



# **Greater Cambridge Local Plan: First Proposals**

## **Sustainability Appraisal**

### **Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council**

**Final report**

Prepared by LUC

September 2021

Version	Status	Prepared	Checked	Approved	Date
1	Draft for client comment	A Peet E Smith H Briggs K Kaczor S Newman S Temple S Smith	S Smith J Allen	T Livingston	13.08.2021
2	Final for consultation	S Smith S Temple E Smith	S Smith T Livingston	T Livingston	27.08.2021
2	Further updates	S Smith	T Livingston	T Livingston	10.09.21

Page 2



## Land Use Consultants Limited

Registered in England. Registered number 2549296. Registered office: 250 Waterloo Road, London SE1 8RD. 100% recycled paper

Greater Cambridge Local Plan: First Proposals

# Contents

## **Chapter 1** **9**

### Introduction

Context for the Greater Cambridge Local Plan	9
The new Local Plan	11
Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment	11
Health Impact Assessment	16
Equalities Impact Assessment	16
Habitats Regulations Assessment	17
Structure of this report	17

## **Chapter 2** **19**

### Methodology

Introduction	19
SA Stage A: Scoping	21
SA Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects	32
SA Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal report	37
SA Stage D: Consultation on the Greater Cambridge Local Plan and this SA Report	37
SA Stage E: Monitoring implementation of the Local Plan	37
Appraisal methodology	38
Appraisal of site options	39
Health Impact Assessment	40
Equalities Impact Assessment	42
Difficulties Encountered	43

## **Chapter 3** **46**

### Sustainability Context for Development in Greater Cambridge

## Contents

Introduction	46
Current adopted Local Plans	46
Review of Plans and Programmes	49
Baseline Information	56
Key Sustainability Issues	56

## **Chapter 4** **72**

### Appraisal of Spatial Options

Spatial Distribution Options	72
Strategic Spatial Options	76
Site Options	132

## **Chapter 5** **174**

### Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

Introduction	174
Greater Cambridge in 2041	175
How much development and where?	181
The City of Cambridge	195
The edge of Cambridge	214
New settlements	228
The rural southern cluster	234
Rest of the rural area	248
Climate Change	255
Biodiversity and Green Spaces	272
Wellbeing and Inclusion	290
Great Places	302
Jobs	321
Homes	343
Infrastructure	385
Recommendations	404

## Contents

# Chapter 6 409

## Conclusions and Next Steps

Conclusions	409
Next Steps	410

# References 411

## Table of Tables

Table 4.1: Summary of likely effects for spatial distribution options	74
Table 4.2: Growth options 2020-41 (rounded to the nearest hundred)	82
Table 4.3: SA effects for SA objective 1: Housing	87
Table 4.4: SA effects for SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities	89
Table 4.5: SA effects for SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities	92
Table 4.6: SA effects for SA objective 4: Health	95
Table 4.7: SA effects for SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity	99
Table 4.8: SA effects for SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape	103
Table 4.9: SA effects for SA objective 7: Historic environment	106
Table 4.10: SA effects for SA objective 8: Efficient use of land	109
Table 4.11: SA effects for SA objective 9: Minerals	112
Table 4.12: SA effects for SA objective 10: Water	114
Table 4.13: SA effects for SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change	117
Table 4.14: SA effects for SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation	120
Table 4.15: SA effects for SA objective 13: Air pollution	124
Table 4.16: SA effects for SA objective 14: Economy	127
Table 4.17: SA effects for SA objective 15: Employment	129
Table 4.18: Summary of SA findings for the Densification of existing urban areas site options	135
Table 4.19: Summary of SA findings for site options in Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt	142

**Contents**

Table 4.20: Summary of SA findings for site options in Edge of Cambridge – non-Green Belt 149

Table 4.21: Summary of SA findings for the Integrating homes and jobs – Southern cluster site options 153

Table 4.22: Summary of SA findings for the Growth around transport nodes: Cambourne Area site options 158

Table 4.23: Summary of SA findings for site options for Dispersal: Villages 162

Table 4.24: Summary of SA findings for site options for Dispersal: Villages / Transport Corridors 168

Table 5.1: Vision 175

Table 5.3: Policy S/JH: New jobs and homes 182

Table 5.4: Policy S/DS: Development strategy 185

Table 5.8: Policy S/WC: West Cambridge 202

Table 5.12: Policy S/CE: Cambridge East 214

Table 5.13: Policy S/NWC: North West Cambridge 218

Table 5.14: Policy S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke’s Hospital) 221

Table 5.22: Policy S/RRA: Allocations in the rest of the rural area 249

Table 5.24: Policy CC/NZ: Net zero carbon new buildings 255

Table 5.25: Policy CC/WE: Water efficiency in new developments 258

Table 5.26: Policy CC/DC: Designing for a changing climate 261

Table 5.27: Policy CC/FM: Flooding and integrated water management 263

Table 5.28: Policy CC/RE: Renewable energy projects and infrastructure 265

Table 5.29: Policy CC/CE: Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy 268

Table 5.30: Policy CC/CS: Supporting land-based carbon sequestration 270

Table 5.31: Policy BG/BG: Biodiversity and geodiversity 273

Table 5.32: Policy BG/GI: Green Infrastructure 276

Table 5.33: Policy BG/TC: Improving tree canopy cover and the tree population 279

Table 5.34: Policy BG/RC: River corridors 283

Table 5.35: Policy BG/PO: Protection of open spaces 285

Table 5.36: Policy BG/EO: Providing and enhancing open spaces 288

Table 5.37: Policy WS/HD: Creating healthy new developments 290

Table 5.38: Policy WS/CF: Community, sports, and leisure facilities 294

Table 5.39: Policy WS/MU: Meanwhile uses during long term redevelopments 296

Table 5.40: Policy WS/IO: Creating inclusive employment and business opportunities through new developments 299

Table 5.41: Policy WS/HS: Pollution, health and safety 301

## Contents

Table 5.42: Policy GP/PP: People and place responsive design	303
Table 5.43: Policy GP/LC: Protection and enhancement of landscape character	306
Table 5.44: Policy GP/GB: Protection and enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt	308
Table 5.45: Policy GP/QD: Achieving high quality development	310
Table 5.46: Policy GP/QP: Establishing high quality landscape and public realm	313
Table 5.47: Policy GP/HA: Conservation and enhancement of heritage assets	316
Table 5.48: Policy GP/CC: Adapting heritage assets to climate change	317
Table 5.49: Policy GP/PH: Protection of public houses	319
Table 5.50: Policy J/NE: New employment development proposals	321
Table 5.51: Policy J/RE: Supporting the rural economy	323
Table 5.52: Policy J/AL: Protecting the best agricultural land	326
Table 5.53: Policy J/PB: Protecting existing business space	327
Table 5.54: Policy J/RW: Enabling remote working	329
Table 5.55: Policy J/AW: Affordable workspace and creative industries	332
Table 5.56: Policy J/EP: Supporting a range of facilities in employment parks	334
Table 5.57: Policy J/RC: Retail and centres	336
Table 5.58: Policy J/VA: Visitor accommodation, attractions and facilities	338
Table 5.59: Policy J/FD: Faculty development and specialist/language schools	341
Table 5.60: Policy H/AH: Affordable housing	344
Table 5.61: Policy H/ES: Exception sites for affordable housing	348
Table 5.62: Policy H/HM: Housing mix	351
Table 5.63: Policy H/HD: Housing density	353
Table 5.64: Policy H/GL: Garden land and subdivision of existing plots	355
Table 5.65: Policy H/SS: Residential space standards and accessible homes	357
Table 5.66: Policy H/SH: Specialist housing and homes for older people	362
Table 5.67: Policy H/CB: Self and custom-build homes	364
Table 5.68: Policy H/BR: Build to Rent Homes	367
Table 5.69: Policy H/MO: Houses in multiple occupation	370
Table 5.70: Policy H/SA: Student accommodation	373
Table 5.71: Policy H/DC: Dwellings in the countryside	375
Table 5.72: Policy H/RM: Residential moorings	378
Table 5.73: Policy H/RC: Residential caravan sites	379
Table 5.74: Policy H/GT: Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites	381
Table 5.75: Policy H/CH: Community-led housing	383
Table 5.76: Policy I/ST: Sustainable Transport and Connectivity	386
Table 5.77: Policy I/EV: Parking and Electric Vehicles	388

**Contents**

Table 5.78: Policy I/FD: Freight and Delivery Consolidation 392

Table 5.79: Policy I/SI: Safeguarding important infrastructure 394

Table 5.80: Policy I/AD: Aviation Development 396

Table 5.81: Policy I/EI: Energy Infrastructure Masterplanning 398

Table 5.82: Policy I/ID: Infrastructure and Delivery 400

Table 5.83: Policy I/DI: Digital infrastructure 402

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

**1.1** South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council (the Councils) have commissioned LUC to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) (incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), Health Impact Assessment (HIA) and Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA)) of their Local Plan.

**1.2** The Councils are required by law to carry out both SEA and SA of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. The Councils have appointed LUC to do this on their behalf. SEA assesses the likely environmental effects of a plan, whereas SA builds on this to assess economic and social effects as well. The SA also includes a Health Impact Assessment to determine the impacts of the Local Plan on people's health and well-being, and an Equality Impact Assessment to identify if any groups of people with 'protected characteristics' within Greater Cambridge may be disproportionately affected.

**1.3** This report relates to the Greater Cambridge Local Plan: First Proposals document ('First Proposals document') and should be read in conjunction with that document. The purpose of this report is to assess the likely sustainability impacts of the preferred options and reasonable alternatives for the Local Plan.

## Context for the Greater Cambridge Local Plan

**1.4** Comprising Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District, Greater Cambridge covers approximately 360 square miles, with a total population of around 290,000 people across the two local authority areas. Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire have a unique relationship, in that South Cambridgeshire entirely surrounds Cambridge City. Greater Cambridge borders

Huntingdonshire and East Cambridgeshire to the north; Central Bedfordshire to the west; North Hertfordshire, Uttlesford and Braintree to the south, and to the east, it borders West Suffolk.

**1.5** Whilst Cambridge City is distinctly urban, South Cambridgeshire is a mainly rural district. With Cambourne in the west, Histon to the north and Sawston in the south being the most populated settlements in Greater Cambridge, after Cambridge City. The new town of Northstowe is under construction in the north of the district.

**1.6** Cambridge is a city of international importance in terms of its world-class university, research, heritage, culture and science. Cambridge also plays a key functional role in planning terms as the dominant centre in Cambridgeshire and as a main nodal point of the Oxford-Milton Keynes-Cambridge Arc and M11 corridor.

**1.7** As a prominent hub for research and the dominant centre of Cambridgeshire, Cambridge has strong north-south transport links to London and north Cambridgeshire via train and the M11 corridor. Approximately 23,367 people commute daily from South Cambridgeshire to the city. Whilst South Cambridgeshire currently has limited access to bus services and other more sustainable modes of transport, particularly in the more remote west and eastern parts of Greater Cambridge, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport Plan (2020) sets out a number of measures to improve transport links in the area.

**1.8** Greater Cambridge contains a wealth of historic assets, with over 4,000 listed buildings, 32 conservation areas and 24 registered parks and gardens across Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. A variety of mineral resources are also found in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan area, including sand, gravel and chalk. These extensive deposits often occur under high quality agricultural land or in areas valued for their biodiversity and landscapes, such as river valleys.

## The new Local Plan

**1.9** Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council have committed to preparing a joint Local Plan for their combined area, referred to as Greater Cambridge, a strand of work which originated as part of the City Deal agreement with central government established in 2014. The individual Councils both adopted separate Local Plans in September and October respectively in 2018 which set out the development needs of the local authority areas up to 2031.

**1.10** The adopted Local Plans acknowledged the commitment to an early review of their Local Plans beginning in 2019. This decision to take forward the early review of the Local Plans was made in order to establish what impact the anticipated changed infrastructure and economic growth in the area might have on housing need and other aspects of spatial and transport planning. Further, during Examination of the individual Local Plans, a number of issues were highlighted for specific attention. These related to the assessment of housing needs, progress in delivering the development strategy and in particular the proposed new settlements and provision to meet the requirements of caravan dwellers.

**1.11** The plan period for the Greater Cambridge Local Plan will cover the period to 2041. It will replace the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018).

## Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

**1.12** Sustainability Appraisal is a statutory requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. It is designed to ensure that the plan preparation process maximises the contribution that a plan makes to sustainable development and minimises any potential adverse impacts. The SA

process involves appraising the likely social, environmental and economic effects of the policies and proposals within a plan from the outset of its development.

**1.13** Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is also a statutory assessment process, required by the SEA Regulations (Statutory Instrument 2004, No 1633, as amended by Statutory Instrument 2018 No 1232 and by Statutory Instrument 2020 No 1531). The SEA Regulations require the formal assessment of plans and programmes which are likely to have significant effects on the environment and which set the framework for future consent of projects requiring Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The purpose of SEA is to provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans with a view to promoting sustainable development.

**1.14** SEA and SA are separate processes but have similar aims and objectives. Simply put, SEA focuses on the likely environmental effects of a plan whilst SA includes a wider range of considerations, extending to social and economic impacts. National Planning Practice Guidance shows how it is possible to satisfy both requirements by undertaking a joint SA/SEA process, and to present an SA report that incorporates the requirements of the SEA Regulations. The SA/SEA of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan is being undertaken using this integrated approach and throughout this report the abbreviation 'SA' should therefore be taken to refer to 'SA incorporating the requirements of SEA'.

## Requirements of the SEA Regulations and where these are addressed in this SA Report

**1.15** The text below signposts how the requirements of the SEA Regulations have been met in this report.

## Reporting Requirements

**1.16** The SEA Regulations require the responsible authority to prepare, or secure the preparation of, an 'environmental report', which in this case will comprise the SA report. The environmental report must set out the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme, and reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and geographical scope of the plan or programme, are identified, described and evaluated (Regulation 12). The information to be given (as listed in Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations) is set out below, with the relevant chapter(s) and appendix(ces) that include that information referred to.

- An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes – covered in Chapter 1, Chapter 3 and Appendix B of this SA Report.
- The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme – covered in Chapter 3 and Appendix B of this SA Report.
- The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected – covered in Chapter 3 and Appendix B of this SA Report.
- Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC – covered in Chapter 3 and Appendix B of this SA Report.
- The environmental protection, objectives, established at international, community or national level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental, considerations have been taken into account during its preparation – covered in Chapter 3 and Appendix B of this SA Report.
- The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between

the above factors. (Footnote: These effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects) – covered in Chapter 4, Chapter 5 and Appendix C of this SA Report.

- The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme – Chapter 5 of this SA Report sets out a series of recommendations for each policy approach, including measures to avoid, minimise and mitigate negative effects identified, where appropriate. Further mitigation suggestions will be included in future iterations of the SA, once policies are fully drafted.
- An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information – covered in Chapter 2, Chapter 4 (for the strategic spatial and site options) and Chapter 5 (for the policy approaches) of this SA Report.
- A description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Regulation 17 – this will be included in future iterations of SA, once policies and the Local Plan’s monitoring framework are fully drafted.
- A non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings – a separate Non-Technical Summary has been published alongside this document.

**1.17** (Regulation 12(3)) requires that the report shall include the information that may reasonably be required taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment, the contents and level of detail in the plan or programme, its stage in the decision-making process and the extent to which certain matters are more appropriately assessed at different levels in that process to avoid duplication of the assessment. These requirements are addressed throughout this SA Report.

## Consultation Requirements

**1.18** The SEA Regulations also set out the consultation processes that should be undertaken when preparing an environmental report.

- Authorities with environmental responsibility must be consulted, when deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information which must be included in the environmental report (Regulation 12(5)) – Consultation was undertaken on the SA Scoping Report in January and February 2020.
- Authorities with environmental responsibility and the public shall be given an effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan or programme and the accompanying environmental report before the adoption of the plan or programme (Regulation 13) – this document is being published for consultation for a six week period between 1 November to 13 December 2021.
- Any relevant EU Member State must be consulted, where the implementation of the plan or programme is likely to have significant effects on the environment of that country (Regulation 14) – this does not apply to this SA Report.

## Provision of Information on the Decision

**1.19** Regulation 14 of the SEA Regulations addresses taking the environmental report and the results of the consultations into account in decision-making. When the plan or programme is adopted, the public and any countries consulted under Regulation 14 must be informed and the following made available to those so informed:

- The plan or programme as adopted; a statement summarising how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme and how the environmental report, the opinions expressed and the results of consultations entered into have been taken into account, and the reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with; and Monitoring of the

significant environmental effects of the plan's or programme's implementation (Regulation 17) - To be addressed after the Local Plan is adopted.

**1.20** Quality assurance: environmental reports should be of a sufficient standard to meet the requirements of the SEA Regulations – this report has been produced in line with current guidance and good practice for SEA/SA and this section has demonstrated where the requirements of the SEA Regulations have been met.

## Health Impact Assessment

**1.21** Health Impact Assessment (HIA) aims to ensure that health-related issues are integrated into the plan-making process. HIA of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan has been integrated into the SA. SA objective 4 considers impacts on health.

## Equalities Impact Assessment

**1.22** The requirement to undertake formal Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) of plans was introduced in the Equality Act 2010, but was abolished in 2012. Despite this, authorities are still required to have regard to the provisions of the Equality Act, namely the Public Sector Duty which requires public authorities to have due regard for equalities considerations when exercising their functions. The SA considers whether the Local Plan is likely to disproportionately affect any groups with particular 'protected characteristics' under the Equality Act, as well as whether the Local Plan may disproportionately affect any other groups, such as different socio-economic groups, through the application of SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities. A separate EqIA has been undertaken of the Local Plan by the Councils and has been drawn upon to inform the findings for SA objective 3, where relevant.

## Habitats Regulations Assessment

**1.23** The requirement to undertake Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of development plans was confirmed by the amendments to the Habitats Regulations published for England and Wales in July 2007; the currently applicable version is the Habitats Regulations 2017, as amended (SI No. 2017/1012, as amended by The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 (SI 2019/579)). The purpose of HRA is to assess the impacts of a land-use plan against the conservation objectives of nature conservation sites afforded the highest level of protection in the UK (formerly classified under EU legislation and now protected by the Habitats Regulations) and to ascertain whether it would adversely affect the integrity of that site.

**1.24** The HRA is being undertaken separately but the findings will be taken into account in the SA where relevant (for example to inform judgements about the likely effects of potential development locations on biodiversity).

## Structure of this report

**1.25** This section has introduced the SA process for the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. The remainder of the report is structured into the following sections:

- Chapter 2: Methodology describes the approach that is being taken to the SA of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan.
- Chapter 3: Sustainability Context for Development in Greater Cambridge summarises the policy context for the Local Plan SA and the key environmental, social and economic issues in the area.
- Chapter 4: Appraisal of Spatial Options presents the SA findings for the Strategic Spatial Options and site options considered in the preparation of the Local Plan.

- Chapter 5: Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives presents the SA findings for the preferred policy approaches and reasonable alternatives to these set out in the Local Plan First Proposals document.
- Chapter 6: Conclusions and Next Steps summarises the key findings from the SA and describes the next steps to be undertaken.

**1.26** The main report is supported by a number of appendices, as follows:

- Appendix A presents the consultation comments received in relation to previous stages of the SA.
- Appendix B presents the review of relevant plans, policies and programmes and updated baseline information.
- Appendix C presents the assessment of Strategic Spatial Options, as prepared in November 2020 and updated to take account of baseline updates.
- Appendix D sets out the criteria applied in assessing site options.
- Appendix E sets out the Council's justification for selecting sites to take forward for allocation and discounting alternatives.

# Chapter 2

## Methodology

### Introduction

**2.1** In addition to complying with legal requirements, the approach being taken to the SA of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan is based on current best practice and the guidance on SA/SEA set out in the national Planning Practice Guidance, which involves carrying out SA as an integral part of the plan-making process. The main stages of the plan-making process and shows how these correspond to the SA process are set out below.

### Local Plan Step 1: Evidence Gathering and Engagement

- Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope
  - Identifying other relevant policies, plans and programmes, and sustainability objectives
  - Collecting baseline information
  - Identifying sustainability issues and problems
  - Developing the SA Framework
  - Consulting on the scope of the SA

### Local Plan Step 2: Production

- Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects

- Testing the Local Plan objectives against the SA Framework
- Developing the Local Plan options
- Evaluating the effects of the Local Plan
- Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects
- Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the Local Plan
- Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report
  - Preparing the SA Report
- Stage D: Seek representations on the Local Plan and the Sustainability Appraisal Report
  - Public participation on Local Plan and the SA Report
  - Appraising significant changes

## Local Plan Step 3: Examination

- Appraising significant changes resulting from representations

## Local Plan Step 4 & 5: Adoption and Monitoring

- Making decisions and providing information
- Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the Local Plan
  - Finalising aims and methods for monitoring
  - Responding to adverse effects

**2.2** The sections below describe the approach that has been taken to the SA of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan to date and provide information on the subsequent stages of the process.

## SA Stage A: Scoping

**2.3** The SA process began in September 2019 with the production of a SA Scoping Report for the Greater Cambridge Local Plan.

**2.4** The Scoping stage of the SA involves understanding the social, economic and environmental baseline for the plan area as well as the sustainability policy context and key sustainability issues. The Scoping Report presented the outputs of the following tasks:

- Policies, plans and programmes of relevance to the Local Plan were identified and the relationships between them and the Local Plan and the SA were considered, enabling any potential synergies to be exploited and any potential inconsistencies and incompatibilities to be identified and addressed.
- Baseline information was collected on environmental, social and economic issues in Greater Cambridge. This baseline information provides the basis for predicting and monitoring the likely effects of options for policies and site allocations and helps to identify alternative ways of dealing with any adverse effects identified.
- Key sustainability issues for Greater Cambridge were identified.
- A Sustainability Appraisal framework was presented, setting out the SA objectives against which options and subsequently policies will be appraised. The SA framework provides a way in which the sustainability impacts of implementing a plan can be described, analysed and compared. It comprises a series of sustainability objectives and associated sub-questions that can be used to ‘interrogate’ options and draft policies during the plan-making process. During the SA, the performances of the plan options (and later, policies) are assessed against these SA objectives and sub-questions.

**2.5** The SA framework for the Greater Cambridge Local Plan is presented below, showing the SA objectives (labelled SA 1, SA 2 and so on) and appraisal questions (labelled SA 1.1, SA 1.2 and so on). This also shows how all of the

'SEA topics' (as listed in Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations) have been covered by the SA objectives, reflecting the fact that an integrated approach is being taken to the SA and SEA of the Local Plan.

**2.6** Public and stakeholder participation is an important part of the SA and wider plan-making processes. It helps to ensure that the SA Report is robust and has due regard for all appropriate information that will support the plan in making a contribution to sustainable development. The Scoping Report was consulted on in January and February 2020. Appendix A lists the comments that were received during the consultation on the SA Scoping Report and describes how each one was addressed, where relevant. A small number of updates have been made to the SA framework since the Scoping Report and Issues and Options SA, to reflect consultation responses received in relation to those documents. The SA objectives themselves have not changed, but some of the sub-questions have been refined. These changes are as follows:

- Question 1.4 has been amended from 'Does the Plan provide for the housing needs of both an ageing and young population based on locational needs?' to 'Does the Plan provide for the housing needs of both an ageing population and younger adults (such as young professionals) based on locational needs?'
- Question 3.1 has been amended from 'Does the Plan facilitate the integration of new neighbourhoods with existing neighbourhoods?' to 'Does the Plan facilitate the integration of new neighbourhoods with existing communities?'
- Question 12.4 has been amended from 'Does the Plan support public transport?' to 'Does the Plan support the growth of public transport networks, modal shift away from private cars and onto public transport, and access to public transport options?'
- Question 14.5 has been amended from 'Does the Plan support stronger links to the wider economy of the Oxford-Cambridge Arc?' to 'Does the Plan support stronger links to the wider economy of, and contribute to meeting sustainable economic growth envisaged across, the Oxford-Cambridge Arc, the Cambridge Norwich Tech Corridor and/or the Stanstead Growth Corridor?'

# Sustainability Appraisal Framework

## SA objective 1: Housing

- To ensure that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent, well-designed, sustainably constructed and affordable home.

### Appraisal questions:

- SA 1.1: Does the Plan provide for the local housing need of Greater Cambridge?
- SA 1.2: Does the Plan deliver the range of types, tenures that Greater Cambridge needs over the plan period?
- SA 1.3: Does the Plan increase the supply of affordable homes in both urban and rural areas?
- SA 1.4: Does the Plan provide for the housing needs of both an ageing population and younger adults (such as young professionals) based on locational needs?
- SA 1.5: Does the Plan provide for specialist housing needs, including that of the student population and Gypsies and Travellers?
- Relevant SEA topics: Population, Human Health and Material Assets

## SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities

- To maintain and improve access to centres of services and facilities including health centres and education.

### Appraisal questions:

- SA 2.1: Does the Plan support the existing city, district, local, neighbourhood, rural and minor rural centres?
- SA 2.2: Does the Plan provide for sufficient local services and facilities to support new and growing communities (e.g. schools, employment

training and lifetime learning facilities, health facilities, sport and recreation, accessible green space and services in local centres)?

- SA 2.3: Does the Plan provide for development within proximity to existing or new services and facilities that are accessible for all?
- Relevant SEA topics: Population, Human Health and Material Assets

## SA objective 3: Social inclusion and Equalities

- To encourage social inclusion, strengthen community cohesion, and advance equality between those who share a protected characteristic (Equality Act 2010) and those who do not.

### Appraisal questions:

- SA 3.1: Does the Plan facilitate the integration of new neighbourhoods with existing communities?
- SA 3.2: Does the Plan promote developments that benefit and are used by existing and new residents in Greater Cambridge, particularly for Greater Cambridge's most deprived areas?
- SA 3.3: Does the Plan meet the needs of specific groups in Greater Cambridge, including those with protected characteristics and the needs of a growing and ageing population?
- SA 3.4: Does the Plan promote the vitality and viability of Greater Cambridge's city, district, local, neighbourhood, rural and minor rural centres through social and cultural initiatives?
- SA 3.5: Does the Plan help to support high levels of pedestrian activity/ outdoor interaction, where people mix?
- SA 3.6: Does the Plan remove or reduce disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics?
- Relevant SEA topics: Population, Human Health and Material Assets

## SA objective 4: Health

- To improve public health, safety and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.

### Appraisal questions:

- SA 4.1: Does the Plan promote health and wellbeing and encourage healthy lifestyles by maintaining, connecting, creating and enhancing multifunctional open spaces, green infrastructure, and recreation and sports facilities and by providing access to recreational opportunities in the countryside?
- SA 4.2 Does the Plan promote healthy lifestyle choices by encouraging and facilitating walking and cycling, including provision of dedicated cycleways, as well as permeable and legible streets?
- SA 4.3: Does the Plan safeguard human health and well-being by promoting climate change resilience through sustainable siting, design, landscaping and infrastructure, particularly green infrastructure?
- SA 4.4: Does the Plan provide sufficient access to local health services and facilities (e.g. health centres and hospitals)?
- SA 4.5: Does the Plan encourage local food growing?
- SA 4.6: Does the Plan promote mental wellbeing through the design of attractive places and opportunities for social interaction?
- SA 4.7: Does the Plan promote principles of good urban design to limit the potential for crime in Greater Cambridge?
- SA 4.8: Does the Plan contribute to a reduction in the fear of crime?
- Relevant SEA topics: Population, Human Health and Climatic Factors

## SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity

- To conserve, enhance, restore and connect wildlife, habitats, species and/or sites of biodiversity or geological interest.

