; its use as a service road serving retail units on a busy retail park, and for a tree/landscape belt screening the retail units from adjoining dwellings in York St.
541	The Beehive Centre	Petersfield	6.86	Site 541 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it would result in the loss of a significant retail site, with consequent impact on Cambridge's retail economy.
551	Area with trees west of 55 to 67 Highsett	Petersfield	0.30	Site 551 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it provides open space for Highsett, and residential development of the site would compromise

				the design of Highsett.
543	Workshops 72a Ainsworth Street	Petersfield	0.17	Site 543 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: Although initially considered to be suitable for development, the landowner has confirmed that they are not interested in residential development in timescale of next Local Plan
64	5-15 Tenison Road and land adjacent	Petersfield	0.74	Site 54 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because although initially considered suitable, the 3 owners are not interested in developing the site for residential.
20	Strangeways Research Laboratory, 2 Worts Causeway	Queen Edith's	0.74	Site 20 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it is established for research and employment use and is recommended to be retained in the Employment Land Review.
836	Garages behind Lady Jane Court, Cavendish Avenue	Queen Edith's	0.21	Site 836 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because: The site is poorly related to the adjoining 3-storey flats to the south at 1 - 21 Lady Jane Court. Any new development would result in overlooking and a loss of amenity between occupants of the new and existing buildings; the loss of a lot of surrounding tree cover; and, would be harmful to the character of the area. Also loss of parking for existing residents.
850	Play area north of 25 to 37 Godwin Way	Queen Edith's	0.32	Site 850 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it forms a formal recreation area and playspace, and is recognised as a Community Facility. There is no road access link to the site from the public highway - access is via two footpaths. These issues aside, any new development of this site should integrate well with surrounding residential development. Although the potential

				loss of the Community Facility and lack of access preclude its development. The site also meets the criteria in the Local Plan to be designated as Protected Open Space
852	Car park H, Addenbrookes, Hills Road	Queen Edith's	0.45	Site 852 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it forms part of Addenbrookes Hospital complex and is used as a public car park. The Hospital has a long history of parking issues and the loss of any parking serving it would have an adverse effect on the surrounding area whilst placing additional pressure on its other car parks. Any new housing on the site would appear out of keeping with its surroundings and would have a low level of amenity due to traffic noise from the very busy Hills Road/Fendon Road roundabout.
853	Michael Young Centre	Queen Edith's	1.26	Site 853 is a 'Nominated Sites with Potential for Sustainable Employment Development' in the Employment Land Review. Given its protected employment land status, the site is considered to be unsuitable for residential development.
617	Various warehouses, car parks etc at Cambridge Retail Park, east of the railway	Romsey	3.86	Site 617 is unsuitable for residential development because sections lie in the floodplain. In addition, the loss of existing employment uses would be unacceptable (safeguarded in ELR). (Size - 38.6ha; its existing uses of Class B1, B2 and B8 activities; poor access; constraints by Green Belt; distance from schools and GP Surgery; and proximity to 2 railway lines with potential for adverse noise generation).
618	Green's Health and Fitness, Coldhams Lane	Romsey	0.86	Site 618 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because of the Community Use of the site as a Health and Fitness Centre and its proximity to Coldhams Lane railway bridge.
619	Car park and open	Romsey	0.37	Site 619 is considered to be unsuitable for residential

	space west of Winstanley Court			development because of its shape; its small size, and its relationship to adjoining housing mean that it is unlikely to prove suitable for residential development. Site is also used for car parking.
637	Car park within Brookfields Hospital complex	Romsey	0.18	Site 637 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because any development of the site would be poorly related to the existing community. The site comprises a parking area serving the Brookfields Hospital and associated Healthcare facilities. These spaces would be lost if the site were developed in a piecemeal manner. There would be a threat to protected trees on the site. It is considered that residential development would be inappropriate in these surroundings, and may prejudice the future development of Site 7.12 as identified in the Local Plan 2006.
646	Sainsbury's car park	Romsey	1.60	Site 646 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because any development of this site would result in the loss of the car parking area serving the adjoining Sainsbury's Supermarket; it would have an impact on TPO trees; and a City Wildlife Site. There are issues of flood risk; and, any new development is likely to be poorly related to its surroundings.
647	Open Space on the north side of Coldhams Lane, opposite Sainsbury's petrol filling station	Romsey	0.29	Site 647 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it contains a functional floodplain and contributes to the character and amenity of the local area. Integrating the development of this site into the surrounding residential development may be difficult - the site is isolated from surrounding residential development. It has an irregular shape and is of limited depth; Cherry Hinton Brook runs