### Appraisal questions:

- SA 5.1: Does the Plan avoid adverse effects on internationally and nationally designated biodiversity and geodiversity assets within and outside Greater Cambridge?
- SA 5.2: Does the Plan avoid adverse effects on locally designated biodiversity and geodiversity assets within and outside Greater Cambridge, including ancient woodland?
- SA 5.3: Does the Plan seek to protect and enhance ecological networks, including opportunity areas (buffer and stepping stone opportunities) identified through biodiversity opportunity mapping, promoting the achievement of biodiversity net gain, whilst taking into account the impacts of climate change?
- SA 5.4: Does the Plan provide and manage opportunities for people to come into contact with wildlife whilst encouraging respect for and raising awareness of the sensitivity of biodiversity?
- Relevant SEA topics: Landscape, Biodiversity, Flora, Fauna and Cultural Heritage

## SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape

- To conserve and enhance the character and distinctiveness of Greater Cambridge's landscapes and townscapes, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place.

### Appraisal questions:

- SA 6.1: Does the Plan protect and enhance Greater Cambridge's sensitive, special landscapes, such as fens, and historic settlements?
- SA 6.2: Does the Plan protect and enhance Greater Cambridge's natural environment assets (including parks and green spaces, common land, woodland and forest reserves) and public realm?
- SA 6.3: Does the Plan protect the setting of the city of Cambridge, including key views into and out of the city?
- Relevant SEA topics: Landscape, Biodiversity, Flora, Fauna and Cultural Heritage

## SA objective 7: Historic environment

- To conserve and/or enhance the qualities, fabric, setting and accessibility of Greater Cambridge's historic environment.

### Appraisal questions:

- SA 7.1: Does the Plan conserve and enhance Greater Cambridge's designated heritage assets, including their setting and their contribution to wider local character and distinctiveness?
- SA 7.2: Does the Plan conserve and enhance Greater Cambridge's non-designated heritage assets, including their setting and their contribution to wider local character and distinctiveness?
- SA 7.3: Does the Plan safeguard, and where possible enhance, the historic fabric of the city of Cambridge?
- SA 7.4: Does the Plan provide opportunities for improvements to the conservation, management and enhancement of Greater Cambridge's heritage assets, particularly heritage at risk?
- SA 7.5: Does the Plan promote access to, as well as enjoyment and understanding of, the local historic environment for Greater Cambridge's residents and visitors?
- Relevant SEA topics: Archaeological Heritage

## SA objective 8: Efficient use of land

- To make efficient use of Greater Cambridge's land resources through the re-use of previously developed land and conserve its soils.

### Appraisal questions

- SA 8.1: Does the Plan maximise the provision of housing and employment development on previously developed land?
- SA 8.2: Does the Plan ensure contaminated land is remediated where appropriate?

- SA 8.3: Does the Plan minimise the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land to development?
- Relevant SEA topics: Soil and Material Assets

## SA objective 9: Minerals

- To conserve mineral resources in Greater Cambridge

### Appraisal questions:

- SA 9.1 Does the Plan ensure that unnecessary or unjustified sterilisation of mineral resources is prevented?
- Relevant SEA topics: Material Assets

## SA objective 10: Water

- To achieve sustainable water resource management and enhance the quality of Greater Cambridge's waters.

### Appraisal questions:

- SA 10.1: Does the Plan ensure there is sufficient water to serve new growth for the lifetime of the development in a changing climate without negatively impacting on the environment?
- SA 10.2: Does the Plan seek to improve the water quality of Greater Cambridge's rivers and water bodies?
- SA 10.3: Does the Plan minimise inappropriate development in Source Protection Zones?
- SA 10.4: Does the Plan ensure that there is sufficient waste water treatment infrastructure and environmental capacity to accommodate the new development in a changing climate?
- SA 10.5: Does the Plan promote development which would avoid water pollution due to contaminated runoff from development?

- SA 10.6: Does the Plan support efficient use of water in new developments, including the recycling of water resources, promoting water stewardship and water sensitive design where appropriate?
- Relevant SEA topics: Water, Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora

## SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change

- To adapt to climate change including minimising flood risk.

### Appraisal questions:

- SA 11.1: Does the Plan minimise inappropriate development in areas prone to flood risk and areas prone to increasing flood risk elsewhere, taking into account the impacts of climate change?
- SA11.2: Does the Plan promote the use of Natural Flood Management schemes, SuDS and flood resilient design?
- SA11.3: Does the Plan promote design measures in new development and the public realm to respond to weather events arising from climate change, such as heatwaves and intense rainfall?
- SA 11.4: Does the Plan provide, enhance and retrofit green infrastructure?
- Relevant SEA topics: Water, Material Assets, Climatic Factors and Human Health

## SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation

- To minimise Greater Cambridge's contribution to climate change

### Appraisal questions:

- SA 12.1: Does the Plan promote energy efficient design?
- SA 12.2: Does the Plan encourage the provision of energy from renewable sources?

- SA 12.3: Does the Plan promote the use of locally and sustainably sourced, and recycling of, materials in construction and renovation?
- SA 12.4: Does the Plan support the growth of public transport networks, modal shift away from private cars and onto public transport, and access to public transport options?
- SA 12.5: Does the Plan create, maintain and enhance attractive and well- connected networks of public transport and active travel, including walking and cycling?
- SA 12.6: Does the Plan support development which is in close proximity to city, district and rural centres, services and facilities, key employment areas and/or public transport nodes, thus reducing the need to travel by car?
- SA12.7: Does the Plan address congestion hotspots in the road network?
- Relevant SEA topics: Air, Human health, air and Climatic factors

## SA objective 13: Air quality

- To limit air pollution in Greater Cambridge and ensure lasting improvements in air quality.

### Appraisal questions:

- SA 13.1: Does the Plan avoid, minimise and mitigate the effects of poor air quality?
- SA 13.2: Does the Plan promote more sustainable transport and reduce the need to travel?
- SA 13.3: Does the Plan contain measures which will help to reduce congestion?
- SA 13.4: Does the Plan minimise increases in traffic, particularly non-electric vehicles, in Air Quality Management Areas?
- SA 13.5: Does the Plan facilitate the take up of low / zero emission vehicles?

- Relevant SEA topics: Air and Human Health

## SA objective 14: Economy

- To facilitate a sustainable and growing economy.

### Appraisal questions:

- SA 14.1: Does the Plan provide for an adequate supply of land and the delivery of infrastructure to meet Greater Cambridge's economic and employment needs?
- SA 14.2: Does the Plan support opportunities for the expansion and diversification of businesses?
- SA 14.3: Does the Plan provide for start-up businesses and flexible working practices?
- SA 14.4: Does the Plan support the prosperity and diversification of Greater Cambridge's rural economy?
- SA 14.5: Does the Plan support stronger links to the wider economy of, and contribute to meeting sustainable economic growth envisaged across, the Oxford-Cambridge Arc?
- SA 14.6: Does the Plan support the growth of the knowledge, science, research and high tech sectors?
- Relevant SEA topics: Population and Material Assets

## SA objective 15: Employment

- To deliver, maintain and enhance access to diverse employment opportunities, to meet both current and future needs in Greater Cambridge.

### Appraisal questions:

- SA 15.1: Does the Plan provide for employment opportunities that are easily accessible, preferably via sustainable modes of transport?

- SA 15.2: Does the Plan support equality of opportunity for young people and job seekers?
- Relevant SEA topics: Population and Material Assets

## SA Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects

**2.7** Developing options for a plan is an iterative process, usually involving a number of consultations with the public and stakeholders. Consultation responses and the SA can help to identify where there may be other 'reasonable alternatives' to the options being considered for a plan.

**2.8** Regulation 12 (2) of the SEA Regulations requires that:

"The (environmental or SA) report must identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects on the environment of—

(a) implementing the plan or programme; and

(b) reasonable alternatives, taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme."

**2.9** Any alternatives considered for the plan need to be 'reasonable'. This implies that alternatives that are not reasonable do not need to be subject to appraisal. Examples of unreasonable alternatives could include policy options that do not meet the objectives of the plan or national policy (e.g. the National Planning Policy Framework) or site options that are unavailable or undeliverable.

**2.10** The SA findings are not the only factors taken into account when determining a preferred option to take forward in a plan. Indeed, there will often be an equal number of positive or negative effects identified for each option, such that it is not possible to ‘rank’ them based on sustainability performance in order to select a preferred option. Factors such as public opinion, deliverability and conformity with national policy will also be taken into account by plan-makers when selecting preferred options for their plan.

## Issues and Options Consultation (First Conversation)

**2.11** The Councils held a ‘First Conversation’ consultation in January and February 2020. This included an Issues and Options consultation document, which set out four ‘big themes’, as well as six spatial distribution options. These were subject to SA and the results were presented in the Sustainability Appraisal of Issues and Options (December 2019) and the findings are summarised in Chapter 4.

**2.12** The big themes (climate change; biodiversity and green spaces; wellbeing and social inclusion; and great places) were identified by drawing on views shared in a number of workshops held with community representatives and local organisations in summer 2019, the Councils’ priorities set out in the Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District corporate plans, and by taking into account national and local planning priorities and requirements.

**2.13** The spatial distribution options considered at the Issues and Options stage were:

- Densification of existing urban areas.
- Edge of Cambridge: outside Green Belt.
- Edge of Cambridge: within Green Belt.
- Dispersal: new settlements.

- Dispersal: villages.
- Public transport corridors.

**2.14** These were identified by the Councils as reasonable options drawing upon the development strategy options considered for the Councils' current Local Plans, as well as considering spatial options identified in the recent Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Independent Economic Review and other approaches taken nationally. In the Issues and Options document the Councils recognised that the best scenario would likely involve some growth in all of these locations but in different proportions depending upon the prioritisation of themes in the plan. These spatial distribution options formed the basis for, and evolved into, the Strategic Spatial Options set out below.

## Strategic Spatial Options

**2.15** Building on the initial options set out in the First Conversation, the Councils identified three growth level options for homes and jobs and eight strategic (non-site specific) spatial options, which were subject to SA. A description of the options and explanation of how they were developed is set out in Strategic Spatial Options Chapter 4. These drew on the spatial distribution options considered at the Issues and Options Stage, but with greater consideration of how each could meet the three growth level options and ensuring reasonable alternatives had been considered. The eight Strategic Spatial Options are as follows:

- Densification of existing urban areas.
- Edge of Cambridge: outside Green Belt.
- Edge of Cambridge: within Green Belt.
- Dispersal: new settlements.
- Dispersal: villages.
- Public transport corridors.
- Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs.

- Expanding a growth area around transport nodes.

**2.16** These more detailed Strategic Spatial Options supersede those considered in the SA of Issues and Options.

**2.17** The three growth levels considered were as follows:

- Minimum – Standard Method homes-led.
- Medium – central scenario employment-led.
- Maximum – higher employment-led.

**2.18** In November 2020, the Councils published initial evidence base findings and development strategy options assessments, including an SA of the Strategic Spatial Options at different levels of growth. The results of this assessment are presented in Appendix C (these have been updated to take account of baseline updates). In 2021, the Council identified two additional Strategic Spatial Options, both of which have been subject to SA. The results of this assessment are presented in Chapter 4.

**2.19** Note that in 2021, the Councils no longer consider the minimum and maximum growth levels to be reasonable. This is because:

- Planning for the higher jobs forecast and level of homes associated with it (maximum growth option) was rejected as this higher jobs forecast could be possible, but is not the most likely future scenario. As such the Councils do not consider that it represents Greater Cambridge's objectively assessed need, and would therefore not be a reasonable alternative.
- Planning for the government's standard method local housing need figure (minimum growth option) was rejected as it would not support the most likely forecast for future jobs. As such the Councils do not consider that it represents Greater Cambridge's objectively assessed need, and would therefore not be a reasonable alternative.

## Site Options

**2.20** More than 700 sites were tested by the Councils through the Greater Cambridge Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (2021) (HELAA), in a wide range of locations across Greater Cambridge. The testing of sites through the sustainability appraisal has focused on reasonable alternative sites, informed by the emerging preferred strategy option, and the testing carried out via the HELAA as to where a site was suitable, available and achievable for development. Further information on how site options were identified is presented in Appendix E.

**2.21** All reasonable alternative site options have been subject to SA and the results of this appraisal are presented in Chapter 4.

## Policy Approaches and Alternatives

**2.22** The 2021 First Proposals document sets out proposed policy directions for a number of policy areas, based around the big themes identified at the Issues and Options stage. For each policy area, the First Proposals document set out a summary of the preferred policy approach, why a policy on that area is considered necessary and the alternatives considered (including reasonable alternative and those considered but deemed to not be reasonable). Chapter 5 presents the SA findings for the proposed policy approaches and reasonable alternatives. It also sets out alternatives that were considered but deemed to not be reasonable, with an explanation of why they were not considered to be reasonable.

## **SA Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal report**

**2.23** This report is the SA Report for the Greater Cambridge Local Plan: First Proposals document. This SA Report describes the process that has been undertaken to date in carrying out the SA of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan. It sets out the findings of the appraisal of Strategic Spatial Options, and preferred policy approaches and their reasonable alternatives.

## **SA Stage D: Consultation on the Greater Cambridge Local Plan and this SA Report**

**2.24** This document and the accompanying Non-Technical Summary are subject to consultation alongside the Greater Cambridge Local Plan: First Proposals document to which they relate. Comments received will be taken on board and addressed at the next stage of the SA process.

**2.25** Appendix A presents the consultation comments that were received in relation to the SA Scoping Report and SA of Issues and Options and explains how they have been addressed.

## **SA Stage E: Monitoring implementation of the Local Plan**

**2.26** Recommendations for monitoring the likely significant social, environmental and economic effects of implementing the Greater Cambridge Local Plan will be included at the subsequent stage of plan preparation when

policies are more fully drafted and the likely significant effects of the plan are more certain.

## Appraisal methodology

**2.27** The findings of the SA are presented as colour coded symbols showing a score for each option against each of the SA objectives along with a concise justification for the score given, where appropriate. The use of colour coding and symbols allows for likely significant effects (both positive and negative) to be easily identified, as shown in Table 2.1 below. The colour coding has changed from previous SA Reports to ensure they are in line with accessibility guidelines.

**Table 2.1: Key symbols and colour coding used in the SA of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan**

Symbol	Explanation
++	Significant positive effect likely
++/-	Mixed significant positive and minor negative effects likely
+	Minor positive effect
+/-	Mixed minor effects likely
-	Minor negative effect likely
--/+	Mixed significant negative and minor positive effects likely
--	Significant negative effect likely
0	Negligible effect likely
?	Likely uncertain effect

**2.28** All potential effects identified are uncertain to some extent. Where this uncertainty is considered to be particularly significant, a question mark is added to the relevant score (e.g. +? or -?) and the score has been colour coded as per the potential positive, negligible or negative effect (e.g. green, blue, orange, etc.).

**2.29** The likely effects of options and policies need to be determined and their significance assessed, which inevitably requires a series of judgments to be made. The appraisal has attempted to differentiate between the most significant effects and other more minor effects through the use of the symbols shown above. The dividing line in making a decision about the significance of an effect is often quite small. Where either (++) or (--) has been used to distinguish significant effects from more minor effects (+ or -) this is because the effect of an option or policy on the SA objective in question is considered to be of such magnitude that it will have a noticeable and measurable effect taking into account other factors that may influence the achievement of that objective. However, effects identified are relative to the scale of proposals under consideration.

**2.30** The SA objectives are interlinked and impacts of the Local Plan will rarely affect a single objective in isolation. However, they are necessarily considered and discussed separately to clearly show how different sustainability topic areas may be affected by the Local Plan, and to aid interpretation and comparison between options. For example, effects on air quality are not in themselves positive or negative. Air quality is considered because it has implications for human and environmental health. Similarly, the contribution of development to climate change is important because of the likely impacts of climate change on human health, nature and the functioning of natural systems.

## **Appraisal of site options**

**2.31** Site options were appraised using the assumptions set out in Appendix D. Note that the criteria for the appraisal of site options have been updated since the Scoping Report in order to make best use of the information collated for the

HELAA. The updated version is presented in Appendix D. Given that no site options were assessed before this point, this does not affect the conclusions of previous SA Reports.

**2.32** The assumptions were applied using data directly from the HELAA and mapped data, using Geographic Information Systems (GIS).

## Health Impact Assessment

**2.33** Health Impact Assessment (HIA) aims to ensure that health-related issues are integrated into the plan-making process. As described in Chapter 1, HIA has been incorporated into the SA. SA objective 5 directly addresses health issues, while achievement of SA objectives 2, 3 and 14 would also indirectly benefit people's health.

**2.34** The HIA topics from the NHA London Rapid Health Impact Assessment Tool [[See reference 1](#)] are listed below, along with how each has been included in the SA framework:

- Housing quality and design.
  - SA objective 1: Housing.
- Access to healthcare services and other social infrastructure.
  - SA objective 2: Access to Services and Facilities.
  - Accessibility is also relevant to this topic (see below).
- Access to open space and nature.
  - SA objective 2: Access to Services and Facilities.
  - SA objective 4: Health and Wellbeing.
  - SA objective 5: Biodiversity.
- Air quality, noise and neighbourhood amenity.
  - SA objective 13: Air Quality.

- SA objective 6: Landscape, Townscape and Local Distinctiveness.
- SA objective 12: Climate Change Mitigation.
- Accessibility and active travel.
  - SA objective 4: Health and Wellbeing.
  - SA objective 2: Access to Services and Facilities.
  - SA objective 12: Climate Change Mitigation.
- Crime reduction and community safety.
  - SA objective 4: Health and Wellbeing.
- Access to healthy food.
  - SA objective 4: Health and Wellbeing considers food growing.
  - Other aspects of access to healthy food are not within the scope of the local plan. This issue should be addressed through other means.
- Access to work and training.
  - SA objective 15: Employment.
  - SA objective 14: Sustainable Economy.
- Social cohesion and lifetime neighbourhoods.
  - SA objective 4: Health and Wellbeing.
  - SA objective 3: Equality.
  - Housing and accessibility (see above) are also relevant to this topic.
- Minimising the use of resources.
  - SA objective 8: Sustainable Land Use.
- Climate change.
  - SA objective 11: Climate Change Adaptation.
  - SA objective 12: Climate Change Mitigation.
- Environmental quality.

- SA objective 9: Minerals.
- SA objective 10: Water resources and quality.
- SA objective 8: Sustainable Land Use.
- SA objective 5: Biodiversity.

## Equalities Impact Assessment

**2.35** There are three main duties set out in the Equality Act 2010, which public authorities including South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City Councils must meet in exercising their functions:

- To eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct that is prohibited under the Act.
- To advance equality of opportunity between persons who share relevant protected characteristics and persons who do not share it.
- To foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

**2.36** The Equality Act 2010 identifies nine ‘protected characteristics’ and seeks to protect people from discrimination on the basis of these characteristics. They are:

- Age.
- Disability.
- Gender reassignment.
- Marriage and civil partnership.
- Pregnancy and maternity.
- Race.
- Religion or belief.
- Sex.

- Sexual orientation.

**2.37** The Local Plan will be assessed to consider the likely impacts of the draft policies on each of the nine protected characteristics from the Equality Act 2010 listed above. This is being considered through a separate Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) undertaken by the Councils. SA objective 3 relates specifically to equalities and will draw on the findings of the EqIA.

**2.38** It is noted that, as with health, equalities is a cross-cutting issue. For example, different groups may need different types of housing (such as people with disabilities, gypsies and travellers, those living in larger family groups). SA objective 1 (housing) will consider how the plan provides for those with different housing needs. SA objectives 2 (access to services and facilities), 4 (health) and 15 (employment) all include some consideration of the ability to access certain facilities, services and amenities by different groups, and SA objectives 12 (climate change mitigation) and 13 (air quality) similarly include consideration of access to sustainable modes of transport, which ultimately provide access to services, facilities and employment. The ability to access facilities, services and amenities easily is important for a range of people with protected characteristics, including those who are less mobile, unable to drive, or need to access medical services and facilities on a frequent basis, such as older people, disabled people and pregnant people. Accessibility is also important for those who cannot drive, choose not to drive, or have difficulty affording a car.

## Difficulties Encountered

**2.39** It is a requirement of the SEA Regulations that consideration is given to any data limitations or other difficulties that are encountered during the SA process.

**2.40** Because many effects of development are dependent on the exact location, layout and design of development, it may be possible to mitigate some of the effects highlighted in this SA. However, given the inherent uncertainties

about these details at this strategic stage of planning and assessment, the SA focuses on identifying potential significant effects of the options considered, whilst making no assumptions about detailed design or mitigation matters. This is particularly true for the assessment of Strategic Spatial Options, but also applies to the site options. The exception to this is when making assumptions about provision of new services, facilities and amenities at larger sites. For site options, the SA has used the same assumptions as the HELAA in this regard, as detailed in Appendix D.

**2.41** The assessment of site options was based on the assumptions detailed in Appendix D. These drew on HELAA data, where relevant. The HELAA made a number of assumptions regarding the thresholds at which new infrastructure (such as local/district centres and schools) would be provided. These have influenced the assessment of site options, and are detailed in the site assessment criteria in Appendix D.

**2.42** The SA of the options has been undertaken using available evidence. There may be gaps in this evidence base that, where possible, will be filled as information and data to inform the Local Plan preparation process continues. For example:

- There could be undiscovered archaeological features at any location within Greater Cambridge. For the purposes of this SA, we have focused on assessing the likely effects of development on known heritage assets, but further archaeological work may be necessary prior to any development in order to avoid loss of archaeological resources.
- The rate at which emissions from private vehicles will change over the course of the plan period as a result of technological improvements cannot be predicted or realistically factored into judgements about air quality.
- The SA has assumed that all site options can be joined to existing utilities networks in order to be considered to be reasonable (although this may require investments and upgrades to accommodate growth). However, there are known challenges with water supply in terms of sustainable abstraction.

- The SA has considered impacts beyond the Local Plan boundary where possible. However, not all mapped datasets held by LUC extend beyond the plan boundary, including locations of schools, local centres, medical facilities, open space, conservation areas, employment sites and bus stops.
- The assessment of Strategic Spatial Options drew on analysis from a number of other evidence base studies. As detailed in Chapter 4, not all updated evidence base documents were available at the time of preparing this SA Report.
- GIS data relating to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan did not distinguish between minerals sites and consultation areas, and waste sites and consultation areas. As such, assessments relying on this dataset were precautionary and assumed any site or consultation area could relate to minerals development and therefore could have implications for SA objective 9: Minerals. This uncertainty has been recognised in relevant appraisals.

**2.43** With regards to the Strategic Site Options and the appraisal of Policy S/CB: Cambourne, the Councils advised that the housing trajectory has been guided by the anticipated opening of the railway station in the early 2030s. Appraisals have been carried out on this basis.

## Chapter 3

# Sustainability Context for Development in Greater Cambridge

## Introduction

**3.1** In order to set the context for the preparation of the Local Plan and the SA, it is important to have an understanding of how the Local Plan relates to other plans and programmes, the wider environmental, social and economic policy objectives set at an international, national and local level, and also the baseline trends and issues that characterise the Local Plan area.

## Current adopted Local Plans

**3.2** Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council are already pursuing a significant growth strategy, set out in their last round of plan making (Cambridge Local Plan 2018 and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018). A significant proportion of development is to be centred on the edges of Cambridge, complemented by a new settlement, Northstowe, to the north west of the city, a major extension to Cambourne to the west, and new settlements planned at Bourn Airfield, also to the west, and north of Waterbeach to the north, both of which are in the early stages of planning.

## Cambridge Local Plan (2018)

**3.3** The spatial strategy for Cambridge sets out the City's approach to planning for a compact city through focusing new development in accessible locations, reusing previously developed land and completing the delivery of planned new

urban neighbourhoods, and small Green Belt releases where exceptional circumstances exist. Sufficient land for housing, jobs and education/research, and supporting land uses to meet objectively assessed needs, is allocated at locations and in amounts compatible with a compact city strategy. Emphasis is placed on the need to provide strategic transport infrastructure with a focus on sustainable modes. Continued protection is given to the Cambridge Green Belt, the River Cam corridor and the setting of the historic city. A network of centres is defined to meet appropriate retail and services, and to secure the diversity, vitality and viability of the city centre and district and local centres.

**3.4** The need for new housing in Cambridge is high and the Local Plan sets out how the objectively assessed need for 14,000 additional homes between 2011 and 2031 can be achieved. This is through development of sites within the urban area of Cambridge, sites on the edge of Cambridge including large-scale housing developments which are underway on sites at Trumpington Meadows, Clay Farm, Glebe Farm, the National Institute of Agricultural Botany (NIAB), and the University of Cambridge's North West Cambridge site and through two small Green Belt releases. The Councils agreed in a Memorandum of Understanding that the housing trajectories for both areas be considered together for the purposes of housing delivery, including calculations of 5 year housing land supply, and this is reflected in both the Cambridge Local Plan and the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan.

## South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018)

**3.5** South Cambridgeshire aims to bring together the economy, social and natural environments to ensure a sustainable future for the District over the period to 2031 and beyond. There will be considerable change, not least with significant developments already planned at the new town of Northstowe and on the Cambridge fringes as well as in surrounding areas such as at Alconbury Enterprise Zone, and further major new developments to meet additional needs to 2031. As part of a sequential policy of encouraging a more sustainable pattern of living, only limited development to meet local needs will take place within villages in the District, with most of that limited development focussed into the larger, more sustainable villages. The emphasis will be on providing quality

homes for all, including affordable housing to meet local needs, located where it has good access to services and facilities by sustainable modes of transport, to ensure the creation of sustainable and balanced communities. The major development sites include (housing numbers taken from Local Plan allocation unless stated otherwise. Policy references refer to the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018):

### ■ Edge of Cambridge:

- Trumpington Meadows – 600 homes, with planning permission as part of a wider development of 1,200 which includes land in Cambridge City Council’s area.
- North West Cambridge – 1,155 homes in South Cambridgeshire with planning permission as part of a wider development of 3,000 homes which includes land in Cambridge City Council’s area, to meet the needs of Cambridge University.
- North East Cambridge – this area (taking in Cambridge Science Park and the area east of Milton Road) has been identified as an area that can accommodate growth in order to meet the region’s development needs. However the nature, balance and quantity of development will be decided through the emerging North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (AAP).
- Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road – named Darwin Green, originally allocated for 1,100 homes but the capacity assumption has now been revised to 900 dwellings in the light of pre-application discussions to allow a more appropriate density of development. Policy SS/2 identifies a larger site boundary than in the Site Specific Policies DPD, bringing capacity to approximately 1,000 dwellings.
- Land north of Newmarket Road – Outline Planning permission granted in 2016 for development of approximately 1,300 homes.
- Land north of Cherry Hinton – The Cambridge East AAP identified that it may be possible for this area to come forward ahead of relocation of the airport. Policy SS/3 identifies 420 homes in South Cambridgeshire

as part of a wider development of 1,200 homes, which includes land in Cambridge City Council's area.

■ **New settlements:**

- Northstowe – a new town of 10,000 homes, the first phase of which was granted planning permission in 2014 for 1,500 homes and a development framework plan for the whole new settlement agreed at the same time. Phase 2, 3,500 homes, was granted outline planning permission in 2017.
- A new town north of Waterbeach for approximately 8,000 to 9,000 homes (note that the total quantum of development proposed in planning applications would exceed this).
- A new village based on Bourn Airfield for approximately 3,500 homes.
- A major expansion of Cambourne for a fourth linked village of 1,200 homes, all of which by 2031. It should be noted that planning permission has been granted for a larger site at Cambourne West comprising 2,350 homes.

**3.6** It is also noted that there are occasions on which major development comes forward that are not allocated in the Local Plan. For example, the Wellcome Genome Campus, a proposal for up to 150,000 square metres employment land, including research and development use, alongside 1,500 homes and associated amenities at Hinxton, was granted planning permission in December 2020.

## Review of Plans and Programmes

**3.7** Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations requires:

(1) “an outline of the...relationship with other relevant plans or programmes”; and

(5) “the environmental protection objectives established at international, Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation”

**3.8** The Greater Cambridge Local Plan is not prepared in isolation, being greatly influenced by other plans, policies and programmes and by broader sustainability objectives. It is necessary to identify the relationships between the Local Plan and the relevant plans, policies and programmes so that any potential links can be built upon and any inconsistencies and constraints addressed.

**3.9** The Local Plan also needs to be consistent with international and national guidance and strategic planning policies and should contribute to the goals of a wide range of other programmes and strategies, such as those relating to social policy, culture and the historic environment. It must also conform to environmental protection legislation and the sustainability objectives established at an international, national and regional level.

**3.10** It should be noted that the policy context is inherently uncertain as the current framework outlined here is likely to change in response to a number of key factors:

- **Brexit** - Following the United Kingdom’s (UK) departure from the European Union (EU) on 31 January 2020, it entered a transition period, which ended on 31 December 2020. Directly applicable EU law now no longer applies to the UK and the UK is free to repeal EU law that has been transposed into UK law. As set out in the Explanatory Memorandum accompanying the Brexit amendments, the purpose of the Brexit amendments to the SEA Regulations is to ensure that the law functions correctly after the UK has left the EU. No substantive changes are being made by this instrument to the way the SEA regime operates.
- **Covid-19** – The Covid-19 pandemic has led to far-reaching changes to society in the UK and around the world. Which of these changes will continue in the long term is unknown and will depend on a variety of

factors, including the global rollout of vaccines. Potential implications for planning and development include: Government measures to re-start the economy via support for housebuilding and infrastructure development; changes to permitted development rights; increased remote working and reduced commuting and related congestion and air pollution; increased prioritisation of walking and cycling over public transport; and increasing pressure to ensure satisfactory living standards are set and enforced.

- **Planning for the Future White Paper –** The August 2020 consultation sets out proposals for the reform of the planning system in England, covering plan-making, development management, development contributions, and other related policy proposals. Potential implications include reducing the period of a Local Plan period to 10 years; a move towards a zonal planning system with areas of England allocated as either Growth Areas; Renewal Areas or Protected Area; and the abolition of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Section 106 planning obligations.

**3.11** During the Scoping stage of the SA, a review was undertaken of the policy objectives of other plans, policies and programmes that are relevant to the Local Plan. These have been checked to ensure they are up to date and a full review is included in Appendix B. An overview of key policies and programmes is set out below.

## Key international plans, policies and programmes

**3.12** Although the requirements for SA and HRA originate from EU Directives, the UK left the EU in January 2020 and the transition period ended at the end of 2020. Following the end of the transition period, most EU law continues to apply as a result of provisions in the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 (EUWA) and the 'EU Exit' amendments to domestic legislation, although the UK is no longer bound by judgements of the Court of Justice of the European Union.

**3.13** The UK remains part of a number of international treaties, many of which relate to environmental protection, particularly in terms of biodiversity protection and climate change. This includes the Ramsar convention, which requires conservation and sustainable use of wetlands, the Bern Convention (1979) and International Convention on Biological Diversity (1992), which seek to ensure international co-operation to conserve species in their natural habitats, and the UN Declaration on Forests. In addition, international agreements, such as the 2015 Paris Agreement address, minimising carbon emissions and global warming.

**3.14** The European Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (1985) and the Valletta Treaty (1992) seek to protect the historic environment, while the European Landscape Convention seeks to protect and manage landscapes and promote living landscapes.

**3.15** Also of relevance is the Aarhus Convention (1998), which seeks to enable public participation in decision-making and the Johannesburg Declaration (2002), which sets an international framework for sustainable development.

## Key national plans, policies and programmes

**3.16** The most significant national policy context for the Local Plan is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which was originally published in 2012 and revised in 2018 and 2019 and updated once again in 2021. The NPPF sets out information about the purposes of local plan-making, stating that:

“Succinct and up-to-date plans should provide a positive vision for the future of each area; a framework for addressing housing needs and other economic, social and environmental priorities; and a platform for local people to shape their surroundings.”

**3.17** The NPPF sets out information about the purposes of local plan-making, stating that plans should:

- Be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.
- Be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable.
- Be shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between plan-makers and communities, local organisations, businesses, infrastructure providers and operators and statutory consultees.
- Contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals.
- Be accessible through the use of digital tools to assist public involvement and policy presentation.
- Serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant).

**3.18** The NPPF requires local planning authorities to set out the strategic priorities for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver:

- Housing (including affordable housing), employment, retail, leisure and other commercial development.
- Infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, Flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat).
- Community facilities (such as health, education and cultural infrastructure).
- Conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure, and planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation.

**3.19** The NPPF also promotes well-designed places and development, as well as protection and enhancing beneficial use of the Green Belt.

**3.20** Non-strategic policies should be used by local planning authorities and communities to set out more detailed policies for specific areas, neighbourhoods or types of development, including qualitative aspects such as design of places, landscapes, and development.

**3.21** The NPPF also states that:

“Local plans and spatial development strategies should be informed throughout their preparation by a sustainability appraisal that meets the relevant legal requirements. This should demonstrate how the plan has addressed relevant economic, social and environmental objectives (including opportunities for net gains). Significant adverse impacts on these objectives should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. Where significant adverse impacts are unavoidable, suitable mitigation measures should be proposed (or, where this is not possible, compensatory measures should be considered).”

## Neighbourhood Plans

**3.22** The Localism Act (2011) sought to move decision-making away from central government and towards local communities. Part of this included the introduction of Neighbourhood Planning.

**3.23** Neighbourhood Plans must be consistent with the requirements of the NPPF and, once adopted, Neighbourhood Plans form part of the statutory development plan for the district or Borough within which they are located. The NPPF sets out information about the purposes of Neighbourhood Plan-making, stating that:

“Neighbourhood planning gives communities the power to develop a shared vision for their area.”

**3.24** The NPPF also states that Neighbourhood Plans “can shape, direct and help to deliver sustainable development”, but they should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies in a Local Plan covering the neighbourhood area. Within this context, Neighbourhood Plans typically include policies to deliver:

- Site allocations for small and medium-sized housing.
- The provision of infrastructure and community facilities at a local level.
- Establishing design principles.
- Conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment.

**3.25** There are 16 designated neighbourhood areas within South Cambridgeshire, in addition to four areas with adopted neighbourhood plans:

- Cottenham Neighbourhood Plan (made 20 May 2021).
- Great Abington Former Land Settlement Association Estate Neighbourhood Plan (made 21 February 2019).
- Histon & Impington Neighbourhood Plan (made 20 May 2021).
- Foxton (made 5 August 2021).

**3.26** There is one neighbourhood area in Cambridge city: South Newnham. Preparation of the South Newnham Neighbourhood Plan is underway, with a draft plan having been prepared and consulted on from October 2019.

## Baseline Information

**3.27** Baseline information provides the context for assessing the sustainability of proposals in the Local Plan and it provides the basis for identifying trends, predicting the likely effects of the plan and monitoring its outcomes. The requirements for baseline data vary widely, but it must be relevant to environmental, social and economic issues, be sensitive to change and should ideally relate to records which are sufficient to identify trends.

**3.28** Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations requires data to be gathered on biodiversity, population, human health, flora, fauna, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage and landscape. As an integrated SA and SEA is being carried out, baseline information relating to other sustainability topics has also been included; for example, information about housing, education, transport, energy, waste and economic growth. This information can be found in Appendix B.

## Key Sustainability Issues

**3.29** A set of key sustainability issues for Greater Cambridge was identified during the Scoping stage of the SA and was originally presented in the Scoping Report. These have been reviewed to ensure they are up to date in light of any updated baseline information.

**3.30** Identification of the key sustainability issues and consideration of how these issues might develop over time if the Local Plan is not prepared, help meet the requirements of Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations to provide information on:

“the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan” and “any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan.”

**3.31** The likely evolution of each key sustainability issue if the Local Plan were not to be adopted is set out below.

## Key sustainability issues and likely evolution without the new Local Plan

- Key issue: The population structure of South Cambridgeshire reflects an ageing population. This has the potential to result in pressure on the capacity of local services and facilities including healthcare and ensuring the right type of homes are provided. However, Cambridge has one of the ‘youngest’ populations in the country which needs different housing and social needs. To accommodate future provision of student accommodation more student rooms will need to be built by 2026.
- Likely evolution: Without the Local Plan it is likely that services and facilities will still be delivered. Population growth and demographic change is accounted for through many policies within the Cambridge Local Plan, including Policies 56 and 73 which support the creation of accessible, high quality, inclusive and safe developments and the provision of new or improved community, sports and leisure facilities. Similarly, within the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, Policies SC/3 and SC/4 aim to meet community needs and protect village services and facilities. However, it is less likely that provision supported through these policies will be in appropriate locations, or of sufficient quality and quantity to keep pace with demands of particular groups. The Local Plan offers an opportunity to deliver the required services and facilities in a coherent, sustainable manner alongside new development.
- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 2

- Key issue: Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire are some of the least affordable areas in the country outside of London. House prices in Cambridge are high comparable to the regional and national average and sustained population and employment growth has led to a housing shortage within Cambridge, with high house prices and low levels of housing affordability.
- Likely evolution: Without the Local Plan it is likely that house prices will continue to be an issue across Greater Cambridge. Policy 45 in the Cambridge Local Plan seeks to address the amount of affordable housing for each residential development. Policy H/10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan aims to do the same. However, the Local Plan offers the opportunity to facilitate and expedite the delivery of affordable housing and private market accommodation which will also help to meet the needs of more specialist groups including older people. The new Local Plan presents the opportunity to consider supporting the provision of a more appropriate mix of new homes to meet the requirements of local families.
- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 1
- Key issue: Overall, Greater Cambridge is not a deprived area. However, there are disparities between the least and the most deprived areas in Greater Cambridge. Two wards within Cambridge are within 20% of the most deprived in the UK.
- Likely evolution: Without the Local Plan there is potential for issues of disparity to become more apparent in Greater Cambridge. Policies 45, 46 and 51 of the Cambridge Local Plan and Policy H/10 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan seek to address the issue of access to housing, including student housing, within Greater Cambridge, while Policies 72 and 73 of the Cambridge Local Pan and Policies HQ/1, SC/3 and SC/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Pan seek to support the provision of services and facilities, through high quality design, which are likely to help address improve living standards in Greater Cambridge. These policies would continue to apply in the absence of the Local Plan. However, the new Local Plan presents the opportunity to build on these policies to ensure that indicators of disparity such as access to housing, income deprivation, health deprivation, employment

deprivation, living environment deprivation and education skills deprivation are appropriately addressed. This approach will also allow for changing circumstances in Greater Cambridge to be more appropriately addressed.

- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 1
- Key issue: Health in Greater Cambridge is generally recorded as being at reasonably good level or higher. However, there are inequalities displayed between the most and least deprived areas of Greater Cambridge in terms of health.
  - Likely evolution: The topic of health is intertwined with many policies throughout the current Local Plans of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. This includes Policies 5, 56 and 73 from the Cambridge Local Plan and Policies TI/2, HQ/1, SC/3 and SC/4 which seek to encourage active modes of transport, create socially inclusive and adaptable environments and provide new or improved community facilities or services. However, without the Local Plan, policies will be less suitable to help prevent the continued inequalities between the most and least deprived areas of Greater Cambridge. The Local Plan presents an opportunity to address health deprivation in Greater Cambridge by supporting the provision of healthcare facilities and other relevant improvements at areas of most need.
- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 2
- Key issue: The provision of green space varies throughout Greater Cambridge. For example, open spaces are not evenly distributed, with many suburbs experiencing a relative paucity of open space in comparison with the City Centre and the west of the City. A deficiency in recreational or open space provision has been identified in a number of specific areas including provision for informal play space and outdoor sports. There is also potential for new development to result in loss of access to open spaces and elements of green infrastructure as well as impacts upon their quality.
  - Likely evolution: Policies 59 and 67 of the Cambridge Local Plan ensure external spaces are designed as an integral part of new developments and that open space will not be lost or harmed by new

development. Within the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, Policy SC/1 outlines sites which are to be allocated to meet local need for open space. However, without the Local Plan there is potential that the quality of open spaces will deteriorate and access to these types of provisions in certain areas will remain limited. The Local Plan offers the opportunity to better address the changing circumstances in the plan area by ensuring the protection and enhancement of access to and quality of open space and services and facilities. The process will also allow for new local green spaces to be planned and incorporated alongside new development.

- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 3
- Key issue: In general Greater Cambridge is a relatively safe sub-region in which to live. In recent years however certain types of crime such as violent crime, anti-social behaviour and illegal drug use have increased in Greater Cambridge.
  - Likely evolution: Policy 56 of the Cambridge Local Plan and Policy HQ/1 of South Cambridgeshire's Local Plan set out design principles for new development in Greater Cambridge and these include the incorporation of measures to reduce opportunities for crime. The Local Plan presents an opportunity to build on the requirement of these policies to encourage aims to make the local environment and streets safer, for example through relevant approaches to 'designing out' crime. Any new policy would make a contribution to achieving this aim alongside other local and national measures.
- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 4
- Key issue: Greater Cambridge has two AQMAs, one within South Cambridgeshire alongside the A14 and the other covering the entire city centre area of Cambridge. Residents of existing and any new nearby development could experience adverse health effects associated with air pollution, and also noise, which may be worsened by increasing levels of traffic.
  - Likely evolution: Policy 36 in the Cambridge Local Plan and Policy SC/12 in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan seek to minimise air pollution, especially within the AQMA, and protect air quality as well as

promoting sustainable transport in the District. Without the Local Plan, development may be located in less sustainable locations that increase reliance on car use, which is likely to increase air pollution. Recent national policies and the emergence of new technologies are likely to improve air quality, for example, through cleaner fuels/energy sources. Nonetheless, the Local Plan provides an opportunity to contribute to improved air quality in Greater Cambridge through the sustainable siting of development to avoid the adverse impacts of air pollution, and the promotion of alternative travel modes to the motorised vehicle, in line with national policy aspirations.

- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 13
- Key issues: Cambridge needs to ensure that it is able to continue its vital role as a world class centre for higher education, research and knowledge based industries as the regional, national and global economies rely on it.
- Likely evolution: It is uncertain how the knowledge based industries will change without the implementation of the Local Plan and some degree of change is inevitable, particularly given the uncertainties posed by Brexit. However, the Local Plan offers the opportunity to create and safeguard jobs through the allocation and promotion of employment generating uses including office and industrial spaces. Policy 43 of the Cambridge Local Plan aims to support the development or redevelopment of faculty, research and administrative sites for the University of Cambridge and Anglia Ruskin University.
- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 14
- Key issues: Greater Cambridge needs to ensure a future supply of jobs and continued investment to ensure identified employment development opportunities are taken forward and deprivation issues tackled. Although the main focus of employment is in Cambridge, there is a need to ensure a diverse range of employment opportunities are available across Greater Cambridge, for example, in the smaller settlements. Within Cambridge, despite the focus on higher education, research and knowledge based industries, there is a need for a variety of employment opportunities, both skilled and lower-skilled across a range of economic sectors.

- Likely evolution: It is uncertain how the job market will change without the implementation of the Local Plan and some degree of change is inevitable, particularly given the uncertainties posed by Brexit. However, the Local Plan offers the opportunity to create and safeguard jobs through the allocation and promotion of employment generating uses including office and industrial spaces and the promotion of the rural economy, as well as promoting access and opportunity for all. Policies 40, 41 and 42 of Cambridge Local Plan sets out how the Council will support and improve the economy of the city. Policy 77 supports the development of new visitor accommodation and will help retain the economic benefits of the visitor/tourism sector within the local economy by providing service related jobs. The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan also contains Policies E/18, E/19 which aim to support the agricultural and tourism sectors.
- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 15
- Key issues: Significant development is planned within the realm of the Oxford-Cambridge Arc with the role of Cambridge acting as a key component. However, this development must be done sustainably to ensure the long term success of the area.
  - Likely evolution: As Cambridge is amongst the UK's most productive, successful and fast growing cities, it is likely the Arc will affect the local economy without the implementation of the Local Plan, however there is some degree of uncertainty, particularly given the uncertainties posed by Brexit. However, the Local Plan offers the opportunity to help shape the Arc to create the necessary infrastructure, from public transport to housing, in the most sustainable way.
  - Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 14
- Key issues: Both highway and bus networks suffer from limited capacity, which is unlikely to be able to cater for significant increases in traffic volumes without worsening congestion and lengthening journey times.
  - Likely evolution: Policy 5 of the Cambridge Local Plan and Policy TI/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan address the provision of new infrastructure to meet new needs of development and support the aim of achieving an integrated community connected by a sustainable

transport system in Greater Cambridge. The emerging Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport Plan sets out ambitious proposals to improve the public transport network over the coming 30 years, which are likely to help relieve these issues. However, without the Local Plan there is still potential for congestion to continue to be an issue in Greater Cambridge, particularly given that the growing population is likely to exacerbate this issue. The Local Plan presents the opportunity to address this by providing clarity for infrastructure providers and also to strengthen policy to promote the use of alternative modes of transport. It also has the potential to direct new development to the most sustainable locations as to minimise the need to travel by private vehicle on the local network. This approach can be used to complement measures taken by highways authorities to combat congestion on the strategic road network.

- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 12, SA objective 13
- Key issues: Given the rural character of much of the South Cambridgeshire District a large proportion of the District's residents drive to work and some have limited access to bus services and other public transport links.
- Likely evolution: Policy 5 of the Cambridge Local Plan and Policy TI/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan supports the aim of achieving an integrated community connected by a sustainable transport system in Greater Cambridge. However, the Local Plan presents the opportunity to further address the issue of car dependency especially within South Cambridgeshire. This can be achieved by promoting sustainable and active transport (based on sufficient population densities), sustainable development locations, and integrating new and more sustainable technologies, as new development is to be provided in Greater Cambridge.
- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 12, SA objective 13
- Key issues: Greater Cambridge has two AQMAs, one within South Cambridgeshire alongside the A14 and the other covering the entire city centre area of Cambridge. Additional development within Greater Cambridge has the potential to exacerbate air quality issues at AQMAs

within Greater Cambridge and could have impacts on AQMAs in neighbouring authorities. Similarly, there is potential for a cumulative impact of development in neighbouring authorities alongside development in Greater Cambridge in terms of air quality at AQMAs in Greater Cambridge.

- Likely evolution: Policy 36 in the Cambridge Local Plan and Policy SC/12 in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan seek to minimise air pollution, especially within the AQMA, and protect air quality as well as promoting sustainable transport in the District. Without the Local Plan, development may be located in less sustainable locations that increase reliance on car use, which is likely to increase air pollution. Recent national policies and the emergence of new technologies are likely to improve air quality, for example, through cleaner fuels/energy sources. Nonetheless, the Local Plan provides an opportunity to contribute to improved air quality in Greater Cambridge through the sustainable siting of development and the promotion of alternative travel modes to the motorised vehicle, in line with national policy aspirations.
- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 13
- Key issues: The majority of Greater Cambridge contains best and most versatile agricultural land with a mix of classified agricultural land, Grades 1, 2 and 3. New development should, where possible, be delivered as to avoid the loss of higher grades of agricultural land.
- Likely evolution: The Cambridge Local Plan seeks to safeguard the best and most versatile agricultural land within and on the edge of the City through Policy 8 and Policy NH/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan ensures no development will be granted if it leads to the irreversible loss of Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land. Furthermore the NPPF supports the re-use of brownfield land and states that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by “recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land”. The Local Plan provides an opportunity to strengthen the approach and ensure these natural assets are not lost or compromised. This may involve the prioritisation

of use of brownfield sites and lower quality agricultural land for development.

- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 8
- Key issues: The Greater Cambridge contains safeguarded mineral resources which, where possible, should not be lost or compromised by future growth.
  - Likely evolution: Without the Local Plan it is possible that development could result in unnecessary sterilisation of mineral resources which would mean they are not available for future generations to use. Policy 5 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan addresses proposals for non-mineral development within the Minerals Safeguarded Areas.
- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 9
- Key issues: Some of the water bodies which flow through Greater Cambridge have been identified by the Environment Agency as having 'bad' or 'poor' ecological status. There are also areas in Greater Cambridge which are covered by a Source Protection Zone.
  - Likely evolution: Without the Local Plan it is possible that un-planned development could be located in areas that will exacerbate existing water quality issues, although existing safeguards, such as the EU Water Framework Directive, would provide some protection. Development which occurs within Source Protection Zones presents the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. Policy 7 of the Cambridge Local Plan aims to raise the water quality and enhance the natural resources of the River Cam. Policy CC/7 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan aims to ensure that sufficient capacity in the existing local infrastructure is provided to meet the additional requirements arising from new development, that the quality of water bodies will not be harmed and the delivery of mitigation which would help to prevent water quality issues emerging. The Local Plan will provide the opportunity to ensure that development is located and designed to take into account the sensitivity of the water environment. It will also provide further certainty in terms of planning

for adequate wastewater infrastructure to address development requirements over the plan period.

- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 10
- Key issues: Over-abstraction of water in this region is a key issue and action is required now to ensure the availability of water for future uses, including potable water supply and food production, without having a detrimental impact on the environment, as low rainfall and over abstraction in rivers is causing serious concern. This is likely to be exacerbated by the effects of climate change, and it should be noted that there is significant cross-over between water resource availability and water quality.
- Likely evolution: Without the Local Plan it is possible that un-planned development could be located in areas that will exacerbate the water stress issue within the sub-region, although Cambridge Water's WRMP sets out measure to ensure that supply and demand in the region can be balanced over the next 25 years and beyond. Policy 28 of the Cambridge Local Plan requires all new development to meet the minimum standards of water efficiency to address the severe water stress within the area and has set a target for water consumption of 110 litres per person per day. Policy CC/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan requires all new residential development to achieve a minimum water efficiency equal to 110 litres per person per day. The Local Plan has the potential to secure long term sustainable development, which will be essential in ensuring that all new development implement water efficiency standards, and that the phasing of new development is in line with any implementation timescales for any new strategic schemes that water companies might require. It will also be better placed to take an up-to-date approach to climate change adaptation, based on up to date evidence.
- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 10
- Key issues: While carbon emissions from all sectors have fallen in both districts since 2005, given the rural nature of South Cambridgeshire there has been little progress on transport emissions, which still accounted for 53% of the total as of 2019. Both Councils have committed to meet net zero by 2050 at the latest, and to meet this will need to make significant

shifts in energy efficiency of new and existing buildings, transport trends, and the further deployment of a range of renewables infrastructure.

- Likely evolution: Several policies in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan seek to reduce per capital emissions, including CC1, CC2 CC/3 and CC/5, which require mitigation principles to be embedded in new development, encourage renewable energy generation and on-site generation, and measures to encourage home buyers to select sustainable options. Similarly, Policies 28, 29 and 30 of the existing Cambridge City Local Plan prioritise renewable energy generation, sustainable design and energy efficiency measures in existing dwellings. However since these plans were adopted the Councils have adopted more ambitious carbon reduction targets that will require more ambitious requirements of development to meet. The new Local Plan provides an opportunity to strengthen policies which act positively in terms of climate change, especially those that limit the need to travel through the appropriate siting and design of new development.
- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 12
- Key issues: The effects of climate change in Greater Cambridge are likely to result in extreme weather events (e.g. intense rainfall, prolonged high temperatures and drought) becoming more common and more intense.
- Likely evolution: Policy CC/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan require development to embed climate adaptation measures, including conservation of water, flood risk management, SuDs, a layout that combats overheating, and better linked habitat networks. Similarly, Policies 28, 31 and 32 of the Cambridge City Local Plan requires new development to adapt through sustainable design, water management and flood risk adaptation measures. While the new Local Plan will not influence extreme weather events, it can build upon the approach of current policy to better respond to current circumstances as evidence and techniques develop.
- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 4, SA objective 11
- Key issues: Greater Cambridge will need to become more resilient to the increased risk of flooding in particular. Given the low-lying nature of the plan area, it is at significant risk of fluvial and surface water flooding,

especially in the north, which is likely to be exacerbated by climate change.