				through the middle of the site; site levels vary as site rises to meet railway forming an embankment prior to the railway crossing Barnwell Road by the railway over-bridge. The site provides small area of public open space and forms part of railway infrastructure.
648	Territorial Army Centre - Car park	Romsey	0.32	Site 648 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because of its use as a car park serving the Cambridge Territorial Army Centre; its proximity to the TA buildings; and, its separation from any existing residential development, means that any new development is likely to be mismatched in terms of adjoining land use, and divorced from any nearby housing. It is, therefore, considered to be unsuitable for residential development.
68	<i>Railway depot adjacent to 125a Cavendish Road</i>	<i>Romsey</i>	<i>0.30</i>	<i>Site 68 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development. The site is considered to be unsuitable for development because it has no current highway frontage and there are also noise issues associated with the site. Network Rail has also confirmed the existing use likely to continue to 2031 so the development is unachievable.</i>
574	Car park to rear of UCLES buildings, Hills Road	Trumpington	0.30	Site 574 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development due to the loss of office parking within the CPZ (office identified in ELR); impact on TPO trees; and, on neighbours amenities.
576	Car park west of Unilever House	Trumpington	0.24	Site 576 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development due to the loss of office parking within the CPZ. In addition, the height, scale and proximity of neighbouring buildings and the potential impact on adjoining Listed dwellings and the character of the Conservation Area,

				render it unsuitable for residential development.
582	Car park and garages west of Southacre Park	Trumpington	0.22	Site 582's is considered to be unsuitable for residential development due to its primary function as a garage court/car park, and access road serving adjoining existing housing.
587	Car park south and east of Eastbrook	Trumpington	0.41	Site 585's is considered to be unsuitable for residential development due to its primary function as a car parking area serving adjoining office accommodation (which has been identified in the ELR); its close proximity to the office buildings, and the loss of workplace car parking that would arise in an area close to the Controlled Parking Zone.
592	Savill's car park	Trumpington	0.22	Site 592 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development as any development is likely to prove difficult due to its poor relationship to adjoining commercial property to the north, proximity to noise sources (railway/guided bus route), and restricted access. The site benefits from an extant consent for office and car parking which would be a more suitable use than residential.
606	Car park west of 48 to 58 High Street, Trumpington	Trumpington	0.36	Site 606 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because it is constrained by the adjoining office building and there would be a considerable loss of parking. Allocation of the site would be inconsistent with treatment of other protected office sites in the ELR.
609	Waitrose car park	Trumpington	0.68	Site 609 is not suitable for residential development by virtue of its existing use which is required for the supermarket to operate.
122	Land adjacent to the Unicorn Public House, Church Lane	Trumpington	0.23	Site 122 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because although the site was initially considered to be suitable for development, it has recently

				been extended to provide B&B accomodation. It is also an awkward shape and is not really developable given constraints
21	158 Shelford Road	Trumpington	0.29	Site 21 was initially considered to be suitable for development, however the site may result in a gain of only 8 on redevelopment which is not enough to be SHLAA site as less than 10. In addition, on the 17/8/11 a letter was received from the land owner who envisages current use continuuiing throughout the plan period.
22	Bishops Court, Trumpington	Trumpington	1.56	Site 22 is considered to be unsuitable for residential development because although the site was initially considered to be suitable for development, the mutiplicity of ownerships and poor access along with parking displacement will mean very unlikely to happen.
8	Land to the rear of 29 & 31 Bateson Road	West Chesterton	0.31	Site 8 is unlikely to be considered to be developable as it would lead to the loss of an allotment site that meets the criteria in the Local Plan for Protected Open Space
329	Open space on Mulberry Close	West Chesterton	0.21	Site 329 is not suitable for residential development because it involves the loss of open space and the site adds to the character and amenity of the local area. It also meets the crieria in the Local Plan to be Protected Open Space
337	Open space east of College Fields	West Chesterton	0.28	Site 337 is not suitable for residential development because it involves the loss of open space and the site adds to the character and amenity of the local area. It also meets the crieria in the Local Plan to be Protected Open Space
338	Open space west of College Fields	West Chesterton	0.28	Site 338 is not suitable for residential development because it involves the loss of open space. Fitting the development in between the surrounding buildings may prove problematic. Site also meets the criteria in the Local Plan to

				be designated as Protected Open Space
908	Cambridge Student Support Centre (CSSC) Ascham Road	West Chesterton	0.58	Site 908 is not suitable for new development that involves the demolition of a listed building.