- Likely evolution: Policy CC/8 and CC/9 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan require developments to be appropriately sites to take flood risk into account and to incorporate SuDS to manage surface water. Similarly, Policies 31 and 32 of the Cambridge City Local Plan require surface water to be managed close to its source where possible, including through SuDS, and to manage flood risk through siting. However, the new Local Plan presents the opportunity, alongside national measures, to mitigate the effects of potential future flooding through appropriate siting of development and flood resilient design. It will also allow policy to respond to the update evidence based regarding flood risk in the plan area.
- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 4, SA objective 11
- Key issues: Greater Cambridge contains and is in close proximity to a number of both designated and non-designated natural habitats and biodiversity. This includes those designated for their national and international importance. Not all SSSIs are in favourable condition.
- Likely evolution: While the designation of the biodiversity sites described above provide a level of protection (particularly those that are nationally and internationally designated), pressures are likely to continue due to ongoing pressure for further development and growth projections. Policy NH/5 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan prevents development having adverse effects on designated sites unless in exceptional circumstances. Policy 69 of the Cambridge Local Plan contains similar requirements. The new Local Plan presents the opportunity for new development to come forward at the most appropriate locations in order to avoid detrimental impacts on biodiversity assets, as well as to update planning policy in relation to future policy direction such as biodiversity net gain. The findings of the HRA will be incorporated into the SA and will provide further insight into biodiversity impacts specifically at designated sites, presenting the opportunity to limit adverse impacts at these locations.
- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 5

- Key issues: Although designated sites represent the most valued habitats in the plan area, the overall ecological network is also important for biodiversity as a whole and helps to support the health of designated sites, allowing species to migrate in response to climate change. The fragmentation and erosion of habitats and the wider ecological network in Greater Cambridge, including the identified sparse woodland cover and condition of water bodies, is an ongoing threat to biodiversity.
- Likely evolution: Erosion and fragmentation of habitats and ecological networks could take place through poorly located and designed development. The NPPF requires Local Plans to include policies to safeguard, restore and create ecological networks at a landscape scale. In addition, Policy NH/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan prevents development that results in the deterioration or fragmentation of habitats, and requires new development to maintain, enhance and restore biodiversity. Similarly, Policy 70 of the Cambridge City Local Plan requires development to protect and enhance habitats and species. The new Local Plan provides the opportunity to further promote biodiversity gain and to improve the overall ecological network. Improvements to GI can have a wider range of benefits beyond biodiversity, such as adapting to climate change, acting as a carbon sink and improving mental and physical health and wellbeing.
- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 5, SA objective 11
- Key issues: There are many sites, features and areas of historical and cultural interest in the plan area, both designated and non-designated, a number of which are at risk and identified on the Heritage at Risk register. In the context of significant ongoing pressures for development locally, these assets, and their landscape setting, may be at risk of adverse effects from poorly located or designed development, particularly in areas where there is likely to be a significant loss or erosion of landscape or townscape quality due to development.
- Likely evolution: A number of the heritage assets in the plan area, for example listed buildings and scheduled monuments, will be protected by statutory designations, and existing Local Plan policies provide further protection - Policy NH/14 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan sets out to ensure that development sustains and enhances

the character of the historic environment and creates high quality new environments with a strong sense of place by responding to local heritage character. In addition, locally-specific policies outline specific heritage assets to be protected. Policies 61 and 62 of the adopted Cambridge Local Plan seek to protect and enhance the city's historic environment, and are supported by Policies 55-59 which safeguard local character. However, without the new Local Plan it is possible that these assets will be adversely affected by inappropriate development. This is because the new plan will be developed on the basis of a different baseline of expected growth, which may put these assets (including their setting) under increased pressure.

- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 6, SA objective 7
- Key issues: Heritage assets in the plan area which are at risk from decay and neglect may also be affected by traffic-related impacts, including air quality and noise pollution.
  - Likely evolution: Policies SC/12 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan requires applicants to ensure no adverse impacts on air quality of new development, and Policy SC/10 requires that development does not have an unacceptable adverse impact on countryside areas of tranquillity important for countryside recreation. Policy 36 of the Cambridge Local Plan requires developers to ensure they have no adverse effects on air quality, and Policy 35 requires that development does not have an adverse effect on amenity from noise and vibration. However, without a new Local Plan, developed on the basis of updated evidence and development trajectories, historic assets and their settings may be put at further risk. The new Local Plan presents an opportunity to address potential harm to the historic environment from these indirect effects in a more holistic way.
- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 6, SA objective 7, SA objective 13
- Key issues: While the plan area is not in close proximity to nationally designated or highly sensitive landscape areas, it contains a diverse range of nationally recognised landscape character areas that could be harmed by inappropriate development. For example, the fenlands on the northern

boundary of Greater Cambridge are particularly sensitive to development. If development was to be allocated there it could threaten losses to a distinctive wetland landscape.

- Likely evolution: While the plan area is not in close proximity to nationally designated or highly sensitive landscape areas, it contains a diverse range of nationally recognised landscape character areas that could be harmed by inappropriate development. For example, the fenlands on the northern boundary of Greater Cambridge are particularly sensitive to development. If development was to be allocated there it could threaten losses to a distinctive wetland landscape.
- Relevant SA objective: SA objective 6
- Key issues: The distinct historic character of the South Cambridgeshire villages, and in particular the sensitive historic landscape setting of Cambridge requires protection as development comes forward, particularly in maintaining key views into Cambridge.
- Likely evolution: Policy NH/13 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan requires definition along important countryside frontages where land has a strong landscape character, while Policy 59 of the Cambridge City Plan requires that landscape and boundary treatment are designed as an integral part of new development proposals. Further, Policy 60 sets out criteria for assessing buildings breaking with the existing skyline, which should fit within the existing landscape and townscape. The new Local Plan provides an opportunity to ensure that, in the context of ongoing development pressures, development coming forward does not adversely affect the setting of sensitive heritage assets and lies sympathetically within the existing landscape and townscape.
- Relevant SA objectives: SA objective 6

## Chapter 4

# Appraisal of Spatial Options

**4.1** This Chapter presents the findings of the spatial distribution options, Strategic Spatial Options and site options considered for inclusion in the Local Plan. Strategic Spatial Options are high-level approaches to distributing development across the plan area, which do not focus on specific parcels of land. Site options are individual parcels of land promoted for development and considered to be reasonable alternatives for allocation in the Local Plan by the Councils through the HELAA process.

## Spatial Distribution Options

**4.2** The spatial distribution options were assessed in the SA of the First Conversation Issues and Options in December 2019. These are high-level options summarising different focuses for growth as follows:

- Option 1: Densification.
- Option 2: Edge of Cambridge – Outside the Green Belt.
- Option 3: Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt.
- Option 4: Dispersal – new settlements.
- Option 5: Dispersal – villages.
- Option 6: Public transport corridors.

**4.3** At the time these options were assessed, the Councils advised that more than one would likely be taken forward, but each was assessed on its own merits in order to help decision-making in this regard. In order to be precautionary, any potential effects that could arise at particular locations where development could come forward under an option influenced the overall likely effect recorded. A summary of the likely effects identified for each of these

**Chapter 4** Appraisal of Spatial Options

options is set out in Table 4.1. The full assessment can be found in the SA of Issues and Options (December 2019).

Table 4.1: Summary of likely effects for spatial distribution options

SA Objective	Option 1 Densification	Option 2 Edge of Cambridge – Outside Green Belt	Option 3 Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt	Option 4 Dispersal – new settlements	Option 5 Dispersal – villages	Option 6 Public transport corridors
1. Housing	++/-?	++/-?	+++?	+++?	++/-?	+++?
2. Access to services and facilities	++/-	++	++/-?	++/-?	--/+	+/-
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+	+++?	++/-?	++/-?	+/-	+/-
4. Health	++/-	+++?	+++?	+++?	-	+/-
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	-?	+/-?	--/+?	--/+?	--?	--?
6. Landscape and townscape	+/-?	+/-?	--?	--/+?	--?	--?
7. Historic environment	--?	-?	--?	--?	--?	-?

Chapter 4 Appraisal of Spatial Options

SA Objective	Option 1 Densification	Option 2 Edge of Cambridge – Outside Green Belt	Option 3 Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt	Option 4 Dispersal – new settlements	Option 5 Dispersal – villages	Option 6 Public transport corridors
8. Efficient use of land	++	++	-?	-?	-?	-?
9. Minerals	-?	0	-?	-?	-?	-?
10. Water	0?	0	-?	-?	-?	-?
11. Adaptation to climate change	-?	++/-?	-?	-?	-?	-?
12. Climate change mitigation	++	++/-?	++/-?	+/-	--	++/-?
13. Air quality	++	++/-?	++/-?	+/-	-	++/-?
14. Economy	--/+?	++/-?	++/-?	+/-?	--/+?	++/-?
15. Employment	++/-	++/-	++/-	+/-?	--/+?	++/-

**4.4** These spatial distribution options then evolved into the Strategic Spatial Options discussed below. The spatial distribution options formed the basis of the various Strategic Spatial Options assessed, but were refined to ensure that each could meet the development needs of Greater Cambridge and also to ensure that all reasonable alternative options were considered.

## Strategic Spatial Options

**4.5** The Strategic Spatial Options identification and assessment has been undertaken at two stages in the Local Plan preparation: in November 2020 and in Summer 2021.

**4.6** For the Strategic Spatial Options stage LUC completed assessments of three growth levels and eight Strategic Spatial Options, called ‘Spatial option 1’ to ‘Spatial option 8’ and described below under the heading ‘Strategic Spatial Options (November 2020)’.

**4.7** Subsequently, as part of the evidence base work undertaken to inform the First Proposals consultation taking place in autumn 2021, officers from Greater Cambridge Shared Planning on behalf of the two councils shared with LUC a ‘working assumption preferred option development strategy’, including dwellings, jobs and associated population assumptions. This represented a ninth strategic spatial option (‘Spatial option 9’) that needed to be assessed in a comparable way to the eight previous Strategic Spatial Options. Officers also supplied a further strategic spatial option (‘Spatial option 10’) that has been assessed in this chapter. The two additional Strategic Spatial Options are described below under the heading ‘Additional Strategic Spatial Options (August 2021)’

**4.8** It should be noted that the use of the working assumption preferred option development strategy to inform this SA and other evidence base studies does not confer formal support by either council for that strategy. No decisions will be taken on development strategy assumptions until relevant member committees

meet and approve documents for the First Proposals consultation. Such decisions will be informed by the appraisal of reasonable alternatives set out in this chapter, and will not be prejudiced by the working assumption set out in this and the other evidence base studies.

## Strategic Spatial Options (November 2020)

**4.9** In November 2020, the Councils published eight Strategic Spatial Options and initial evidence base findings for these, including an SA of the Strategic Spatial Options at different levels of growth. The results of the November 2020 SA work are presented in Appendix C. These have been updated to take account of the following baseline updates:

- Change in Minerals Safeguarding Areas and Minerals Consultation Areas identified in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2021).
- The Cambridge Autonomous Metro (CAM) may not come forward (although some public transport improvements included in this will do).
- With regards to growth at Cambourne, the Councils advised that the housing trajectory has been guided by the anticipated opening of the railway station in the early 2030s. Appraisals have been carried out on this basis.
- Preparation of the Strategic Heritage Impact Assessment (2021), which assesses each of the Strategic Spatial Options.

**4.10** The eight Strategic Spatial Options identified by the Councils in 2020 were as follows:

■ Spatial option 1: **Densification of existing urban areas**

- This option focuses new homes within Cambridge, the main sources of supply are the brownfield site at North East Cambridge and development within the urban area which would meet the minimum needs. To meet the medium growth figures density would increase in

the urban area and additional sites including Cambridge Airport and a site/broad location in the Green Belt would be required. To meet the maximum growth figures development within the urban area and at North East Cambridge and Cambridge Airport would be developed at higher densities and delivery rates.

### ■ Spatial option 2: Edge of Cambridge - outside Green Belt

- This option focuses new homes in extensions on the edge of Cambridge at Cambridge Airport. North East Cambridge and one village site are required to make up the balance to meet the minimum growth figure. To meet the medium growth figure there needs to be additional development of two smaller new settlements on public transport corridors and growth at a range of rural centres and minor rural centres outside the Green Belt. To meet the maximum growth figures, the Airport will come forward at higher delivery rates, together with North East Cambridge and two new settlements (one smaller, one large) on public transport corridors also at increased delivery rates.

### ■ Spatial option 3: Edge of Cambridge - Green Belt

- This option focuses new homes in extensions on the edge of the city and will involve the release of Green Belt land. To meet the minimum need three sites/broad locations would be required. To meet the medium growth figures, five edge of Cambridge sites/broad locations would be required together with additional limited development within the Cambridge urban area. To meet the maximum growth figures, five edge of Cambridge sites/broad locations are required all to be delivered at high delivery rates.

### ■ Spatial option 4: Dispersal - new settlements

- This option establishes new towns and villages providing homes, jobs and associated infrastructure. To meet the minimum need two smaller settlements on public transport corridors are required. To meet the medium growth figures two larger new settlements and one smaller

new settlement are required on public transport corridors and a further smaller new settlement on the road network. To meet maximum growth figures the same as the medium scenario is required but delivered at higher delivery rates.

### ■ Spatial option 5: Dispersal - villages

- This option spreads new homes to the villages. To meet the minimum, medium and maximum need, growth will be distributed as follows:
  - 40% at Rural Centres
  - 40% at Minor Rural Centres
  - 17% at Group villages
  - 3% at infill villages

### ■ Spatial option 6: Public transport corridors

- This option focuses homes along public transport corridors around transport hubs. The supply to meet the minimum needs are North East Cambridge, a small new settlement on a public transport corridor, and the balance spread across 18 villages sited long existing or proposed public transport corridors. To meet the medium growth figures, North East Cambridge, and a large new settlement on a public transport corridor is required, with the balance again spread across the 18 villages. To meet the maximum growth figures the distribution is the same as medium except all delivered at higher delivery rates.

### ■ Spatial option 7: Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs (southern cluster)

- This option focuses new homes close to existing and committed jobs around the south of Cambridge. The sources of supply to meet the minimum needs are one smaller new settlement on a public transport corridor within the southern cluster and the balance equally distributed between the five villages in the core southern cluster and also on a

public transport corridor. To meet medium growth figures the distribution is as above with further villages included that are within the Southern Cluster but not in public transport corridors. To meet the maximum growth figures one large new settlement on a public transport corridor in the south is required with less growth spread equally across the five southern villages. This option then adds the Airport and North East Cambridge to make up the numbers all of which are provided at higher delivery rates.

■ Spatial option 8: Expanding a growth area around transport nodes

- This option focuses homes at Cambourne and along the A428 public transport corridor as a response to a new East West Rail station and public transport improvements. To meet the minimum needs Cambourne will be expanded by equivalent of a small new settlement (4,500 total, when fully built out), and the balance spread across three villages on the A428. To meet medium growth figures a further four minor rural centres/group villages within 5km of Cambourne are required. In addition, North East Cambridge will also be developed. To meet the maximum growth figures there will be greater expansion of Cambourne by the equivalent of a larger new settlement (9,000 total, when fully built out) together with growth spread across three villages on A428, one Minor Rural Centre and three Group villages within 5km of Cambourne all at higher delivery rates. In addition, Cambridge Airport and North East Cambridge are required at higher delivery rates.

**4.11** For each strategic spatial option, three growth scenarios were considered as follows (see also Table 4.2):

- Minimum – Standard Method homes-led.
- Medium – central scenario employment-led.
- Maximum – higher employment-led.

## Update to Growth Scenarios (2021)

**4.12** In developing a preferred development strategy and the new Strategic Spatial Options 9 and 10, the Councils advised that the minimum and maximum growth scenarios are no longer considered to be reasonable alternatives. This is because:

- Planning for the higher jobs forecast and level of homes associated with it (maximum growth option) was rejected as this higher jobs forecast could be possible, but is not the most likely future scenario. As such the Councils do not consider that it represents Greater Cambridge's objectively assessed need, and would therefore not be a reasonable alternative.
- Planning for the government's standard method local housing need figure (minimum growth option) was rejected as it would not support the most likely forecast for future jobs. As such the Councils do not consider that it represents Greater Cambridge's objectively assessed need, and would therefore not be a reasonable alternative.

**4.13** Nevertheless, the assessment of all three levels of growth (as was undertaken in November 2020) is presented in Appendix C as they were considered to be reasonable alternatives at the time.

**4.14** The Councils have now identified an updated preferred level of growth, referred to as the 'medium+' scenario (see Table 4.2). This applies a 'consume own smoke' commuting ratio (i.e. providing for a 1:1 commuting ratio for housing growth generated by additional jobs above those supported by the Standard Method rather than relying on in-commuting) to the medium homes level to result in a figure 2,400 homes higher than the original medium figure considered for the plan period. This does not result in a change from the November 2020 SA results for the medium growth scenario, as the SA effects are generally dependent on where development is located. For example, all Strategic Spatial Options would still have likely significant positive effects for SA objective 1: Housing under the medium+ scenario, with the exception of option 4: Dispersal - new settlements, which would still have minor positive uncertain effects within the plan period and significant positive effects when fully built out.

The authors of the water study clarified that the previous assessments for the medium growth scenario also apply to the medium+ scenario, although with a note that there will inevitably be an overall increase in water use. Similarly, the zero carbon study authors noted that overall carbon emissions would be higher in the plan period, due to the overall increased level of housing, but would still remain very much in the middle of the minimum and maximum growth scenarios. The authors of other evidence base studies that the SA drew on have confirmed that their overall conclusions for the medium growth option, also apply to the medium+ growth option (albeit effects associated with the quantum of development would increase slightly). As such, the difference between the medium and medium+ growth option is considered to be negligible and the medium growth options have therefore not been re-assessed.

**Table 4.2: Growth options 2020-41 (rounded to the nearest hundred)**

Growth scenario	Employment (number of jobs)	Housing (number of dwellings)
Minimum	45,800	36,700
Medium	58,500	41,900
Medium+	58,500	44,300
Maximum	78,700	56,500

## Additional Strategic Spatial Options (2021)

**4.15** In 2021, the Council identified two additional Strategic Spatial Options. These are both ‘hybrid’ options, incorporating a range of sources of supply. The additional options are as follows:

- Spatial option 9: Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne).

- This option includes a substantial amount of housing development within Cambridge city, particularly at North East Cambridge and densification of consented development at North West Cambridge and the Cambridge urban area. It also includes a substantial amount of housing development at Cambridge Airport and around Cambourne, with additional development within the 'southern cluster' and villages. This option also includes faster delivery rates at Northstowe and Waterbeach. This option focuses employment development at North East Cambridge, Cambridge Airport, Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Cambourne, although the majority of this is expected to come forward beyond the plan period. Additional rural employment locations are identified at Babraham and on the A14 corridor in vicinity of Swavesey Junction, as well as in the southern cluster and villages.

■ Spatial option 10: Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt.

- This option is very similar to Strategic Spatial option 9, but instead of delivering homes and jobs around Cambourne, it includes substantial growth on the edge of Cambridge, in the Green Belt (specific locations are not identified at this stage).

**4.16** Given that the minimum and maximum growth scenarios are no longer considered to be reasonable, these two additional Strategic Spatial Options have only been assessed for the preferred 'medium+' growth scenario. These have been subject to SA using the same assumptions and methodology as the other eight Strategic Spatial Options (described below). The findings of the assessment of the Strategic Spatial Options 9 and 10 are presented in this chapter, below. The findings of the assessment of the eight Strategic Spatial Options assessed in 2020 (along with the findings of the assessment Strategic Spatial Options 8 and 9) are presented in Table 4.3 to Table 4.17 and the full findings are presented in Appendix C.

**4.17** Note that the two additional Strategic Spatial Options both include faster delivery of planned development at Waterbeach and Northstowe, contributing 750 homes each within the plan period. As this development is already

committed and the difference from the baseline situation is timing, rather than quantum or location, it will not result in any effects for the majority of SA objectives, as the outcome will be the same as the likely future baseline without the plan.

## Approach to Assessment of Strategic Spatial Options

**4.18** Despite the broad nature of the Strategic Spatial Options, the assessments sought to bring out differences between them, where possible. However, many of the Strategic Spatial Options cannot meet the full housing need through the focus source of supply in each option (such as densification within Cambridge city, growth on the edge of Cambridge (both within and outside of the Green Belt, new settlements and village growth) identified by the name of the spatial option) and therefore each option requires additional sources of supply. This has led to substantial overlap between some of the options. For example, many include at least one new settlement and this has therefore resulted in similar effects being identified in relation to the development of a new settlement.

**4.19** The assessment has taken a fairly precautionary approach, in that if negative effects are identified in relation to a particular source of supply, this has been reflected in the overall effect identified for the option. In addition, whilst many of the negative effects identified could potentially be partially or fully mitigated, mitigation measures have not been taken into account, due to the uncertainty at this stage of such measures coming forward and in order to highlight likely negative effects that the plan should address through policy. Nevertheless, the assessment has also sought to highlight the potential opportunities sources of supply could bring, e.g. it has been assumed that larger developments have more scope for incorporating green infrastructure. For each SA objective, the assessment has sought to identify a best performing option.

**4.20** The SA has also drawn on work LUC carried out for Greater Cambridge Shared Planning to identify the size at which settlements are likely to be

sustainable [See reference 2], in order to help distinguish between options. In line with this sustainable settlement sizes review, it has been assumed that developments nearing the minimum size for a new settlement to be sustainable (around 4,500 homes) are likely to provide substantial new services and facilities. It has also been assumed that only limited provision of new services and facilities may be delivered at those larger developments until they are fully built out. It should be noted that this high-level assumption is different to the more detailed assumptions regarding provision of infrastructure drawn from the HELAA and applied to the individual site option assessments, which are more specific in terms of what infrastructure types might be provided on sites of different sizes. The HELAA assumptions had not been established at the time of assessing the eight strategic options. The use of this broader high-level assumption about infrastructure provision within the Strategic Spatial Options is still considered appropriate, given the broad scale of these options and in order to ensure all Strategic Spatial Options are assessed in the same way.

**4.21** The SA has sought to distinguish between short to medium term effects occurring within the plan period (referred to as '2020-2041') and longer term/permanent effects that would occur when sites are fully built out (referred to as the 'all time' scenario or 'fully built out'). However, for Spatial Options 3 (Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt) and 5 (Dispersal – villages), there will be no further planned development beyond the plan period, i.e. sources of supply will be fully built out within the plan period. As such, no assessment of these two Strategic Spatial Options was made or effects recorded for the 'all time' scenario. However, this does not mean that additional development will not take place beyond the plan period, but decisions about how much and where this additional development would be left to future reviews of the Local Plan.

**4.22** The SA has been informed by a review of the options by those preparing other evidence base documents, where appropriate. This includes taking into account the following:

- Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options assessment: Water Management (November 2020) and Supplement Report 2021.

- Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options assessment: Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) (November 2020) and Supplement Report 2021.
- Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options assessment: Landscape (November 2020) and Supplement Report 2021.
- Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options assessment: Employment (November 2020) and Supplement Report 2021.
- Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options assessment: Housing Delivery (November 2020) and Supplement Report 2021.
- Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options assessment: Infrastructure (November 2020) and Supplement Report 2021.
- Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options assessment: Transport (November 2020) and Supplement Report 2021.
- Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options assessment: Green Infrastructure (November 2020) and Supplement Report 2021.
- Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options assessment: Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) (November 2020) and Supplement Report 2021.
- Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options assessment: Zero Carbon Study (November 2020) and Supplement Report 2021.

**4.23** From here on, these documents are referred to as the ‘Employment Study’, ‘Housing Delivery Study’, ‘Water Management Study’, ‘HRA Study’, ‘Landscape Study’ and so on.

**4.24** A supplementary report was prepared for these studies, which considered the implications of additional Strategic Spatial Options 9 and 10. However, at the time of preparing these assessments, supplementary reports were not available for the following topic areas:

- Infrastructure.
- Transport.

- Housing Delivery.

4.25 For these topic areas, the SA has drawn on the initial 2020 studies as much as possible. The assessment states whether information was drawn from the 2020 study or 2021 supplement.

## Appraisal Results for Strategic Spatial Options 9 and 10

4.26 The overall SA effects for all ten Strategic Spatial Options are shown in the summary tables below for comparison (under the medium growth scenario for options 1 to 8 and the medium+ growth scenario for options 9 and 10), followed by a discussion of the SA effects for the additional Strategic Spatial Options 9 and 10. The full assessment text describing the effects of the first eight Strategic Spatial Options assessed in November 2020 on each SA objective from Appendix C has not been repeated here. A summary of the best performing option (considering all ten options) for each SA objective is provided.

### SA objective 1: Housing

Table 4.3: SA effects for SA objective 1: Housing

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
1. Densification of existing urban areas	++?	++
2. Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt	++?	++
3. Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt	++	
4. Dispersal - new settlements	+	++
5. Dispersal - villages	++?	

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
6. Public transport corridors	++?	++
7. Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs	++?	++
8. Expanding a growth area around transport nodes	++	++
9. Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)	++?	++
10. Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt	++?	++

**4.27** Both options 9 and 10 are expected to have significant positive effects for SA 1: Housing as both will provide sufficient housing and include a range of sources of supply (including development within Cambridge city, on the edge of Cambridge, within the Southern cluster and villages, as well as Cambourne for the preferred option). As well as development within the Cambridge urban area, both options include large-scale growth at North East Cambridge, Cambridge Airport and either substantial growth at Cambourne (preferred option) or in the Green Belt at the edge of Cambridge. These locations are more likely to include a greater range of housing sites. Larger developments could result in a lower level of affordable housing provision due to greater costs to deliver additional infrastructure, but this may be offset overall by smaller sites coming forward within the other sources of supply in this option. The Housing Delivery Study – Interim Findings and Spatial Options Commentary (2020) notes that there is a risk to rely on delivery from North East Cambridge during the middle part of the plan period, given uncertainties surrounding the relocation of the wastewater treatment works.

**4.28** For the period 2020-2041, significant positive effects with uncertainty are therefore expected for both options.

**4.29** When fully built out, the effects are expected to remain the same, although the uncertainty is removed as there is more confidence that the wastewater

treatment works at North East Cambridge will be relocated by the end of the plan period.

### Best performing option

**4.30** As all options are expected to deliver the full housing need within the plan period, it is not possible to distinguish a best performing option. Options that include a more diverse range of housing supply are associated with more certainty, as it is less likely that housing delivery will be skewed towards the end of the plan period. Option 4 'Dispersal – new settlements' performs least well, as it may not result in the necessary range of housing types or sufficient housing coming forward until later in the plan period, given its reliance on new settlements to deliver housing supply.

## SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities

**Table 4.4: SA effects for SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities**

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
1. Densification of existing urban areas	+/-	++/-
2. Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt	+/-?	++/-?
3. Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt	+/-?	
4. Dispersal - new settlements	+/-?	++
5. Dispersal - villages	--/+	
6. Public transport corridors	+/-	++/-
7. Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs	+/-?	++/-?

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
8. Expanding a growth area around transport nodes	+/-?	++/-?
9. Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)	+/-?	++/-?
10. Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt	+/-?	++/-?

**4.31** Both options 9 and 10 include densification of Cambridge and development on the edge of Cambridge, which would result in new development in close proximity to a number of existing services and facilities. The 'Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt' option also includes further growth around Cambridge within the Green Belt, which would also be close to existing services and facilities within Cambridge. However, an increase in the density of the city, including increased density at North West Cambridge, and expansion of the city could place increased strain and pressure on these services and facilities, as they may not have capacity to accommodate the additional growth, reducing people's overall accessibility to them. Indeed, the Infrastructure Study 2020 states that it is thought much of Cambridge's infrastructure is at or close to capacity. Both options also include large new developments around the edge of Cambridge, including North East Cambridge and Cambridge Airport, which will provide new services and facilities, which may help to relieve some pressure on existing amenities. However, a full range of services and facilities is not expected to be delivered at these sites within the plan period.

**4.32** The preferred option also includes substantial growth at Cambourne. Cambourne is served by a range of services and facilities and the level of growth proposed at Cambourne means that additional infrastructure would be provided in the longer term (this may only come forward beyond the plan period). In addition, a new railway station and public transport improvements are expected to be delivered at Cambourne, which will provide good access to Cambridge and probably to other large settlements outside Greater Cambridge, therefore giving access to a wider range of services and facilities. However, there is some uncertainty regarding when these will come forward, which could

leave residents with less access to services and facilities further afield, at least early in the plan period.

**4.33** Both options include some growth at villages. Although villages generally have less access to services and facilities, new development may help to support viability of existing services and facilities at these villages, providing this is distributed between a number of villages.

**4.34** Both options also include development within the 'Southern cluster', which will help to ensure housing is well-located in relation to existing centres of employment. The Southern cluster villages have some services and facilities, including schools and doctors' surgeries, particularly in Great Shelford, Sawston and Linton, although it is uncertain how much capacity these have to accommodate growth. Effects of development in this area are uncertain, as it depends on the final location of development that might be allocated.

**4.35** Both options also include increased delivery rates at Northstowe and Waterbeach, which could potentially provide the critical mass for new services and facilities to come forward more quickly.

**4.36** For 2020-2041, both options are expected to have mixed minor positive and minor negative uncertain effects. The minor positive effects are expected to become significant positive effects when fully built out, due to additional provision of services and facilities, including rapid transport links at Cambourne for the preferred option.

### Best performing option

**4.37** Those options that are expected to result in larger developments, such as new settlements (included in Options 2 'Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt', 4 'Dispersal – new settlements', 6 'Public transport corridors' and 7 'Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs') perform well, particularly when fully built out, as they are expected to provide new services and facilities to meet development needs. Options 8 'Expanding a growth area around

transport nodes' and 9 'Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)' also perform well when fully built out, as they include substantial growth around Cambourne, which will also likely provide new services and facilities as well as having access to existing infrastructure in Cambourne. Options including development in and around Cambridge, including Options 1 'Densification of existing urban areas', 2 'Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt' and 3 'Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt') are expected to have good accessibility to existing services and facilities within Cambridge, although they could also put pressure on these beyond their capacity. Option 5 'Dispersal – villages' performs least well as this option is most likely to put pressure on existing services and facilities and result in development that is less likely to provide new services and facilities, whilst being more distant from larger centres.

### SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities

**Table 4.5: SA effects for SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities**

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
1. Densification of existing urban areas	+/-	++/-
2. Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt	+/-	++
3. Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt	+/-	
4. Dispersal - new settlements	+/-	++/-
5. Dispersal - villages	+/-?	
6. Public transport corridors	++?	+++?
7. Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs	+	++
8. Expanding a growth area around transport nodes	++?	+++?

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
<b>9. Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)</b>	+/-	++/-
<b>10. Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt</b>	+/-	++/-

**4.38** Both options 9 and 10 include densification of Cambridge, including increased density at North West Cambridge, and development on the edge of Cambridge, which would result in new development in close proximity to a number of existing services and facilities, which would improve equalities by benefitting those with protected characteristics (Equality Act 2010), particularly those who are less mobile, such as the elderly or disabled, and could strengthen inclusivity and community cohesion. However, the Infrastructure Study (2020) states that it is thought much of Cambridge’s infrastructure is at or close to capacity. Development in the urban area is also likely to mean housing is closer to facilities such as nurseries, schools and places of worship. Both options also include large new developments around the edge of Cambridge, such as North East Cambridge and Cambridge Airport, which will provide new services and facilities accessible to those living there and in the nearby urban area. Facilities provided may include community meeting space and/or places of worship, which could help ensure the needs of specific groups are met, through providing space for faith groups, ante-natal and parent and baby groups etc. and helping to foster a sense of community. In addition, the preferred option also includes substantial growth at Cambourne, which is similarly likely to provide new services and facilities. Whilst the full range of services and facilities are not likely to be provided within the plan period, these larger developments also offer an opportunity to design streetscapes and buildings suitable for all.

**4.39** In addition, a new railway station and public transport improvements are expected to be delivered at Cambourne, which may be particularly useful to access to Cambridge for those unable or unwilling to drive (including young people or those who cannot afford a car), as well as other large settlements outside Greater Cambridge, therefore giving access to a wider range of services and facilities. However, there is some uncertainty regarding when these will

come forward, which could leave residents with less access to services and facilities further afield, at least early in the plan period.

**4.40** Both options include some growth at villages. Although villages generally have less access to services and facilities, development may help to support existing services and facilities at these villages, providing this is distributed between a number of villages. This may be particularly important for the villages' more elderly residents (the population in rural areas have a higher average age than Cambridge city) although it may be difficult for residents to access employment, services and facilities elsewhere, particularly if good public transport links do not exist, which could disadvantage the less mobile or those unable or unwilling to drive, such as young people, or those who cannot afford a car. Car-dependent development could also disadvantage pregnant women and others who need to regularly access healthcare services.

**4.41** Both options also include development within the 'Southern cluster', which will help to ensure housing is well-located with regard to existing centres of employment. The Southern cluster villages have some services and facilities, including schools and doctors' surgeries, particularly in Great Shelford, Sawston and Linton, although it is uncertain how much capacity these have to accommodate growth. Development at these villages may help to boost the vitality and viability of village services and facilities, which is particularly likely to benefit older people and the less mobile, although growth may also put pressure on the capacity of existing services. It is not known if the demographics of the Southern cluster area differ substantially from other areas within Greater Cambridge. Effects of development in this area are uncertain, as it depends on the final location of development that might be allocated.

**4.42** Both options also include increased delivery rates at Northstowe and Waterbeach, which could potentially provide the critical mass for new services and facilities to come forward quicker, which may benefit older people and the less mobile.

**4.43** For 2020-2041, both options are expected to have mixed minor positive and minor negative effects. The minor positive effects are expected to become

significant positive effects when fully built out, due to additional provision of services and facilities, including rapid transport links at Cambourne for the preferred option.

### Best performing option

**4.44** Overall, Options 6 ‘Public transport corridors’, 7 ‘Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs’ and 8 ‘Expanding a growth area around transport nodes’ arguably perform best, as development at new settlements, Cambourne extensions and North East Cambridge will provide new services to meet the day to day needs of residents, whilst also being within easy access to Cambridge (and Cambourne) and supporting villages and rural centres, therefore likely benefitting less mobile residents, such as the elderly and disabled. Options 1 ‘Densification of existing urban areas’, 2 ‘Edge of Cambridge – outside Green Belt’, 4 ‘Dispersal – new settlements’, 9 ‘Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)’ and 10 ‘Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt’ also perform well when fully built out.

**4.45** All options include a mix of development in and around Cambridge, which provides good access to services, facilities and employment opportunities, and many also include some growth in more rural locations, which is likely to help support services and facilities in those locations, and may even help provide new facilities or build a business case for improved public transport.

## SA objective 4: Health

**Table 4.6: SA effects for SA objective 4: Health**

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
1. Densification of existing urban areas	--/+?	++/--

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
2. Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt	+/-?	++/-?
3. Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt	+/-	
4. Dispersal - new settlements	+?	+++?
5. Dispersal - villages	+/-?	
6. Public transport corridors	+/-	++/-
7. Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs	+/-	++/-
8. Expanding a growth area around transport nodes	+/-	++/-
9. Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)	--/+	++/-
10. Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt	--/+	++/-

**4.46** Both options 9 and 10 include densification of Cambridge, including increased density at North West Cambridge, and development on the edge of Cambridge, which would result in many residents living in close proximity to their workplace, as well as a range of local amenities, including healthcare and recreation facilities. This would encourage active travel such as walking and cycling. However, the Infrastructure Study (2020) states that it is thought much of Cambridge’s infrastructure is at or close to capacity. Furthermore, large parts of Cambridge city centre are an air quality management area (AQMA), and there is an AQMA along the A14, which coincides partly with North East Cambridge and with North West Cambridge. Therefore, poor air quality could have an adverse effect on people’s health. Air quality issues could also be exacerbated by development around Cambridge, but may lessen beyond the plan period as services and facilities are provided more locally. Both options also include large new developments around the edge of Cambridge, such as North East Cambridge and Cambridge Airport, which are already within close proximity to a range of amenities, services and facilities and may also provide new open space, recreation and healthcare facilities. Furthermore, at these larger developments, walking and cycling routes can be designed in from the

outset. The preferred option also includes substantial growth at Cambourne, which is similarly likely to provide new health and recreation facilities, as well as including large developments that can be designed to promote walking and cycling. New healthcare facilities are only likely to come forward beyond the plan period.

**4.47** The Green Infrastructure (GI) Study Supplement (2021) recognised that development at North East Cambridge, North West Cambridge and Cambridge Airport provides greater opportunities for integrating GI, although they may present greater risks to the existing GI network, e.g. due to increased recreational pressure on nearby sites. With regards to development at Cambourne (preferred option only), the Green Infrastructure Study identifies that this option has potential to extend or exacerbate north-south severance of GI, but also to introduce GI connectivity across the A428 corridor and develop active transport connections. However, development distributed among villages may result in piecemeal delivery of GI.

**4.48** The 'Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt' option includes further growth on Green Belt land on the edge of Cambridge. The Green Infrastructure Study Supplement (2021) noted that this may present an opportunity for urban extensions to cater for GI deficits in neighbouring urban areas and positively enhance the remaining Green Belt.

**4.49** Both options also include growth at villages, which could place increasing pressure on existing services, such as primary healthcare, recreational and sporting facilities and amenities, and is unlikely to provide any additional facilities. Furthermore, it is likely that new residents in the villages would need to drive to access a wider range of jobs, facilities and amenities in larger settlements/urban areas, resulting in less active travel and an increase in poor air quality across Greater Cambridge which could have an adverse effect on people's health.

**4.50** Both options also include growth within the 'Southern cluster'. The Green Infrastructure Study Supplement (2021) states that development in this area could enable enhancement of GI, including contributing to strategic GI

initiatives. There is a reasonable amount of existing open space provision in the area and there are also a limited number of existing healthcare facilities in this area. Both options include substantial employment growth at Cambridge Biomedical Campus, which is likely to help progress wider medical research and advances.

**4.51** Both options also include increased delivery rates at Northstowe and Waterbeach, which both include or are near to healthcare facilities and faster growth could potentially provide the critical mass for new services and facilities to come forward more quickly.

**4.52** For 2020-2041, all growth scenarios are expected to have a mixed minor positive and significant negative effect, but a mixed significant positive and minor negative uncertain effect when fully built out.

### Best performing option

**4.53** Option 4 'Dispersal – new settlements' performs well, as new settlements are likely to be of a scale that requires the development of new healthcare services and amenities, along with being large enough to design space for active travel, green infrastructure and open space. All options except Option 5 'Dispersal – villages' perform relatively well when fully built out, although those that include locations within or near the urban area of Cambridge have potential to be affected by poor air quality. For all options, effects will depend on the specific location, design and size of development.

**4.54** Option 5 'Dispersal – villages' performs least well, as it is likely to result in development that would not be of scale that requires new facilities, amenities and open space, and may increase demand on existing services and facilities that cannot be met. It is also more likely to result in piecemeal delivery of GI, failing to support strategic interventions or the wider GI network. Options 9 'Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)' and 10 'Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt' perform poorly in the shorter term, as development in and around Cambridge and in villages

may put pressure on existing infrastructure in the shorter term, but perform similarly to other options when fully built out, due to the provision of additional health and recreation infrastructure.

## SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity

**Table 4.7: SA effects for SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity**

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
1. <b>Densification of existing urban areas</b>	--/+?	--/+?
2. <b>Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt</b>	--/+?	--/+?
3. <b>Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt</b>	--/+?	
4. <b>Dispersal - new settlements</b>	--/+?	--/+?
5. <b>Dispersal - villages</b>	--?	
6. <b>Public transport corridors</b>	--/+?	--/+?
7. <b>Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs</b>	--/+?	--/+?
8. <b>Expanding a growth area around transport nodes</b>	--/+?	--/+?
9. <b>Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)</b>	--/+?	--/+?
10. <b>Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt</b>	--/+?	--/+?

**4.55** Note that the HRA Study 2020 and HRA Study Supplement (2021) identified a range of potential impacts on European sites for each of options 9 and 10, but notes that the level of risk and severity of each impact will be assessed in more detail as part of the full HRA. Reflecting that further HRA

work is required to enable firm conclusions on potential risks to European sites, all effects for this SA objective are therefore recorded as uncertain.

**4.56** Both options 9 and 10 include densification of Cambridge, including a small amount of development within the urban area and development at North East Cambridge, which is primarily urban brownfield land, which is less likely to be of biodiversity value. However, brownfield land can sometimes be of ecological interest, including brownfield mosaic habitat at North East Cambridge, and there are a number of biodiversity sites within Cambridge that could be affected by development within, or around the urban area. In addition, North West Cambridge includes a geological Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which could be at risk of degradation from increased density of development in this area, for example as a result of vandalism. In addition, the Green Infrastructure Study (2020) noted that, whilst densification of Cambridge could increase pressure on existing nature conservation sites, there may be opportunities to use GI to support delivery of Natural England's Habitat Network nearby opportunity zones and support pollinator corridors – particularly in the south of Cambridge.

**4.57** In addition, both options include development at Cambridge Airport, another brownfield site. Much of this site is in the form of open grass areas, which is mown regularly, but habitats along the boundary, such as wooded areas and drainage ditches, can act as foraging habitat for protected species. The site itself does not contain any designated biodiversity habitats, but the western boundary of the airport abuts Barnwell East Local Nature Reserve, and the airport site could be considered to form part of the wider ecological network due to habitats along the boundary. The Green Infrastructure Study Supplement (2021) highlighted that development at North East Cambridge and Cambridge Airport could increase pressure on wetland assets to the east and north east. There are Biodiversity Opportunity Areas present around the edge of the Cambridge Airport site, which could be used as a way to enhance the ecological networks present in the area, whilst also providing an opportunity to design in green infrastructure.

**4.58** The Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt includes further growth on greenfield land around the edge of Cambridge, which could

have a negative effect on biodiversity including the loss of local species, wildlife and their habitats. The Green Belt fringe supports significant habitat opportunity zones (as identified by Natural England Habitat Network mapping) in the south east and south west in particular, and to a lesser extent to the west around Coton. There is some sensitivity within Green Belt corridors that protrude into urban areas where assets are at greatest risk of fragmentation or severance. Green Belt Fringe areas of particular sensitivity include the Cam corridor through Trumpington, Fen Ditton and Grantchester which are vulnerable to hydrological change and recreational pressure. It is therefore possible that individual developments would take place at or within close proximity to these biodiversity assets. However, there may be opportunities to design in green infrastructure, incorporating ecological networks, particularly at larger extensions.

**4.59** The preferred option includes substantial development at Cambourne. The area contains a number of designated and non-designated habitats. For example, north west of Cambourne is Elsworth Wood, which is designated as ancient woodland and a SSSI. North east of Cambourne is Knapwell Woods and east is Bucket Hill Plantation Grassland both of which are Local Wildlife Sites. It is therefore possible that development could take place within close proximity to these biodiversity assets, even if the sites themselves remain protected from development. It is noted that greenfield sites themselves are not always of particular ecological value, but they can provide supporting habitat for nearby more sensitive locations. Larger new developments, such as North East Cambridge, Cambridge Airport and growth at Cambourne, are able to incorporate green infrastructure and ecological networks into designs. The exact locations of the developments are unknown, leading to uncertainty.

**4.60** Both options also include some village growth. As many of the villages across Greater Cambridge contain or are located within close proximity to designated and non-designated biodiversity assets, and development is likely to come forward on greenfield land, both options could lead to loss of biodiversity, depending on the exact location of village growth. Depending on the detailed distribution of development, potential impacts on international sites may occur via hydrological connectivity or quality, recreational impact, air quality impact, or through habitat loss or damage (of designated or functionally linked land). It

may also be more challenging to deliver integrated ecological networks as part of individual development proposals, due to their likely smaller scale.

**4.61** Both options also include housing growth at the 'Southern cluster' and employment growth at Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Babraham. The Green Infrastructure Study Supplement (2021) states that housing delivery in this area provides opportunities to enhance to GI network, including contributing to pollinator corridors and revitalising the chalk stream network.

**4.62** Both options also include employment growth on the A14 corridor (in vicinity of Swavesey junction), which is likely to be on greenfield land. However, such effects are likely to be minor, given that the area of land to be lost is likely to be relatively small and adjacent to existing industrial uses and a busy road.

**4.63** Both options also have potential to impact biodiversity designations of national and international importance, including those in closest proximity to Cambridge, including the wider south east fenland complex (Wilbraham Fen, Fulbourn Fen, and associated watercourses) and north east fen-peat complex (Stow-cum-Quy Fen, Cam Washes, Wicken Fen and local peatlands). This is particularly the case for the 'Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt' option, given it includes greater levels of Growth around Cambridge. The Green Infrastructure Study Supplement (2021) also states that growth around Cambourne has potential to affect the Eversden and Wimpole SAC and woodland SSSIs, as the SAC supports barbastelle bats, who rely on habitats in the wider area for foraging.

**4.64** The HRA Supplement (2021) recognised that both options have potential for effects on a number of internationally important biodiversity sites, but notes substantial uncertainty as effects depend on the final location and nature of development.

**4.65** For 2020-2041, both options are expected to have mixed minor positive and significant negative effects with uncertainty. The effects are all uncertain as it will depend on the exact location of sites and design details, such as whether developments include green infrastructure and open green spaces. These

effects are expected to be the same both within the plan period and when fully built out, particularly as construction for elements coming forward beyond 2041 is likely to commence within the plan period, and therefore effects are expected to arise from that point.

### Best performing option

**4.66** There is no one option which outperforms the other options. However, development that is focused in urban areas or on brownfield land is less likely to have a negative effect on Objective 5. Furthermore, development at new settlements or larger sites offers the opportunity to design in green infrastructure, networks and corridors from the outset (which could include protecting existing features, such as hedgerows and waterbodies), which will have a positive effect on SA objective 5. Option 5 'Dispersal – villages' performs least well as this option includes development at a broad range of locations, so it is likely that development would take place on greenfield land and may intersect with or be adjacent to an ecological designation. In addition, mitigation and enhancement measures will be more difficult to achieve due to the likely smaller scale of development.

## SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape

**Table 4.8: SA effects for SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape**

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
1. <b>Densification of existing urban areas</b>	--/+	--/+
2. <b>Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt</b>	--/+	--/+
3. <b>Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt</b>	--/+?	
4. <b>Dispersal - new settlements</b>	--/+?	--/+?

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
5. Dispersal - villages	-?	
6. Public transport corridors	--/+?	--/+?
7. Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs	--/+?	--/+?
8. Expanding a growth area around transport nodes	--/+?	--/+
9. Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)	--/+?	--/+?
10. Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt	--/+	--/+

**4.67** Both options 9 and 10 include densification of Cambridge and development on the edge of Cambridge, which could have an adverse effect on the historic townscape, views within, into, and out of the city and the setting of the city. The Landscape Study Supplement (2021) identifies that densification of the Cambridge urban area could result in tall buildings, which may alter the historic townscape and key views towards the city. In addition, all landscape character types surrounding Cambridge have features that are vulnerable to change, which could be a particular issue for the ‘Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt’ option, as this includes greater growth on the edge of Cambridge. The Landscape Study Supplement (2021) notes that the ‘Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt’ option may alter the setting of Cambridge, including in relation to its historic core and views into and out of the city. However, both options also include redevelopment of North East Cambridge and other brownfield development, which could improve the townscape and landscape if development is considerate to existing surroundings. Both options include Cambridge Airport, a site that is predominantly grassland. It includes airport buildings and structures, some of which are quite prominent. Although the airport and its associated buildings have formed part of the character and distinctiveness of this location for many years, they do not reflect the wider character of Cambridge. It also currently has aircraft movements, therefore the absence of these after development may improve the tranquillity of the area. The Landscape Study Supplement (2021)

suggests the 'new urban edge' of development at the airport would be a prominent feature in the landscape.

**4.68** Both options include a relatively small amount of growth at village locations. The Landscape Study Supplement (2021) suggests that this growth may cause some harm to local landscape and townscape features. Nevertheless, this development is likely to be distributed so that any one settlement receives a relatively small level of growth, therefore the effect on the landscape/townscape is likely to be fairly minor. Both options also include growth in the 'southern cluster' and employment growth at Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Babraham. Whilst this would introduce more development to a predominantly rural area, and has potential to lead to settlement coalescence, this is considered less likely due to the relatively small level of development in this area.

**4.69** The preferred option includes substantial growth around Cambourne. Given that the area around Cambourne is largely rural, substantial growth in this area would alter the local landscape and may bring a sense of urbanisation to the area. However, large new developments provide an opportunity to consider the character and distinctiveness of the area and design it sensitively from the outset. The final location, design and layout of the proposed development is not yet known so the effects are uncertain.

**4.70** Both options also include employment growth on the A14 corridor (in the vicinity of Swavesey junction). Whilst this area is rural, effects are likely to be limited, given that the area of land to be lost is likely to be relatively small and adjacent to existing industrial uses and a busy road.

**4.71** For 2020-2041, both options are expected to have mixed minor positive and significant negative effects, which is the same when fully built out. Effects are uncertain for the preferred option, due to the uncertainties regarding the final location, design and layout of development at Cambourne.

## Best performing option

**4.72** Most options perform similarly, as all but Option 5 'Dispersal – villages' have potential for minor positive and significant negative effects.

**4.73** Option 5 'Dispersal – villages' arguably performs best, as more dispersed development is less likely to lead to significant landscape change. Whilst Option 4 'Dispersal – new settlements' would have minimal effects on the historic townscape of Cambridge, new settlements would result in substantial change to the local landscape, which would change from rural to urban.

## SA objective 7: Historic environment

**Table 4.9: SA effects for SA objective 7: Historic environment**

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
1. Densification of existing urban areas	--	--
2. Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt	--?	--?
3. Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt	--?	
4. Dispersal - new settlements	--?	--?
5. Dispersal - villages	--?	
6. Public transport corridors	--?	--?
7. Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs	--?	--?
8. Expanding a growth area around transport nodes	-?	-?
9. Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)	-?	-?

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
<b>10. Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt</b>	--	--

**4.74** Both options 9 and 10 include densification of Cambridge, including increased density at North West Cambridge, and development on the edge of Cambridge. Cambridge contains a high number of heritage assets, including listed buildings, as well as a number of scheduled monuments and registered parks and gardens, particularly associated with the University. There are a large number of conservation areas in the city, including at North West Cambridge. Development, and increased density of development, in and around Cambridge could have an adverse effect on heritage assets, the historic townscape, views within, into, and out of the city and the setting of the city. This could be a particular issue for the ‘Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt’ option, as this includes greater growth on the edge of Cambridge. However, both also include redevelopment of North East Cambridge and other brownfield development, which would be less likely to adversely affect the setting of heritage assets, if well-designed. Both options also include development at Cambridge Airport, where there is an airport control tower that is Grade 2 listed. Development of the airport could remove the historic context of this feature. However, less air traffic may have a positive effect on the setting of the historic city.

**4.75** Both options include a relatively small level of development in the villages, many of which include conservation areas, contain listed buildings or are located within close proximity to listed buildings, scheduled monuments and registered parks and gardens. If development is dispersed across a range of villages and rural centres, it is more likely to affect a wider range of assets. Both options also include growth in the ‘southern cluster’. This area contains a number of listed buildings, scheduled monuments and conservation areas. However, the exact location of growth in this area is unknown, so effects are uncertain.

**4.76** Both options also include employment growth at Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Babraham. Whilst there are few designated heritage assets at or

in the immediate vicinity of Cambridge Biomedical Campus, a large expansion of this site has potential to affect the historic city. However, effects of this particular development alone are unlikely to be significant. Babraham has a number of designated assets, including listed buildings and a conservation area, which are likely to be affected by employment development in the area, although the scale of effects depends on the final location, layout and design of development.

**4.77** Both options also include employment growth on the A14 corridor (in vicinity of Swavesey junction). There are a no designated heritage assets within the immediate vicinity of the site, and given this existing setting of industrial development and the A14, development here is unlikely to affect the setting of assets further afield.

**4.78** The preferred option includes substantial growth at Cambourne, which itself has no listed buildings, conservation areas, scheduled monuments or registered parks and gardens. There are a small number of listed buildings in close proximity to Cambourne and to the south and north east of Cambourne there are registered parks and gardens. To the south and west there are scheduled monuments. Development around Cambourne is unlikely to affect much in the way of historic assets or features, but this is uncertain depending on the final location, design and layout of development.

**4.79** The Strategic Heritage Impact Assessment Supplement (2021) considers the preferred option to have low/moderate risk to the historic environment and the 'Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt' option to have moderate risk, due to the greater level of growth around Cambridge.

**4.80** For 2020-2041, the preferred option is expected to have minor positive uncertain effects and the 'Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt' option is expected to have significant negative effects. These are expected to be the same when fully built out. The effects for the preferred option are uncertain, as effects depend on the final location, design and layout of development.

## Best performing option

**4.81** Option 8 'Expanding a growth area around transport nodes' performs best (although it would have a minor negative effect). This is because it has more potential to locate development in less sensitive areas in terms of the historic environment.

**4.82** All other options have the potential to result in significant harm to the historic environment, as Greater Cambridge has a number of historic assets in both urban and rural locations, as well as within the city of Cambridge itself.

## SA objective 8: Efficient use of land

**Table 4.10: SA effects for SA objective 8: Efficient use of land**

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
1. Densification of existing urban areas	++	++
2. Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt	++/--?	++/--?
3. Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt	--/+?	
4. Dispersal - new settlements	++/--?	++/--?
5. Dispersal - villages	--?	
6. Public transport corridors	--/+?	--/+?
7. Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs	--?	--?
8. Expanding a growth area around transport nodes	--/+?	--/+?
9. Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)	--/+?	--/+?

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
<b>10. Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt</b>	--/+?	--/+?

**4.83** Both options 9 and 10 include densification of Cambridge, including development of North East Cambridge, and development of Cambridge Airfield, and likely other brownfield sites. This will help to minimise the loss of high-quality agricultural land. Whilst Cambridge Airfield is a brownfield site, it does contain open grassland and associated soil resources (although unlikely to be used for commercial farming).

**4.84** The ‘Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt’ option would include development of greenfield land around Cambridge. The areas around the city of Cambridge consist of Grades 1, 2 and 3 agricultural land, therefore it is possible or even probable that high-quality agricultural land could be lost. The preferred option includes substantial development around Cambourne. Cambourne and the surrounding area has a large amount of Grade 1, 2 and 3 agricultural land, which could be lost to development. However, the exact location of the development is not yet known, so the effect is uncertain.

**4.85** Both options include a relatively small amount of development at villages, which is likely to be on greenfield land. This could be high-quality agricultural land, as a large part of South Cambridgeshire consists of Grades 1, 2 and 3 agricultural land. However, the exact location of the development is unknown, so the effect is uncertain.

**4.86** Both options also include growth in the ‘southern cluster’ and employment growth at Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Babraham. This area includes large areas of Grades 2 and 3 agricultural land, some of which could be lost to development (although development at Cambridge Biomedical Campus may take place in the urban area).

**4.87** Both options also include employment growth on the A14 corridor (in vicinity of Swavesey junction), which constitutes primarily Grade 3 agricultural land, which could be lost to development.

**4.88** For 2020-2041, both options are expected to have mixed minor positive and significant negative uncertain effects. This is the same when fully built out. Effects are uncertain as they depend on the final location and layout of development.

### Best performing option

**4.89** Option 1 'Densification of existing urban areas' performs best, as development under this option is likely to be focused on brownfield sites and therefore less likely to affect the wider rural areas of Greater Cambridge where there is the best and most versatile agricultural land. The focus source of supply for Option 2 'Edge of Cambridge – outside Green Belt' is at Cambridge Airport, a large brownfield site, albeit with existing soil resources in the large, grassy areas. However, in order to provide sufficient housing this option also includes potential greenfield sites, including at new settlements for the medium growth scenario. All options except Option 3 'Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt', 4 'Dispersal – new settlements' and 5 'Dispersal – villages' also include North East Cambridge, a large brownfield site on the outskirts of Cambridge. However, all options also include other sources of supply.

**4.90** Option 5 'Dispersal – villages' performs least well as this options includes development at a broad range of rural locations, so it is likely that development will take place on greenfield land, which has greater potential to be Grade 1, 2 or 3 agricultural land.

## SA objective 9: Minerals

Table 4.11: SA effects for SA objective 9: Minerals

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
1. Densification of existing urban areas	--?	--?
2. Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt	--?	--?
3. Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt	--?	
4. Dispersal - new settlements	--?	--?
5. Dispersal - villages	--?	
6. Public transport corridors	--?	--?
7. Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs	--?	--?
8. Expanding a growth area around transport nodes	-?	-?
9. Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)	--?	--?
10. Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt	--?	--?

**4.91** Both options 9 and 10 include densification of Cambridge, including increased density at North West Cambridge, and development around Cambridge. The ‘Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt’ option also includes further growth around Cambridge within the Green Belt. Cambridge and the surrounding area (including North East Cambridge, North West Cambridge and Cambridge Airport) lie within Minerals Safeguarding Areas, albeit very little minerals extraction is likely to take place in or adjacent to the urban area.

**4.92** Both options also include a relatively small amount of growth in villages, which could include areas within Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Areas. However, this depends on the specific location of any particular development that come forward. The 'Southern cluster', Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Babraham, which are included in both options, lie within Minerals Safeguarding Areas for chalk, and sand and gravel.

**4.93** Both options also include employment growth on the A14 corridor (in vicinity of Swavesey junction), which does not intersect with any Minerals Safeguarding Areas.

**4.94** The preferred option includes substantial growth at Cambourne. Cambourne and the surrounding area do not contain any Minerals Safeguarding Areas and Minerals Consultation Areas so development is unlikely to coincide with these designations.

**4.95** Overall, development is likely to come forward within Mineral Safeguarding Areas and therefore could sterilise mineral resources. As such, from 2020-2041, both options are expected to have significant negative uncertain effects. This effect is the same when fully built out.

### Best performing option

**4.96** Option 8 'Expanding a growth area around transport nodes' performs best as Cambourne and the surrounding area is not within a Minerals Safeguarding or Consultation Area (although there is a possibility that other growth included in this option could lie within a Minerals Safeguarding Area). All other options have potential to result in development that could be within Minerals Safeguarding Areas or a Minerals Consultation Areas.

## SA objective 10: Water

Table 4.12: SA effects for SA objective 10: Water

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
1. Densification of existing urban areas	--/+?	++/--?
2. Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt	--/+?	++/--?
3. Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt	--/+?	
4. Dispersal - new settlements	--/+?	++/--?
5. Dispersal - villages	--/+?	
6. Public transport corridors	--/+?	++/--?
7. Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs	--/+?	++/--?
8. Expanding a growth area around transport nodes	--/+?	++/--?
9. Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)	--/+?	++/--?
10. Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt	--/+?	++/--?

**4.97** Greater Cambridge lies within an area of water stress, where water resources are under substantial pressure, which will be exacerbated by new development. The Water Study identified that supplying water for this level of development can be accommodated if regional scale solutions are operations by the mid-2030s, and that interim measures will be necessary beforehand. However, the study also notes that development in the Cambourne area could have good opportunities for water resources with the potential to be supplied by bulk transfer, which could reduce water supply issues in the short term.

**4.98** Both options 9 and 10 include growth in the Cambridge urban area, including increased density at North West Cambridge, and at North East Cambridge. North East Cambridge is not within a Source Protection Zone (SPZ). Cambridge contains two SPZs (1 and 2) by The Leys School. However, since built development is already present at these SPZs; it is unlikely that any development coming forward would take place within these SPZs. Furthermore, both options include development at Cambridge Airport which is not in a SPZ. The 'Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt' option also includes further growth around Cambridge within the Green Belt, which could include development within an SPZ, depending on the final location of development. Wastewater from these developments in and around Cambridge could be accommodated in the new Cambridge Water Recycling Centre (WRC) however, this is dependent on timing. Maintaining water quality is likely to be achievable with some mitigation measures at the new WRC, but interim mitigation may be necessary before new works are operational.

**4.99** The preferred option includes substantial growth at Cambourne. Any extension to Cambourne may result in wastewater issues, as both Bourn and Uttons Drove WRC have capacity limitations that would require addressing. Maintaining water quality is likely to be achievable with some mitigation measures at the relevant WRC.

**4.100** Both options include a relatively small amount of village growth and growth within the 'Southern cluster', although exact locations are not specified, and employment growth at Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Babraham. Wastewater from these developments is generally expected to be able to be accommodated (although it is noted some WRC catchments lack capacity), although this is dependent on the specific location and timing of development. Maintaining water quality is likely to be achievable, with some mitigation measures at the relevant WRC. As the locations of the new housing developments are unknown, it is not possible to state whether these developments would be within a SPZ. Cambridge Biomedical Campus is not within an SPZ but part of Babraham lies within SPZ1, with surrounding areas of SPZ2 and 3.

**4.101** Both options also include employment growth on the A14 corridor (in vicinity of Swavesey junction), which is not within a SPZ.

**4.102** Water recycling and new blue-green infrastructure may be easier to implement across larger sites, such as at Cambourne, North East Cambridge and Cambridge Airport, although this is more likely to come forward in the longer term, resulting in minor positive effects within the plan period and potential significant positive effects beyond.

**4.103** For 2020-2041, a mixed minor positive and significant negative effect with uncertainty is identified for both options. Mixed significant positive and significant negative effects with uncertainty are expected for both options when fully built out. These effects are based on a precautionary approach, which does not assume mitigation will be in place.

### Best performing option

**4.104** It is not possible to distinguish a best performing option. The Water Study Supplement (2021) concludes that the most preferable spatial options are Option 2 'Edge of Cambridge – outside Green Belt' and Option 4 'Dispersal – new settlements', following by the preferred option, whereas the least preferable option is Option 5 'Dispersal – villages'. However, this also takes into account flood risk, which is considered under SA objective 11.

**4.105** Availability of water resources is a major issue in Greater Cambridge and the surrounding area. It is noted that the level of growth has significant constraints with regards to water supply that would require regional-scale solutions to be operational by the mid-2030s.

## SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change

**Table 4.13: SA effects for SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change**

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
1. Densification of existing urban areas	--/+	++/--
2. Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt	+/-?	++/-?
3. Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt	++/--	
4. Dispersal - new settlements	--/+?	++/--?
5. Dispersal - villages	-?	
6. Public transport corridors	+/-?	++/-?
7. Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs	+/-	++/-
8. Expanding a growth area around transport nodes	-?	+/-?
9. Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)	+/-?	++/-?
10. Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt	+/-?	++/-?

**4.106** Both options 9 and 10 include development within the city of Cambridge, which contains several areas that fall within Flood Zones 2 and 3. This is due to the fact the River Cam runs through the city. Therefore, development in Cambridge could fall within Flood Zones 2 or 3, which are at a higher risk of flooding, and Cambridge also has high levels of surface water flood risk. North East Cambridge (included in both options) is not within Flood Zones 2 or 3 and North West Cambridge only includes a very small area within Flood Zone 2, in the northern part of the site. Development within the urban area is likely to be on brownfield and North East Cambridge is a brownfield site, which may help

reduce any additional risk of flooding through new development due to not increasing the area of impermeable surfaces when compared to greenfield development. Both options also include development at Cambridge Airport, which is not within Flood Zones 2 or 3. This site constitutes brownfield land, which may help to reduce any additional risk of flooding as a result of development, although large parts of the site are currently areas of grass. The site also has some areas at risk of surface water flooding. The Water Study (2020) states that North East Cambridge is in an area at low risk of flooding and has good opportunities to retrofit sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) and other flood risk measures, and that development at Cambridge Airport could use on-site attenuation to reduce flood risk downstream.

**4.107** The 'Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt' option also includes further growth around Cambridge within the Green Belt. The edge of Cambridge does not contain many areas that fall within Flood Zones 2 or 3, although the Water Study notes that existing fluvial flood and surface water flood risk may make individual sites difficult to deliver, depending on location. Development around the edge of Cambridge is also likely to increase the amount of impermeable areas, which will reduce the infiltration capacity and flood retention provided by greenfield land. However, these developments, particularly larger individual developments, present the opportunity for green spaces to be delivered on-site and to use large scale features in larger sites to reduce flood risk downstream. In addition, provision of green space could incorporate sustainable drainage systems and build climate resilience in the area, especially if the open spaces are naturally designed compared to simple amenity space.

**4.108** Both options include a relatively small level of growth at villages and within the 'Southern cluster' and employment growth at Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Babraham. It is likely that most development within the villages of Greater Cambridge and the 'Southern cluster' will be on greenfield land, which would increase the risk of flooding in the area through the increase of impermeable surfaces. This will reduce the infiltration capacity and flood retention provided by greenfield land. In Greater Cambridge Flood Zones 2 and 3 correspond with the River Cam and its tributaries, therefore there are patches of Flood Zones 2 and 3 throughout the area (not so much in the Southern

cluster, but this could be an issue for village development). As such an increase in flooding would depend on the exact location of the development. Sites coming forward under this option are unlikely to be large enough to offer significant betterment in terms of flood risk.

**4.109** Both options also include employment growth on the A14 corridor (in vicinity of Swavesey junction), which is likely to be on greenfield land. This could increase the area of impermeable surfaces and therefore increase surface water flooding.

**4.110** The preferred option includes growth at Cambourne, which is likely to be on greenfield land, therefore the risk of flooding is likely to rise due to the increase of impermeable areas. There are patches of Flood Zones 2 and 3 within the southern section of Cambourne and the Water Study states that the area has some surface water flood risk, but it should be feasible to safely manage this within development. As such, development could be at some risk of flooding, however the exact locations are uncertain at this time. The large scale of development at Cambourne would be expected to provide new green space, which could incorporate sustainable drainage systems and build climate resilience in the area, especially if the open spaces are naturally designed compared to simple amenity space. The Green Infrastructure Study Supplement (2021) states that this option could provide opportunities to enhance wetland and grassland habitat (possibly as biodiversity mitigation measures), which could support flood management.

**4.111** For 2020-2041, both options are expected to have mixed minor positive and minor negative effects. When fully built out, both are likely to have mixed significant positive and minor negative effects. Effects are uncertain as they depend on the exact location, layout and design of development.

### Best performing option

**4.112** For 2020-2041, Option 3 'Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt' is the only option expected to have significant positive effects, as it is more likely to be able

to avoid areas at high risk of flooding and could include flood betterment measures, although significant negative effects are also identified. When fully built out: Options 2 'Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt', 6 'Public transport corridors', 7 'Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs', 9 'Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)' and 10 'Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt' perform best because, whilst they could lead to minor negative effects due to development of greenfield land, they all include larger developments, which have potential to incorporate features such as SUDs and green infrastructure.

**4.113** The Water Study Supplement (2021) concludes that the most preferable spatial options are Option 2 'Edge of Cambridge – outside Green Belt' and Option 4 'Dispersal – new settlements', followed by the preferred option, whereas the least preferable option is Option 5 'Dispersal – villages'. However, this also takes into account water resources, water quality and wastewater treatment, which are considered under SA objective 10.

## SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation

**Table 4.14: SA effects for SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation**

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
1. <b>Densification of existing urban areas</b>	++/-	++/-
2. <b>Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt</b>	--/+	++/--
3. <b>Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt</b>	+/-?	
4. <b>Dispersal - new settlements</b>	--/+?	++/--
5. <b>Dispersal - villages</b>	--	
6. <b>Public transport corridors</b>	++/--?	++/--?

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
7. Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs	++/-?	++/-?
8. Expanding a growth area around transport nodes	++/--?	++/--
9. Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)	++/--?	++/--
10. Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt	--/+	++/--

**4.114** Both options include development within and around Cambridge, including increased density at North West Cambridge, and development at North East Cambridge and Cambridge Airport. The ‘Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt’ option also includes further growth around Cambridge within the Green Belt. Development at these locations is likely to have good access to existing services, facilities and employment within Cambridge, therefore minimising the need to travel, as well as good access to sustainable transport links. This will help to minimise the increase in carbon emissions arising from new development. Whilst capacity of services and facilities within Cambridge is limited, larger developments, such as North East Cambridge and Cambridge Airport, are expected to provide additional infrastructure and can design in walking and cycling from the outset. However, the Cambridge Airport area and areas to the east and south of Cambridge have been identified as having high levels of estimated soil carbon and carbon in vegetation, which could be disturbed or lost as a result of development. Nevertheless, larger developments, such as urban extensions to Cambridge, may have more potential to incorporate low-carbon and energy efficient design, such as district heating networks.

**4.115** Both options also include some village growth. This could help support existing services and facilities, although these will be more limited than in Cambridge and the larger settlements. As such, an increase in the reliance on private vehicles is likely in order to access services and facilities and employment opportunities elsewhere, thereby leading to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions. This will be more prevalent in villages without good

public transport links, although most are not as well connected via public transport (particularly regarding frequency of services), than larger centres.

**4.116** Both options include a limited amount of development in the ‘Southern cluster’ and employment growth at Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Babraham. Development in this area seeks to locate homes within close proximity of jobs, particularly in the life sciences cluster around the south of Cambridge, which could help reduce the need to travel. However, there may be some use of private vehicles, particularly to access Cambridge city.

**4.117** Both options also include employment growth on the A14 corridor (in vicinity of Swavesey junction), which is near a bus stop but otherwise poorly located with regards to access, due to it not being within a town or city. This would likely result to people driving to work in this area, resulting in an increase in greenhouse gas emissions.

**4.118** The preferred option includes development at Cambourne, which is expected to be served by a new railway station and public transport improvements. Cambourne is reasonably well served by services and facilities, which will help to reduce the need to travel, although a substantial number of Cambourne residents commute to Cambridge for work. As such, an increase in development at Cambourne is expected to result in an increase in carbon emissions, although this will be minimised by public transport improvements. In addition, development of a large area could have greater potential to incorporate low-carbon and energy efficient design, such as district heating networks, as well as designing in walking and cycling from the outset.

**4.119** The Carbon Emissions Study Supplement (2021) concluded that there is very little difference between the two options. However, once the new railway station is in place at Cambourne, the preferred option will have lower carbon emissions.

**4.120** For 2020-2041, the preferred option is expected to have mixed significant positive and significant negative effects, and the ‘Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt’ option is expected to have mixed minor

positive and significant negative effects. The effect for the preferred option is uncertain, as it is uncertain whether the full range of supporting services and facilities will come forward within the plan period. When fully built out, both options are expected to have significant positive and significant negative effects.

### Best performing option

**4.121** Option 1: 'Densification of existing urban areas' performs best, as it locates development within the existing urban area. As such, proximity to existing services, facilities, employment opportunities and public transport is likely to be better than the other options. In addition, the opportunity to cycle and walk are more prevalent within the urban area, but also could be developed within other sources of supply, as active travel could be included from the design stages. Higher density development also tends to have lower embodied carbon. Options 6 'Public transport corridors' and 9 'Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)' perform relatively well, as they would likely lead to a higher modal share for sustainable transport.

**4.122** Option 7 'Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs' seeks to reduce traffic in the wider Cambridge area and reduce journey length/times to work. However, the Zero Carbon Study (2020) suggested that Option 6 'Public transport corridors' would likely lead to lower carbon emissions than Option 7. The Transport Study (2020) also found that Options 2 'Edge of Cambridge – outside Green Belt' and Option 3 'Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt' would help support active travel (based on the maximum growth scenario).

**4.123** Larger urban extensions, such as those that may come forward through options 3 'Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt', 8 'Expanding a growth area around transport nodes', 9 'Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)' and 10 'Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt', as well as new settlements, may present greater opportunity to incorporate sustainable energy generation, such as district heating networks. All development could also help to minimise carbon emissions through energy

efficient design etc., although the Zero Carbon Study highlights that the main source of carbon emissions for all options is transport.

**4.124** Option 5 'Dispersal – villages' performs least well as it is likely to lead to development with high levels of dependency on the private car.

## SA objective 13: Air pollution

**Table 4.15: SA effects for SA objective 13: Air pollution**

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
1. Densification of existing urban areas	++/--	++/--
2. Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt	--/+	++/--
3. Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt	--/+?	
4. Dispersal - new settlements	--/+?	++/--?
5. Dispersal - villages	--	
6. Public transport corridors	--/+?	++/--?
7. Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs	++/-?	++/-?
8. Expanding a growth area around transport nodes	++/--?	++/--
9. Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)	++/--?	++/--
10. Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt	--/+	++/--

**4.125** Both options 9 and 10 include development within and around Cambridge, including increased density at North West Cambridge, and development at North East Cambridge and Cambridge Airport. The 'Blended

Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt' option also includes further growth around Cambridge within the Green Belt. Development at these locations is likely to have good access to existing services, facilities and employment within Cambridge, therefore minimising the need to travel, as well as good access to sustainable transport links. This will help to minimise the increase in air pollution arising from new development. Whilst capacity of services and facilities within Cambridge is limited, larger developments, such as North East Cambridge and Cambridge Airport, are expected to provide additional infrastructure and can design in walking and cycling from the outset. However, there is an AQMA within the city of Cambridge and another on the A14 which connects to the centre of the city, North West Cambridge and North East Cambridge. Whilst development would have good access to services and facilities by non-car modes, it is likely some residents will travel by car or other motorised vehicle, therefore, it is likely that additional development within the urban area and at North East Cambridge will exacerbate the poor air quality within the area.

**4.126** Both options also include some village growth. This could help support existing services and facilities, although these will be more limited than in Cambridge and the larger settlements. As such, an increase in the reliance on private vehicles is likely in order to access services and facilities and employment opportunities elsewhere, thereby leading to an increase in air pollution. This will be more prevalent in villages without good public transport links, although most are not as well connected via public transport (particularly regarding frequency of services), than larger centres.

**4.127** Both options include a limited amount of development in the 'Southern cluster' and employment growth at Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Babraham. Development in the Southern cluster seeks to locate homes within close proximity of jobs, particularly in the life sciences cluster around the south of Cambridge, which could help reduce the need to travel. However, there may still be some use of private vehicles, particularly to access Cambridge city and new employment at Babraham.

**4.128** Both options also include employment growth on the A14 corridor (in vicinity of Swavesey junction), which is near a bus stop but otherwise poorly

located with regards to access, due to it not being within a town or city. This would likely result to people driving to work in this area, resulting in an increase in air pollution, including exacerbating air quality issues in the A14 AQMA.

**4.129** The preferred option includes development at Cambourne, which is expected to be served by a new railway station and public transport improvements. Cambourne is reasonably well served by services and facilities, which will help to reduce the need to travel, although a substantial number of Cambourne residents commute to Cambridge for work. As such, an increase in development at Cambourne is expected to result in an increase in air pollution, although this will be minimised by public transport improvements.

**4.130** For 2020-2041, the preferred option is expected to have mixed significant positive and significant negative effects, and the 'Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt' option is expected to have mixed minor positive and significant negative effects. The effect for the preferred option is uncertain, as it is uncertain whether the full range of supporting services and facilities will come forward within the plan period. When fully built out, both options are expected to have significant positive and significant negative effects.

### Best performing option

**4.131** Option 7 'Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs' performs best, as it is expected to provide additional services and facilities and walking, cycling at the urban extensions/new settlement and are already located near existing public transport links, employment opportunities and Cambridge city, thereby minimising the need to travel far by private car. The Transport Study (2020) identified that Option 7 'Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs' will reduce traffic in the wider Cambridge area and reduce journey length/times to work (for the maximum growth scenario). The Transport Study (2020) also found that Option 1 'Densification of existing urban areas' performed best in terms of promoting active travel (for the maximum growth scenario), but growth in and around Cambridge has potential to exacerbate air quality issues in existing AQMAs, as some new residents will

travel by car or other private vehicle, increasing traffic in these areas to some extent. Options 6 ‘Public transport corridors’ and 9 ‘Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)’ perform relatively well, as they would likely lead to a higher modal share for sustainable transport.

**4.132** Option 5 'Dispersal – villages' performs least well as it is likely to lead to development with high levels of dependency on the private car.

## SA objective 14: Economy

**Table 4.16: SA effects for SA objective 14: Economy**

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
1. Densification of existing urban areas	--/+	++/--
2. Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt	--/+?	++/--?
3. Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt	+/-?	
4. Dispersal - new settlements	+/-	++/-
5. Dispersal - villages	+/-	
6. Public transport corridors	+/-	++/-
7. Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs	+/-	++/-
8. Expanding a growth area around transport nodes	--/+	++/-
9. Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)	+/-	++/-
10. Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt	+/-	++/-

**4.133** Both options 9 and 10 include development within and around Cambridge, including increased density at North West Cambridge, and development at North East Cambridge and Cambridge Airport. The 'Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt' option also includes further growth around Cambridge within the Green Belt. This is likely to support the existing economic hub in Cambridge and support the vitality and viability of the city. This is also likely to help support existing businesses, but locating homes, and therefore workers, close to businesses. North East Cambridge and Cambridge Airport will also provide new employment opportunities within close proximity to homes, particularly beyond the plan period.

**4.134** Both options also include some village growth and development of two rural employment locations. This will help to support and diversify the rural economy through supporting rural services and facilities, although some may have more limited public transport into the economic hub of Cambridge. Both options include employment growth in two rural locations (A14 corridor and Babraham), which may help diversity the rural economy.

**4.135** Both options include a limited amount of development in the 'Southern cluster', including employment growth at Babraham and Cambridge Biomedical Campus. This would support the growth of the science sector, as it would provide easy access to a large amount of job opportunities, and may also provide access to job opportunities within Cambridge as well.

**4.136** The preferred option includes development at Cambourne, which is expected to be served by a new railway station and public transport improvements. This could add to the critical mass of population to generate demand for further services and employment provision. Growth around Cambourne would also provide substantial employment growth, as well as access to Cambridge and other larger settlements. It may take a while to build the vibrancy and vitality of new communities themselves, although the wider settlement of Cambourne is more established.

**4.137** For 2020-2041 both options are expected to have mixed minor positive and minor negative effects. When fully built out, both options are expected to have mixed significant positive and minor negative effects.

### Best performing option

**4.138** For 2020-2041, it is difficult to identify a best performing option, although Options 1 ‘Densification of existing urban areas’, 2 ‘Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt’ and 8 ‘Expanding a growth area around transport nodes’ perform worst, as they have potential for significant negative effects.

**4.139** When fully built out, Options 4 ‘Dispersional – new settlements’, 6 ‘Public transport corridors’, 7 ‘Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs’, 8 ‘Expanding a growth area around transport nodes’, 9 ‘Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)’ and 10 ‘Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt’ perform best.

**4.140** Options 1 ‘Densification of existing urban areas’ and 2 ‘Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt’ perform least well overall, as they are less likely to be able to meet the full range of employment land needs.

## SA objective 15: Employment

**Table 4.17: SA effects for SA objective 15: Employment**

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
1. Densification of existing urban areas	--/+	++/--
2. Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt	--/+?	++/--?
3. Edge of Cambridge – Green Belt	+/-	
4. Dispersional - new settlements	+/-	++/-

Strategic Spatial Options	2020-2041	All time
5. Dispersal - villages	--/+	
6. Public transport corridors	+/-	++/-
7. Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs	+/-	++/-
8. Expanding a growth area around transport nodes	--/+	++/-
9. Preferred options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)	+/-	++/-
10. Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt	+/-	++/-

**4.141** Both options 9 and 10 include development within and around Cambridge, including increased density at North West Cambridge, and development at North East Cambridge and Cambridge Airport. The 'Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt' option also includes further growth around Cambridge within the Green Belt. Development at these locations is likely to have good access to existing employment and sustainable transport to access jobs within Cambridge and North East Cambridge and Cambridge Airport will provide new employment opportunities within close proximity to homes, particularly beyond the plan period.

**4.142** Both options also include some village growth and development of two rural employment locations. This will help to provide some employment opportunities in the wider Greater Cambridge area, although there are likely to be more limited job opportunities in the villages and some may have more limited public transport into the economic hub of Cambridge. Whilst a number of existing employment parks have successfully developed near villages, the location of employment distribution may have a bearing on its level of employment success. Both options include employment growth in two rural locations (A14 corridor and Babraham), which will help provide some employment opportunities in more rural areas.

**4.143** Both options include a limited amount of development in the ‘Southern cluster’, including employment growth at Babraham and Cambridge Biomedical Campus. This would support the growth of the science sector, as it would provide easy access to a large amount of job opportunities, and may also provide access to job opportunities within Cambridge as well.

**4.144** The preferred option includes development at Cambourne, which is expected to be served by a new railway station and public transport improvements. This option would provide substantial employment growth, as well as access to Cambridge and other larger settlements. The Employment Study Supplement (2021) notes that Cambourne has been slow to develop as an employment location, but has gained traction as a secondary office location in recent years for professional services and ICT.

**4.145** The Employment Study Supplement 2021 suggests that both of these options could provide the full range of anticipated employment needs, due to the variety of locations they include, including standalone employment provision and employment provision on mixed-use sites. However, the ‘Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt’ option would better serve further provision of class E(g)(i/ii) employment space (offices, and research and development) and benefit from Cambridge’s professional services cluster, whereas the preferred option could possibly deliver employment floorspace in a more sustainable pattern in the long term, due to increased accessibility via railway. It is noted that a large number of employment opportunities will not come forward until after the plan period.

**4.146** For 2020-2041, both options are expected to have mixed minor positive and minor negative effects. When fully built out, both options are expected to have significant positive and minor negative effects.

### Best performing option

**4.147** Options 4 ‘Dispersion – new settlements’, 6 ‘Public transport corridors’, 7 ‘Supporting a high-tech corridor by integrating homes and jobs’, 9 ‘Preferred

options spatial strategy (Blended strategy including Cambourne)' and 10 'Blended Strategy including Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt' perform well, particularly when fully built out. Whilst Option 8 'Expanding a growth area around transport nodes' performs less well within the plan period, it performs well when fully built out as new strategic transport infrastructure is expected to be implemented in the longer term, which would help new residents to access jobs.

**4.148** Option 5 'Dispersal-Villages' performs least well, as existing centres of employment are likely to be less accessible to development under this option. Options 1 'Densification of existing urban areas' and 2 'Edge of Cambridge – outside the Green Belt' also perform less well than other options, as they are less likely to be able to meet the full range of employment needs.

## Site Options

**4.149** In order to assess site options on a consistent basis, all appraisals follow the assumptions set out in Appendix D. The assumptions are designed to take advantage of data collated for the HELAA and the relevant information was provided to LUC from the Councils. As such, in order to understand why a certain effect has been recorded, please see Appendix D. Further detail on how sites were identified and tested can be found at paragraph 2.20 and Appendix E.

**4.150** The section below summarises the likely effects of potential site allocations, according to the 'source of supply' the sites fall within. The sources of supply are:

- Densification of existing urban areas.
- Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt.
- Edge of Cambridge: Non Green Belt.
- Integrating homes and jobs - Southern cluster.
- Growth around transport nodes: Cambourne Area.

- Dispersal: Villages.
- Dispersal: Villages / Transport Corridors.

**4.151** The summary below considers general patterns of effects in each of these sources of supply in terms of social, environmental and economic SA objectives. These are as follows:

- Social objectives:
  - SA objective 1: Housing.
  - SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities.
  - SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities.
  - SA objective 4: Health.
- Environmental objectives:
  - SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity.
  - SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape.
  - SA objective 7: Historic environment.
  - SA objective 8: Efficient use of land.
  - SA objective 10: Water.
  - SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change.
  - SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation.
  - SA objective 13: Air quality.
- Economic objectives:
  - SA objective 9: Minerals.
  - SA objective 14: Economy.
  - SA objective 15: Employment.

**4.152** Note that, whilst the SA objectives have been divided into social, environmental and economic objectives for the purposes of summarising likely

effects of site options, this does not mean they are only relevant to that category. For example, a healthy environment has implications for human health and economic productivity.

## Densification of existing urban areas

Table 4.18: Summary of SA findings for the Densification of existing urban areas site options

GCSP ref	Site	Proposed use	SA 1	SA 2a	SA 2b	SA 3a	SA 3b	SA 3c	SA 4a	SA 4b	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12a	SA 12b	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15
40018	North Cambridge Academy, Arbury Road, Cambridge	Residential	+	++	+++?	+	+	0	++	0	0?	-?	0?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	0	+
40100	Cherry Hinton Telephone Exchange, 152 Coleridge Road, Cambridge	Residential	+	+	+	+	0	0	-	0	0?	-?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	-	-	0	-
40103	Henry Giles House, 73-79 Chesterton Road, Cambridge	Residential	+	++	+	+	+	0	++	0	-?	-?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	0	--
40133	Land on north side of Station Road, Cambridge	Residential	+	++	-	+	0	0	++	0	-?	-?	--?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	0	--
40168	Land west of Baldock Way, Cambridge	Residential	+	+	+	+	0	0	-	0	-?	0?	0?	+	--?	0	-	++	-	-	0	++
40171	Trumpington Park and Ride site, Trumpington	Residential	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	-?	0?	0?	+	--?	0	-	++	-	-	0	-
40298	Land south of Wilberforce Road, Cambridge	Residential	+	-?	--	0	0	0	+	0	-?	-?	-?	-	--?	0	-	++	-	-	0	-
40385	137 Histon Road, Cambridge	Residential	+	++	+++?	+	0	0	++	0	-?	-?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	0	--
40390	Land at Wolfson Court, Clarkson Road, Cambridge	Residential	+	-?	-	+	0	0	+	0	-?	0?	-?	+	-?	0	-	++	-	-	0	-
40391	Land south of 8-10 Adams Road, Cambridge	Residential	+	-?	--	0	0	0	+	0	-?	-?	-?	-	--?	0	-	++	-	-	0	-
44108	Garages between 20 St. Matthews Street and Blue Moon Public House, Cambridge	Residential	+	++	+++?	+	0	0	+	0	0?	-?	0?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	0	++
48068	Clifton Road Industrial Park, Cambridge	Residential	+	+	-	+	0	0	+	0	0?	0?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	-	-	0	-
50505	Addenbrookes Hospital Extension, Cambridge	Residential	+	-?	-	+	0	0	+	0	-?	-?	-?	+	--?	0	--	++	-	-	0	++

GCSP ref	Site	Proposed use	SA 1	SA 2a	SA 2b	SA 3a	SA 3b	SA 3c	SA 4a	SA 4b	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12a	SA 12b	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15
51485	Land south of Bateman Street, Cambridge	Residential	+	++	+?	+	0	0	++	0	-?	0?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	0	--
51605	Kett House and 10 Station Road, Cambridge	Residential	+	++	-	+	0	0	++	0	0?	0?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	0	--
51615	Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road, Cambridge	Residential	+	++	-	+	0	0	+	0	0?	-?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	0	--
OS032	The Paddocks, 347 Cherry Hinton Road (Policy 27 - R7)	Residential	+	+?	+?	+	0	0	++	0	-?	0?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	-	-	0	-
OS034	BT Telephone Exchange & Car Park, Long Road (Policy 27 - R14)	Residential	+	-?	+?	+	0	0	+	0	-?	0?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	-	-	0	-
OS035	Willowcroft, 137-143 Histon Road (Policy 27 - R2)	Residential	+	++	++?	+	0	0	++	0	-?	0?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	0	+
OS038	Henry Giles House, 73-79 Chesterton Road (Policy 27 - R4)	Residential	+	++	+?	+	+	0	++	0	-?	0?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	0	--
OS039	Camfields Resource Centre & Oil Depot (Policy 27 - R5), 137-139 Ditton Walk	Residential	+	-?	--	+	+	0	+	0	-?	0?	-?	+	--?	0	-	-	-	-	0	-
OS040	149 Cherry Hinton Road and Telephone Ex (Policy 27 - R8)	Residential	+	+?	++?	+	0	0	-	0	0?	0?	0?	+	--?	0	-	++	-	-	0	-
OS041	Horizons Resource Centre, 285 Coldham's Lane (Policy 27 - R11)	Residential	+	-?	-	+	0	0	+	0	-?	0?	-?	+	--?	0	-	+	-	-	0	--
OS042	CPDC, Foster Road (Policy 27 - R16)	Residential	+	-?	-	+/0	0	0	++	0	-?	-?	-?	+/-	--?	0	-	++	-	-	0	-
OS045	636 - 656 Newmarket Road (Policy 27 - R6)	Residential	+	+?	-	+	0	0	++	0	-?	-?	-?	+	--?	0	-	+	-	-	0	-
OS140	Telephone Exchange south of 1 Ditton Lane	Residential	+	+?	-	+	+	0	++	0	-?	-?	-?	+	--?	0	0	+	-	-	0	-
40385a	137 and 143 Histon Road, Cambridge	Residential	+	++	++?	+	0	0	++	0	-?	0?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	0	--
44108a	Garages between 20 St. Matthews Street and the Blue Moon Public House, Cambridge	Residential	+	++	++?	+	0	0	+	0	0?	-?	0?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	0	++
OS036	Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road (Policy 27 - R9)	Residential	+	++	-	+	0	0	+	0	-?	0?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	0	--

GCSP ref	Site	Proposed use	SA 1	SA 2a	SA 2b	SA 3a	SA 3b	SA 3c	SA 4a	SA 4b	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12a	SA 12b	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15
OS037	Police Station, Parkside (Policy 27 - M4)	Residential	+	++	++?	+	0	0	++	0	0?	0?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	0	--
40083	Shire Hall, Castle Street, Cambridge	Mixed use	+	++	-	+	0	0	+	-?	0?	-?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	+	++
40111	Parkside Subdivisional Police Headquarters, Parkside, Cambridge	Mixed use	+	++	++?	+	0	0	+	0	0?	0?	--?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	+	++
40123	Abbey Stadium, Newmarket Road, Cambridge	Mixed use	+	+	-	+	+	0	-	--	-?	-?	-?	+	--?	0	-	+	-	-	+	++
40134	Land south of Coldhams Lane, Cambridge	Mixed use	+	-?	+	+/0	0	0	+	-?	-?	-?	-?	--/+	--?	0	-	+	-	-	+	++
40214	100-112 Hills Road, Cambridge	Mixed use	+	+	-	+	0	0	++	0	-?	-?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	-	-	+	++
51486	Land at Cambridge North	Mixed use	+	-?	-	+	+	0	+	0	-?	-?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	-	-	++	++
OS033	379 - 381 Milton Road (Policy 27 - M1)	Mixed use	+	+	-	+	0	0	-	0	0?	0?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	-	-	+	++
OS043	Clifton Road Area (Policy 27 - M2)	Mixed use	+	++	+	+	0	0	+	0	-?	0?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	+	++
OS044	82 - 90 Hills Road & 57 - 63 Bateman Street (Policy 27 - M5)	Mixed use	+	++	+	+	0	0	+	0	-?	0?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	+	++
OS046	315 - 349 Mill Road and Brookfields (Policy 27 - R21)	Mixed use	+	++	+	+	0	0	+	0	-?	-?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	+	++
OS258	Old Press/Mill Lane, Cambridge	Mixed use	+	++	-	+	0	0	+	-?	-?	-?	-?	+	--?	-?	-	++	+	-	+	++
OS259	New Museums, Downing Street, Cambridge	Mixed use	+	++	-	+	0	0	+	-?	-?	-?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	+	++
40083	Shire Hall, Castle Street, Cambridge	Employment	0	++	N/A	+	0	0	+	-?	0?	-?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	+	++
40214	100-112 Hills Road, Cambridge	Employment	0	++	N/A	+	0	0	++	0	-?	-?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	+	++
40480	SJC Innovation Park, Cowley Road, Cambridge	Employment	0	-?	N/A	+	+	0	-	0	-?	0?	0?	+	--?	0	-	++	-	-	++	++
40134a	Land south of Coldhams Lane, Cambridge	Employment	0	-?	N/A	+/0	0	0	+	0	-?	-?	-?	--/+	--?	0	-	+	-	-	++	+
OS123	South of Coldham's Lane Area of Major Change (Policy 16)	Employment	0	-?	N/A	+	0	0	+	-?	-?	0?	-?	+	--?	-?	-	+	-	-	++	+

## Summary of effects for Social objectives

**4.153** The Densification of existing urban area site options generally perform positively against the social objectives (i.e. SA 1, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a and 4b), partly because the residential and mixed use sites contribute towards housing delivery and will therefore have minor positive effects in relation to SA 1. Most of the sites are expected to have significant positive or minor positive effects in relation to SA 2a because they are likely to deliver a new local/district centre or superstore and/or are located within close proximity to a good range of services and facilities. The same applies to SA 2b because most of the sites are expected to deliver a new primary or secondary school and/or are located within close proximity of existing primary and secondary schools. However, there are also a number of site options with significant negative and minor negative effects in relation to SA 2a and 2b, because although they are located in existing urban areas, they do not have easy access to services and facilities, including schools. Almost all of the sites are expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA 3a because they are located on brownfield land. For three of the sites, these effects are mixed with negligible effects because they are also partially located on greenfield land. Only a small number of sites are expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA 3b because they fall within one of the 40% most deprived areas in England and therefore have the potential to help regenerate those areas.

**4.154** A large proportion of the sites are expected to have significant positive or minor positive effects in relation to SA 4a because they are likely to be located within close proximity of a healthcare facility. A small number of sites are expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA 4a because they are not within close proximity of a healthcare facility or an area of open space/sports facility. The development of a small number of the site options could result in the loss of an open space or sports facility and therefore minor negative effects are expected in relation to SA 4b for some of the sites. However, it may be possible that open spaces could be replaced locally. One of the mixed use sites, Abbey Stadium, Newmarket Road, Cambridge, is

expected to have significant negative effects in relation to SA 4b because it is not yet evidenced that the existing sports facility could be replaced locally.

### Summary of effects for Environmental objectives

**4.155** The Densification of existing urban area site options are generally expected to have minor negative effects in relation to the environmental objectives (i.e. SA 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12a, 12b and 13). Almost all of the site options are expected to have minor negative effects on designated biodiversity sites (SA 5), in addition to the landscape (SA 6). This is because they scored 'Amber' in the HELAA with respect to biodiversity and landscape character.. A fairly large proportion of the sites could also have significant negative or minor negative effects on the historic environment (including above-ground assets and archaeology) (SA 7) due to scoring 'Red' or 'Amber' in the HELAA, respectively. However, it is noted that many of these effects could be mitigated through design and construction requirements included within the Local Plan policies, which have been appraised separately.

**4.156** Almost all of the sites comprise brownfield land and are therefore expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA 8. However, these effects are mixed with significant negative effects for two of the sites, which also partially comprise greenfield land classed as being Grade 1 or 2 agricultural quality. One of the sites, CPDC, Foster Road (Policy 27 – R16), is expected to have mixed minor positive and minor negative effects in relation to SA 8 because it comprises both brownfield and greenfield land, the latter of which is classed as Grade 3 agricultural quality. Only two sites are expected to have minor negative effects because they do not comprise any brownfield land.

**4.157** Two sites, one mixed use (Old Press/Mill Lane, Cambridge) and one employment (South of Coldham's Lane Area of Major Change (Policy 16)), are expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA 10 because they fall within a Source Protection Zone or contain a watercourse or waterbody and their development could therefore have an adverse effect on water quality. All but one of the site options could be at risk of surface water flooding, or contain

smaller areas in flood zones 2 and/or 3 (being assessed as 'Amber' in the HELAA), with minor negative effects in relation to SA 11. This is primarily due to the presence of surface water flood risk across many parts of the city. One of these sites could also increase flood risk more generally because it falls mainly within Flood Zones 2 and 3 (Addenbrookes Hospital Extension, Cambridge) and is therefore expected to have significant negative effects in relation to SA 11.

**4.158** All but one of the site options are expected to have significant positive or minor positive effects in relation to SA 12a because they are located within close proximity of public transport and therefore have potential to reduce reliance on the private car, which could minimise emissions. Although reducing reliance on the private car could also help to reduce air pollution, all of the sites scored 'Amber' in the HELAA with respect to air quality and are therefore expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA 13. In particular, it is noted that the centre of Cambridge is designated as an AQMA. A large number of sites are also expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA 12b because although they are within close proximity of public transport, they are not within close proximity of a defined city, district or rural centre and therefore people may need to travel elsewhere for certain amenities. Just under a half of site options are located within close proximity of the aforementioned centres.

### Summary of effects for Economic objectives

**4.159** All of the employment and mixed use site options are likely to have significant positive or minor positive effects in relation to the economic objectives (i.e. SA 9, 14 and 15) because as well as providing new job opportunities, they are located within close proximity to public transport so as to ensure easy access to employment opportunities. However, all but one of the site options are expected to have significant negative effects with uncertainty with regards to minerals (SA 9) as mineral safeguarding areas cover a large part of the plan area, as identified on the policies map of the recently adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2021. However, very little minerals extraction is likely to take place in or adjacent to the urban area. Only one site is not located directly within a mineral safeguarding area (Land at Wolfson Court, Clarkson Road, Cambridge)

although it is in close proximity to one. The residential sites are not likely to affect SA 14 because they are not providing employment land or contributing significantly to the economy, respectively. The mixed use sites are expected to have significant positive effects in relation to SA 15 because they have the potential to provide both housing and employment uses and will therefore ensure residents are within close proximity of employment opportunities. The residential sites are expected to have a mixture of effects in relation to SA 15. Significant positive and minor positive effects are expected for six of the residential site options whereas significant negative and minor negative effects are expected for the remaining residential site options. This is because a small number of the residential site options are located within close proximity of an employment area or a city, district or rural centre, and would therefore ensure easy access to employment opportunities. However, the majority of residential sites are not located within close proximity to these areas and therefore people may need to travel further in order to access employment opportunities.

## Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt

Table 4.19: Summary of SA findings for site options in Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt

GCSP ref	Site	Proposed use	SA 1	SA 2a	SA 2b	SA 3a	SA 3b	SA 3c	SA 4a	SA 4b	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12a	SA 12b	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15
40110	Land east of Cabbage Moor, Great Shelford	Residential	+	-?	-	+/0	0	0	+	0	-?	--?	--?	--/+	--?	0	-	++	-	-	0	--
40139	Land south of Worts Causeway, Cambridge	Residential	+	-?	-	0	0	0	-	0	-?	--?	-?	--	--?	0	-	++	-	0	0	++
40140	Land south of Babraham Road, Shelford Bottom	Residential	+	-?	--	0	0	0	-	0	0?	--?	-?	--	--?	0	-	++	-	0	0	++
40141	Land at Chandos Farm, Cherry Hinton Road, Shelford Bottom	Residential	+	--?	--	+	0	0	-	0	-?	--?	-?	+	--?	0	-	++	-	0	0	--
40142	Land west of Trumpington Road, Cambridge	Residential	+	-?	-	+/0	0	0	+	0	-?	--?	-?	--/+	--?	0	-	++	-	-	0	++
40143	Land south of Addenbrooke's Road, Trumpington	Residential	+	-?	-	0	0	0	-	0	-?	--?	-?	--	--?	0	-	++	-	-	0	-
40217	Land to the east of Ditton Lane, Fen Ditton	Residential	+	+	-	0	0	0	++	0	0?	--?	-?	--?	--?	0	-	+	-	0	0	-
40394	Land at Fen Road, Cambridge	Residential	+	-?	--	0	0	0	+	0	-?	-?	--?	-	--?	0	--	+	-	0	0	-
40486	Land north of Huntingdon Road, Girton	Residential	+	--?	--	0	0	0	+	0	0?	--?	-?	-	--?	0	-	-	-	--	0	-
40491	Land to the west of the M11 and north of Madingley Road, Madingley	Residential	+	+	++?	0	0	0	+	0	-?	--?	--?	--?	--?	-?	-	++	+	-	0	++
40516	West of Ditton Lane, Fen Ditton.	Residential	+	-?	+	0	0	0	+	0	0?	--?	-?	--	--?	0	0	+	-	-	0	-
40528	Land north of Cherry Hinton Caravan Club, Limekiln Road, Cambridge	Residential	+	++	+	0	0	0	+	0	--?	-?	-?	-	--?	0	0	+	+	-	0	++
47647	Land to the east of Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton	Residential	+	-?	+	0	0	0	+	0	-?	--?	-?	--	--?	0	-	+	-	-	0	-

GCSP ref	Site	Proposed use	SA 1	SA 2a	SA 2b	SA 3a	SA 3b	SA 3c	SA 4a	SA 4b	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12a	SA 12b	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15
47648	Land east of Cherry Hinton Road and south of Worts Causeway, Cambridge	Residential	+	-?	-	0	0	0	-	0	-?	--?	-?	--	--?	0	-	++	-	0	0	++
47943	Land south of Milton, north of A14, Milton	Residential	+	++?	--	0	+	0	-	0	0?	--?	-?	--?	--?	0	-	++	-	-	0	++
52643	Land north of Barton Road and Land at Grange Farm, Cambridge	Residential	+	++	++?	+/0	0	0	+	0	-?	--?	-?	-- ?/+	--?	-?	-	++	+	-	0	++
40048	Land north of M11 and west of Hauxton Road, Trumpington	Mixed use	+	-?	-	0	0	0	+	0	-?	--?	-?	--	--?	0	-	++	-	0	++	++
40058	Land south of Fulbourn Road and north of Worts Causeway, known as Cambridge South East	Mixed use	+	-?	-	0	0	0	+	0	-?	--?	-?	--	--?	-?	-	++	-	-	++	++
40064	Land south of Addenbrooke's Road and east of M11, Cambridge South	Mixed use	+	++	+++?	0	0	0	+	0	-?	--?	--?	--	--?	-?	-	++	+	-	++	++
40087	Land at Capital Park, Fulbourn	Mixed use	+	-?	-	+/0	0	0	-	0	-?	--?	--?	+/-	--?	-?	-	+	-	0	+	++
40096	Land north of A14 and south of Milton Road, Impington	Mixed use	+	++	++?	0	0	0	++	0	-?	--?	-?	--	--?	0	-	++	+	-	++	++
40138	Land at Granham's Road, Cambridge	Mixed use	+	-?	-	0	0	0	-	0	-?	--?	-?	--	--?	0	-	++	-	-	++	++
40250	Land east of Gazelle Way and west of Teversham Road, Teversham	Mixed use	+	-?	++?	0	0	0	-	0	-?	--?	--?	--	--?	-?	-	+	-	-	++	++
40306	Land at and adjacent to Cambridge Airport, Newmarket Road, Cambridge	Mixed use	+	++	+++?	+/0	+	0	+	0	--?	--?	-?	--/+	--?	-?	-	+	+	-	++	++
40492	Land cornering M11 and Madingley Road, Cambridge	Mixed use	+	--?	-	+	0	0	-	0	-?	--?	0?	+	-?	0	-	++	-	-	+	++
OS217	Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extention (North of Granham's Road)	Mixed use	+	-?	-	0	0	0	-	0	-?	--?	-?	--	--?	0	0	++	-	-	++	++
OS215	Cambridge South (Cambridge Biomedical Campus) - West	Mixed use	+	++	+++?	0	0	0	+	0	-?	--?	--?	--	--?	-?	-	++	+	-	++	++

GCSP ref	Site	Proposed use	SA 1	SA 2a	SA 2b	SA 3a	SA 3b	SA 3c	SA 4a	SA 4b	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12a	SA 12b	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15
OS214	Cambridge South (Cambridge Biomedical Campus) - East	Mixed use	+	++	-	0	0	0	-	0	-?	--?	-?	--	--?	-?	-	++	+	-	++	++
40096	Land north of A14 and south of Milton Road, Impington	Employment	0	++	N/A	0	0	0	++	0	-?	--?	-?	--	--?	0	-	++	+	-	++	++
OS214	Cambridge South (Cambridge Biomedical Campus) - East	Employment	0	++	N/A	0	0	0	-	0	-?	--?	-?	--/+	--?	0	-	++	+	-	++	++

## Summary of effects for Social objectives

**4.160** The Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt site options generally perform poorly against the social objectives (i.e. SA 1, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a and 4b). More than half of the sites are expected to have significant negative and minor negative effects in relation to SA 2a and 2b because they are located further than the other sites from a defined city, district, local, neighbourhood, rural or minor rural centre, in addition to primary and secondary schools. Therefore, they do not have easy access to services, facilities and education establishments. Conversely, there are a smaller number of sites that perform well against SA 2a and 2b because they are located within close proximity to services and facilities and therefore provide easy access to them with significant positive and minor positive effects recorded. Just below half of the sites are expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA 4a because they are also not within close proximity of primary healthcare facilities, open space and/or sports facilities.

**4.161** All of the residential and mixed use sites contribute towards housing delivery and will therefore have minor positive effects in relation to SA 1. Only two of the site options, one residential (Land at Chandos Farm, Cherry Hinton Road, Shelford Bottom) and one mixed use (Land cornering M11 and Madingley Road, Cambridge), are expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA 3a because they comprise brownfield land and will therefore help promote the achievement of regeneration in Greater Cambridge. A small number of sites are expected to have mixed minor positive and negligible effects in relation to SA 3a because they are located on a mix of brownfield and greenfield land. It is noted that Land at and adjacent to Cambridge Airport, Newmarket Road, Cambridge includes a particularly large area of brownfield land (Cambridge Airport), but also includes greenfield land beyond this. Two of the sites, Land south of Milton, north of A14, Milton (a residential site) and Land at and adjacent to Cambridge Airport, Newmarket Road, Cambridge, fall within one of the 40% most deprived areas in England and therefore has potential to help regenerate the area. For this reason, they are expected to have minor positive effects against SA 3b.

## Summary of effects for Environmental objectives

**4.162** The Edge of Cambridge: Green Belt site options are generally expected to have minor negative effects in relation to the environmental objectives (i.e. SA 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12a, 12b and 13), with most of the sites having significant negative effects in relation to SA 6 and 8. This is because a large proportion of the sites could have an adverse effect on landscape character because they scored 'Red' in the HELAA and consist of at least 25% greenfield land, which is classed as Grade 1 or Grade 2 agricultural land. Only two of the sites, one residential (Land at Chandos Farm, Cherry Hinton Road, Shelford Bottom) and one mixed use (Land cornering M11 and Madingley Road, Cambridge), comprise brownfield land and would therefore have minor positive effects. Land at Capital Park, Fulbourn is expected to have mixed minor positive and minor negative effects in relation to SA 8 because it is located on brownfield and greenfield land and the greenfield land is classed as Grade 3 agricultural quality. A small number of sites are expected to have mixed minor positive and significant negative effects in relation to SA 8 because they are located on brownfield and greenfield land, the latter of which is classed as Grade 1 or Grade 2 agricultural quality. It is noted that Land at and adjacent to Cambridge Airport, Newmarket Road, Cambridge includes a particularly large area of brownfield land (Cambridge Airport), but also includes greenfield land beyond this.

**4.163** All of the site options are expected to have significant negative or minor negative effects on designated biodiversity sites (SA 5) because they scored 'Red' or 'Amber' in the HELAA, respectively. Most of the sites include areas identified as being at surface water flood risk, with one of the sites falling within Flood Zones 2 and/or 3 (SA11). A fairly large proportion of the sites could also have significant negative or minor negative effects on the historic environment (including above-ground assets and archaeology) (SA 7) due to scoring 'Red' or 'Amber' in the HELAA, respectively. However, it is noted that many of these effects could be mitigated through design and construction requirements included within the Local Plan policies, which have been appraised separately. Only one site, (Land cornering M11 and Madingley Road, Cambridge) is expected to have a negligible effect in relation to SA 7. Only a small proportion

of the sites are likely to have minor negative effects on water quality (SA 10) due to the presence of Source Protection Zones, watercourses or waterbodies.

**4.164** Despite most of the sites performing poorly in relation to proximity to city, district and rural centres (SA 12b), they are located within close proximity of public transport and therefore have potential to reduce reliance on the private car, which could minimise emissions and result in significant positive and minor effects in relation to SA 12a. Although reducing reliance on the private car could also help to reduce air pollution, many of the sites scored 'Amber' in the HELAA with respect to air quality and are therefore expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA 13.

### Summary of effects for Economic objectives

**4.165** The employment site options are expected to have significant positive effects in relation to the economic objectives (i.e. SA 9, 14 and 15), while the mixed use site options are expected to have a significant positive effects in relation to SA 15 and a mixture of significant positive and minor positive effects in relation to SA 14, because as well as providing new job opportunities, they are located within close proximity to public transport so as to ensure easy access to employment opportunities. However, all but one of the site options are expected to have significant negative effects with uncertainty with regards to minerals (SA 9) as mineral safeguarding areas cover a large part of the plan area. Only one site is the exception to this (Land cornering M11 and Madingley Road, Cambridge) because although it is not located directly within a mineral safeguarding area, it is in close proximity to one. The residential sites are not likely to affect SA 14 because they are not providing employment land or contributing significantly to the economy, respectively. The mixed use sites are expected to have significant positive effects in relation to SA 15 because they have the potential to provide both housing and employment uses and will therefore ensure residents are within close proximity of employment opportunities. A small number of residential sites are expected to have significant positive effects in relation to SA15 because they are located within close proximity of an employment area, which would provide employment opportunities. Two of the residential site options are expected to have

significant negative effects in relation to SA15 because they are currently in employment use and would therefore be lost to residential development.

## Edge of Cambridge – non-Green Belt

Table 4.20: Summary of SA findings for site options in Edge of Cambridge – non-Green Belt

GCSP ref	Site	Proposed use	SA 1	SA 2a	SA 2b	SA 3a	SA 3b	SA 3c	SA 4a	SA 4b	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12a	SA 12b	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15
OS024	Land between Huntington Road and Histon Road (SS/2)	Residential	+	-?	-	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	-?	-	++	-	-	0	++
56251	North West Cambridge (Eddington)	Mixed use	+	++	+	0	0	0	+	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	-?	-	++	+	-	++	++
OS022	North West Cambridge (NW/4)	Mixed use	+	-?	++ ?	0	0	0	+	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	-?	-	++	-	-	++	++
OS062	North East Cambridge Area Action Plan Boundary	Mixed use	+	++	+	+	+	0	++	0	-?	0?	-?	+	--?	-?	-	++	+	-	++	++
OS213	Cambridge East (Safeguarded Land)	Mixed use	+	++	++ ?	+	+	0	++	0	-?	0?	-?	+	--?	0	-	+	-	-	++	++
OS055	Fulbourn Road East (Fulbourn) (E/3)	Employment	0	-?	N/A	0	0	0	-	0	-?	0?	-?	--	--?	-?	0	+	-	0	++	+
OS056	Cambridge Biomedical Campus extension (E/2)	Employment	0	--?	N/A	0	0	0	-	0	-?	0?	-?	--	--?	0	-	++	-	0	++	++
OS260	Fulbourn Road West 1 & 2, Cambridge	Employment	0	-?	N/A	0	0	0	-	0	0?	0?	0?	-	--?	0	0	+	-	-	++	+
OS161	West Cambridge (M13 Designated Site)	Employment	0	-?	N/A	+/0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	0?	-- ?/+	--?	-?	-	++	-	-	++	++

**4.166** The Edge of Cambridge – non-Green Belt site options are a mixture of large and small sites located around the edge of the city of Cambridge. The residential site and most of the employment sites are located to the north and north west of the city, whilst the mixed use sites are mainly located to the east and south east of the city.

## Summary of effects for Social objectives

**4.167** The Edge of Cambridge – non-Green Belt site options generally perform positively against the social objectives (i.e. SA 1, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a and 4b), partly because the residential and mixed use sites contribute towards housing delivery and will therefore have minor positive effects in relation to SA 1. North East Cambridge (Area Action Plan Boundary) is located within close proximity to the city of Cambridge and would provide a new local centre as part of its mixed use development. This would ensure easy access to a number of services and facilities for new residents, resulting in a significant positive effect for SA 2a.

**4.168** The employment sites perform less well in relation to access to services and facilities when compared to the residential and mixed use sites because although they are located on the edge of Cambridge, the employment sites are located further from the edge of Cambridge and therefore do not have easy access to services and facilities, including primary healthcare facilities, open space and sports facilities. Therefore, they are likely to have minor or significant negative effects on SA 2a and SA 4a. North East Cambridge is the only site to have a minor positive effect in relation to social inclusion and equality (SA 3a and 3b) because it is the only site that falls within one of the 40% most deprived areas in England and due to the fact it is brownfield, has the potential to help regenerate the area. One of the sites, West Cambridge (M13 Designated Site) is expected to have mixed minor positive and negligible effects against SA 3a because it is located on a mix of brownfield and greenfield land. The mixed use site of North West Cambridge (NW/4) is expected to have a significant positive effect with respect to access to education (SA 2b) because it is located within close proximity to both primary and secondary schools.

## Summary of effects for Environmental objectives

**4.169** The Edge of Cambridge – non-Green Belt site options are generally expected to have minor negative effects in relation to the environmental objectives (i.e. SA 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12a, 12b and 13), with most of the sites having significant negative effects in relation to SA 8. This is because a large proportion of the sites consist of at least 25% greenfield land, which is classed as Grade 1 or Grade 2 agricultural land. Two of the sites, North East Cambridge (SS/5) and West Cambridge (M13 Designated Site), comprise brownfield land and would therefore have minor positive effects. West Cambridge (M13 Designated Site) is also expected to have minor positive effects because it is partially located on brownfield land. However, the positive effect is mixed with a significant negative effect because the site is also partially located on greenfield land classed as Grade 1 or Grade 2 agricultural quality. All but one of the sites are expected to have minor negative effects on designated biodiversity sites (SA 5) because they scored 'Amber' in the HELAA. Most of the sites could have minor negative effects on water quality (SA 10) due to the presence of Source Protection Zones, watercourses or waterbodies, in addition to being at risk of surface water flooding, or containing smaller areas in flood zones 2 and/or 3 (being assessed as 'Amber' in the HELAA) (SA 11). Around half of the sites could have minor negative effects on landscape character (SA 6) because they scored 'Amber' in the HELAA with respect to landscape character. All of the residential and mixed use sites could have minor negative effects on the historic environment (including above-ground assets and archaeology) (SA 7) due to scoring 'Amber' in the HELAA with respect to the historic environment. It is noted that many of these effects could be mitigated through design and construction requirements included within the Local Plan policies, which have been appraised separately.

**4.170** Despite most of the sites performing poorly in relation to proximity to city, district and rural centres (SA 12b), they are located within close proximity of public transport and therefore have potential to reduce reliance on the private car, which could minimise emissions and result in significant positive and minor positive effects in relation to SA 12a. Although reducing reliance on the private car could also help to reduce air pollution, many of the sites scored 'Amber' in

the HELAA with respect to air quality and are therefore expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA 13.

## **Summary of effects for Economic objectives**

**4.171** All of the site options are expected to have significant negative effects with uncertainty with regards to minerals (SA 9) as mineral safeguarding areas cover a large part of the plan area. All of the employment and mixed use site options are likely to have significant or minor positive effects in relation to the economic objectives (i.e. SA 9, 14 and 15) because as well as providing new job opportunities, they are located within close proximity to public transport so as to ensure easy access to employment opportunities. The residential site is not likely to affect SA 14 because it is not providing employment land or contributing significantly to the economy. The mixed use sites are expected to have significant positive effects in relation to SA 15 because they will provide both housing and employment uses and will therefore ensure residents are within close proximity of employment opportunities. The residential site is expected to have significant positive effects in relation to SA 15 because it is located within close proximity of an employment area, which would provide employment opportunities.

## Integrating homes and jobs – Southern cluster

Table 4.21: Summary of SA findings for the Integrating homes and jobs – Southern cluster site options

GCSP ref	Site	Proposed use	SA 1	SA 2a	SA 2b	SA 3a	SA 3b	SA 3c	SA 4a	SA 4b	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12a	SA 12b	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15
40117	Land at 120 Cambridge Road, Great Shelford	Residential	+	-?	--	+/0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--/+	--?	0	-	++	-	-	0	--
40118	Land west of High Street, Great Abington	Residential	+	--?	+?	+/0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	-- ?/+	--?	-?	0	+	-	-	0	++
40150	Land South of Common Lane, Sawston	Residential	+	-?	-	+/0	0	0	-	0	0?	0?	-?	-- ?/+	--?	-?	-	-	-	-	0	--
40165	Whittlesford Highways Depot, Station Road, Whittlesford	Residential	+	--?	--	+	0	0	-	0	0?	0?	-?	+	--?	-?	0	++	-	-	0	--
40256	Land on the north side of Pampisford Road, Great Abington	Residential	+	--?	-	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	-?	0	+	-	-	0	-
40336	Land off Balsham Road, Linton	Residential	+	-?	-	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--?	--?	-?	-	+	-	-	0	-
40509	Land to the south of Babraham Road and east of site H1c, Sawston	Residential	+	-?	-	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	-?	0	+++	-	-	0	-
40525	Land at Common Lane, Sawston	Residential	+	++	-	0	0	0	++	0	-?	0?	-?	--?	--?	-?	-	+	+	-	0	+
40558	Land at Maarnford Farm, Hunts Road, Duxford	Residential	+	--?	+?	0	0	0	+	0	0?	-?	-?	--	--?	-?	0	+	-	-	0	++
OS030	Land south of Babraham Road, Sawston (H/1(c))	Residential	+	-?	+?	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	--?	-	+++	-	0	0	-
OS216	Land between Hinton Way and Mingle Lane, Great Shelford	Residential	+	-?	--	0	0	0	+	0	-?	0?	-?	--	--?	0	-	++	+	-	0	+

GCSP ref	Site	Proposed use	SA 1	SA 2a	SA 2b	SA 3a	SA 3b	SA 3c	SA 4a	SA 4b	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12a	SA 12b	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15
40534	Deal Farm, Cambridge Road, Sawston	Mixed use	+	-?	+?	+/0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--/+	--?	0	0	+++?	-	-	+	++
51657	Land north of A505 - Site A1 (east of Hill Farm Road), Duxford	Mixed use	+	--?	--	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	-?	0	++	-	-	+	++
51660	Land north of A505 - Site A2 (east of M11 and west of Hill Farm Road), Duxford	Mixed use	+	--?	--	+/0	0	0	-	0	-?	0?	-?	--/+	--?	-?	0	+	-	-	+	++
51604a	The Babraham Research Campus, Cambridge	Mixed use	+	--?	+?	+/0	0	0	+	0	-?	-?	-?	--/+	--?	0	-	+++?	-	-	++	++
40125	Comfort Cafe, Four Wentways, Little Abington	Employment	0	--?	N/A	+	0	0	-	0	0?	0?	-?	+	--?	-?	0	+++?	-	-	+	+
40534	Deal Farm, Cambridge Road, Sawston	Employment	0	-?	N/A	+/0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--/+	--?	0	0	+++?	-	-	+	+
51660	Land north of A505 - Site A2 (east of M11 and west of Hill Farm Road), Duxford	Employment	0	--?	N/A	+/0	0	0	-	0	-?	0?	-?	--/+	--?	-?	0	+	-	-	++	+
OS208	Dales Manor Business Park [element of site not included in HELAA OSOS Employment Allocation]	Employment	0	-?	N/A	+	0	0	-	0	-?	0?	0?	+	--?	-?	-	+++?	-	-	++	+
51604	The Babraham Research Campus, Cambridge	Employment	0	--?	N/A	+/0	0	0	+	0	-?	-?	-?	--/+	--?	--?	-	+++?	-	-	++	+
40125	Comfort Cafe, Four Wentways, Little Abington	Employment	0	--?	N/A	+	0	0	-	0	0?	0?	-?	+	--?	-?	0	+++?	-	-	+	++

## Summary of effects for Social objectives

**4.172** The Integrating homes and jobs – Southern cluster site options generally perform poorly against the social objectives (i.e. SA 1, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a and 4b). A large proportion of the sites are expected to have minor or significant negative effects in relation to SA 2a and 2b. This is because these sites are located a long distance away from a defined city, district, local, neighbourhood, rural or minor rural centre, in addition to primary and secondary schools. Therefore, they do not have easy access to services, facilities and schools. Conversely, there are a small number of sites that perform well against SA 2b because they are located within close proximity to schools.

**4.173** All of the residential and mixed use sites contribute towards housing delivery and are therefore expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA 1. Around two fifths of sites are expected to have mixed minor positive and negligible effects in relation to SA 3a because they comprise both brownfield and greenfield land. Just one fifth of sites are expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA 3a because they solely comprise brownfield land. Over three quarters of the site options are expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA 4a because they are not within close proximity of a healthcare facility or area of open space/sports facility. However, one of the sites, Land at Common Lane, Swaston, is expected to have significant positive effects in relation to SA 4a because it is within close proximity of a healthcare facility and/or will provide a new health centre and area of open space/sports facility. The remaining site options are expected to have minor positive effects because they are within close proximity of a healthcare facility and/or will provide a new health centre of area of open space/sports facility.

## Summary of effects for Environmental objectives

**4.174** The Integrating homes and jobs – Southern cluster site options are generally expected to have minor negative effects in relation to the

environmental objectives (i.e. SA 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12a, 12b and 13), with most of the sites expected to have significant negative effects against SA 8. This is because they comprise at least 25% greenfield land, which is classed as being Grade 1 or 2 agricultural quality. Some of the significant negative effects are recorded as uncertain because the land at some of these sites is classed as Grade 3 agricultural quality but it is unknown whether it is Grade 3a or 3b agricultural quality. For some of the sites, these effects are mixed with minor positive effects because some of the sites comprise brownfield land, in addition to greenfield land. Only three sites are expected to have minor positive effects only in relation to SA 8 because they entirely comprise brownfield land.

**4.175** Almost all of the site options are expected to have minor negative effects on designated biodiversity sites (SA5) due to scoring 'Amber' in the HELAA. Just under half of the sites are expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA 6 because they scored 'Amber' in the HELAA with respect to landscape character. All but one of the options (Dales Manor Business Park [element of site not included in HELAA OSOS Employment Allocation]) are expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA 7 because they scored 'Amber' in the HELAA with respect to the historic environment (including above-ground assets and archaeology).

**4.176** Just under two thirds of sites fall within Source Protection Zones 2 or 3 or contain a watercourse or waterbody and are therefore expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA 10. Two of the sites are expected to have significant negative effects in relation to SA 10 because they falls within Source Protection Zone 1 and development therefore has the potential to affect water quality. Two fifths of sites are expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA11 because they are at risk of surface water flooding.

**4.177** Despite most of the sites performing poorly in relation to proximity to city, district and rural centres (SA 12b), they are located within close proximity of public transport and therefore have potential to reduce reliance on the private car, which could minimise emissions and result in significant positive and minor effects in relation to SA 12a. Although reducing reliance on the private car could also help to reduce air pollution, all but one of the sites scored 'Amber' in the

HELAA with respect to air quality and are therefore expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA 13.

## Summary of effects for Economic objectives

**4.178** All of the site options are expected to have significant negative effects with uncertainty with regards to minerals (SA 9) as mineral safeguarding areas cover a large part of the plan area. All of the employment and mixed use site options are likely to have significant positive or minor positive effects in relation to economic objectives 14 and 15 because as well as providing new job opportunities, they are located within close proximity to public transport so as to ensure easy access to employment opportunities. The residential sites are not likely to affect SA 14 because they are not providing employment land or contributing significantly to the economy. The mixed use sites are expected to have significant positive effects in relation to SA 15 because they have potential to provide both housing and employment uses and will therefore ensure residents are within close proximity of employment opportunities. The residential sites are expected to have a mixture of effects in relation to SA 15. Significant positive and minor positive effects are expected for four of the residential site options whereas significant negative and minor negative effects are expected for the remaining residential site options. This is because a small number of the residential site options are located within close proximity of an employment area or a city, district or rural centre, and would therefore ensure easy access to employment opportunities. However, the majority of residential sites are not located within close proximity to these areas and therefore people may need to travel further in order to access employment opportunities.

## Growth around transport nodes: Cambourne Area

**Table 4.22: Summary of SA findings for the Growth around transport nodes: Cambourne Area site options**

GCSP ref	Site	Proposed use	SA 1	SA 2a	SA 2b	SA 3a	SA 3b	SA 3c	SA 4a	SA 4b	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12a	SA 12b	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15
40131	Land west of Broadway, South of Beaufort Road, Cambourne	Residential	+	++	+?	0	0	0	+	0	-?	--?	-?	--	0	-?	-	+++?	+	-	0	+
40132	Land south of School Lane, east of A1198, Cambourne	Residential	+	++	+?	0	0	0	-	-?	-?	--?	--?	--	--?	-?	-	+++?	+	-	0	++
40447	Land at Grange Farm, Caxton	Residential	+	-?	+?	0	0	0	+	0	-?	--?	-?	--	--?	-?	-	+++?	-	-	0	-
40473	Land to north-east of the junction of A1198 and A428 at Caxton Gibbet	Residential	+	-?	+?	0	0	0	++	0	-?	--?	-?	--	0	-?	-	+	-	-	0	-
48054	Land at Vine Farm and to the south of Caxton, Caxton	Residential	+	+?	+++?	0	0	0	-	0	-?	--?	-?	--	--?	-?	-	+++?	+	-	0	-
48096	Land at Crow's Nest Farm, Papworth Everard	Residential	+	-?	+?	0	0	0	-	0	-?	--?	-?	--	0	-?	-	+	-	-	0	-
51601	Land south of A428 and west of the A1198, Caxton	Residential	+	+?	+++?	0	0	0	+	0	-?	--?	--?	--	0	-?	-	+++?	+	-	0	-
51612	Land north east of Bourn	Residential	+	+?	+?	0	0	0	+	0	-?	--?	-?	--	--?	-?	-	-	+	-	0	-
51668	Land north and south of Cambridge Rd, Eltisley	Residential	+	+?	+++?	0	0	0	+	0	-?	--?	-?	--	0	-?	-	+	+	-	0	-
40076	Land south west of Caxton Gibbet	Mixed use	+	--?	--	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--	0	0	0	+	-	-	++	++
40114	Land north of Cambourne, Knapwell	Mixed use	+	++	+++?	0	0	0	+	0	--?	--?	--?	--	0	-?	-	+++?	+	-	+	++

**4.179** The Growth around transport nodes: Cambourne Area site options are a mixture of large sites located to the north, south and west of the new settlement of Cambourne. There are no employment site options within this site typology.

## Summary of effects for Social objectives

**4.180** The Growth around transport nodes: Cambourne Area site options have a mix of positive and negative effects in relation to the social objectives (i.e. SA 1, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a and 4b). A large proportion of the sites are expected to have positive effects in relation to SA 2a and 2b because they are located in proximity to an existing city, district, local, neighbourhood, rural or minor rural centre, in addition to primary and/or secondary schools. Conversely, there are a small number of sites that perform less well against SA 2a and 2b because they are located not within close proximity to services and facilities. In particular, Land south west of Caxton Gibbet is expected to have significant negative effects in relation to both 2a and 2b.

**4.181** All of the residential and mixed use sites contribute towards housing delivery and are therefore expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA 1. A mixture of effects is expected in relation to SA 4a, with just over half of sites expected to have minor positive effects because they are within close proximity of a healthcare facility and/or will provide a new health centre or area of open space. One residential site, Land to north-east of the junction of A1198 and A428 at Caxton Gibbet, is expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to SA 4a because it is of a scale where it would provide a new health centre and is within proximity of an existing sports facility. The remaining four site options are expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA 4a because they are not within close proximity of a healthcare facility or area of open space/sports facility. Only one site is expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA 4b because it would result in the loss of open space but which could be replaced locally.

## Summary of effects for Environmental objectives

**4.182** The Growth around transport nodes: Cambourne Area site options are generally expected to have minor negative effects in relation to the environmental objectives (i.e. SA 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12a, 12b and 13), with all of the sites expected to have significant negative effects against SA 8 and all but one of the sites expected to have significant negative effects against SA 6. This is because all of the sites consist of at least 25% greenfield land classed as Grade 1 or Grade 2 agricultural quality. With regard to SA 6, all but one of the sites scored 'Red' in the HELAA as they are expected to have adverse impacts on landscape character which cannot be mitigated. The remaining site option scored 'Amber' in the HELAA as although it could have an adverse impact on the landscape, this impact could be mitigated through design and construction requirements included within the Local Plan policies, which have been appraised separately.

**4.183** All site options with the exception of Land north of Cambourne, Knapwell, are expected to have minor negative effects on designated biodiversity sites (SA 5). Land north of Cambourne, Knapwell, is expected to have significant negative effects on designated biodiversity sites because its impacts on biodiversity cannot be reasonably mitigated or compensated for. The same site is also expected to have significant negative effects in relation to SA 7 because it scored 'Red' in the HELAA with respect to the historic environment (including above-ground assets and archaeology). Most of the remaining sites are expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA 7 because they scored 'Amber' in the HELAA.

**4.184** All but one site fall within Source Protection Zones 2 or 3 or contain a watercourse or waterbody, in addition to being at high or medium risk from surface water flooding, or containing smaller areas in flood zones 2 and/or 3 (being assessed as 'Amber' in the HELAA). Therefore, these sites are expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA 10 and SA 11.

**4.185** Almost all of the site options are expected to have significant positive or minor positive effects in relation to SA 12a because they are located within

close proximity of public transport and therefore have potential to reduce reliance on the private car, which could minimise emissions. Although reducing reliance on the private care could also help to reduce air pollution, all of the sites scored 'Amber' in the HELAA with respect to air quality and are therefore expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA 13. Just over half of the sites are expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA 12b because they are within close proximity of a defined city, district or rural centre and therefore people do not need to travel elsewhere to reach certain amenities. The remaining sites are expected to have minor negative effects in relation to 12b because although they are within close proximity of public transport, they are not within close proximity of a defined city, district or rural centre.

### Summary of effects for Economic objectives

**4.186** All of the site options are expected to have significant negative effects with uncertainty with regards to minerals (SA 9) as mineral safeguarding areas cover a large part of the plan area. The residential site options are not likely to affect SA 14 because they are not providing employment land or contributing significantly to the economy. The mixed use site options are expected to have a significant positive and minor positive effect in relation to SA 14 because they are likely to provide new job opportunities. However, the mixed use sites are expected to have significant positive effects in relation to SA 15 because they will provide both housing and employment uses and will therefore ensure residents are within close proximity of employment opportunities. One of the residential site options, Land south of School Lane, east of A1198, Cambourne, is expected to have significant positive effects in relation to SA15 and Land west of Broadway, South of Beaufort Road, Cambourne, is expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA 15 because they are within close proximity to Cambourne centre, where job opportunities are available. The remaining site options are expected to have minor negative effects in relation to this objective because they are a further distance from employment areas and city, district and rural centres.

## Dispersal: Villages

Table 4.23: Summary of SA findings for site options for Dispersal: Villages

GCSP ref	Site	Proposed use	SA 1	SA 2a	SA 2b	SA 3a	SA 3b	SA 3c	SA 4a	SA 4b	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12a	SA 12b	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15
40014	Oakington Road, Cottenham	Residential	+	-?	-	+	0	0	-	0	-?	0?	0?	+	0	0	0	+	-	-	0	--
40108	Land to the rear of 38 Histon Road, Cottenham	Residential	+	-?	+	0	0	0	-	0	0?	-?	-?	-	0	0	-	+	-	-	0	-
40163	Gamlingay First School, Green End, Gamlingay	Residential	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	-?	-?	-?	-?	+	0	-?	-	+	-	-	0	-
40164	Land west of South End, Bassingbourn	Residential	+	+	+	0	0	0	-	0	0?	-?	-?	--	--?	0	-	+	-	-	0	-
40179	Land at Belsar Farm, Sponge Drove, Willingham	Residential	+	-?	--	0	0	0	+	0	-?	0?	-?	--	--?	0	-	+	-	-	0	-
40215	The Moor, Moor Lane, Melbourn	Residential	+	-?	+	0	0	0	-	0	-?	0?	0?	--	--?	0	-	-	-	-	0	++
40251	Land at Beach Road, Cottenham	Residential	+	-?	-	0	0	0	+	0	0?	-?	-?	--	0	0	-	+	-	-	0	-
40253	Land at Bennell Farm (west), West Street, Comberton	Residential	+	-?	+	0	0	0	+	0	-?	-?	0?	--	--?	0	-	+	-	-	0	-
40271	Land east of Balsham Road, Fulbourn (40271)	Residential	+	-?	-	0	0	0	+	0	-?	0?	-?	-	--?	-?	-	-	-	-	0	-
40272	Land east of Balsham Road, Fulbourn (40272)	Residential	+	-?	-	0	0	0	+	0	-?	0?	-?	-	--?	-?	-	-	-	-	0	-
40286	Bird Farm, Cambridge Road, Fulbourn	Residential	+	-?	-	0	0	0	++	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	--?	0	+	-	-	0	-

GCSP ref	Site	Proposed use	SA 1	SA 2a	SA 2b	SA 3a	SA 3b	SA 3c	SA 4a	SA 4b	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12a	SA 12b	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15
40296	Land to the south of Oakington Road, Cottenham	Residential	+	-?	+	0	0	0	-	0	0?	-?	-?	--	0	0	-	+	-	-	0	-
40329	Land to the west of Oakington Road, Girton	Residential	+	--?	-	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	-	--?	-?	-	+	-	-	0	-
40345	Ely Road, Milton	Residential	+	-?	-	+/0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--/+	--?	0	-	+++?	-	-	0	-
40468	Land south of Priest Lane, Willingham	Residential	+	-?	-	0	0	0	+	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	0	-	+	-	-	0	-
40489	Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn (40489)	Residential	+	-?	+	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	0	-	+	-	-	0	++
40490	Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn (40490)	Residential	+	-?	+	0	0	0	-	0	-?	0?	-?	--	--?	0	-	+	-	-	0	++
40549	Land off Bourney's Manor Close, Willingham	Residential	+	+	-	0	0	0	++	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	-?	-	+	-	-	0	-
40555	Cockerton Road, Girton	Residential	+	--?	+	0	0	0	+	0	0?	-?	-?	--	--?	0	-	+	-	-	0	-
47903	Land south of Cambridge Road, Melbourn	Residential	+	-?	-	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	0	-	+	-	-	0	++
56169	29 Station Rd, Shepreth	Residential	+	--?	--	+	0	0	-	0	0?	-?	0?	+	--?	0	-	++	-	-	0	--
OS154	Land adj (north) to 69 Long Road, Comberton	Residential	+	-?	-	0	0	0	-	0	0?	0?	-?	--	--?	0	-	-	-	-	0	-
51649	Land to the north of Meadow Road, Willingham	Residential	+	+	+	0	0	0	-	0	-?	0?	-?	--	--?	0	-	++	-	-	0	-
40028	Land west of Church Street, Haslingfield	Mixed use	+	--?	-	0	0	0	+	0	-?	0?	-?	--?	--?	0	-	+	-	0	+	++
40109	Hall Farm, Teversham	Mixed use	+	--?	+	+/0	0	0	+	0	-?	-?	-?	--/+	--?	0	-	+	-	-	+	++

GCSP ref	Site	Proposed use	SA 1	SA 2a	SA 2b	SA 3a	SA 3b	SA 3c	SA 4a	SA 4b	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12a	SA 12b	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15
40151	Ramphill Farm, Rampton Road, Cottenham	Mixed use	+	-?	-	+/0	0	0	-	0	-?	0?	-?	--/+	0	0	0	+	-	-	+	++
40158	Madingley Mulch, Madingley Road, Cambridge	Mixed use	+	--?	--	+/0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--/+	-?	0	0	+++?	-	-	+	++
40384	Old Highways Depot, Twenty Pence Lane, Cottenham	Mixed use	+	-?	--	+	0	0	-	0	-?	0?	-?	+	-?	0	-	+	-	-	+	++
40427	Land off Longstanton Road, Over	Mixed use	+	--?	-	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	0	-	-	-	-	+	++
40544	Land at Potton Road, Gamlingay	Mixed use	+	-?	--	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--?	-?	-?	0	-	-	-	+	++
45107	Land to the south of the A14 Services, Boxworth	Mixed use	+	--?	--	+	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	0?	+	0	0	-	-	-	-	++	++
OS009	Land To The South Of Station Road, Gamlingay, Sandy, Beds SG19 3HE	Mixed use	+	++?	-	0	0	0	+	-?	-?	-?	0?	--?	--?	-?	-	+	-	0	+	++
40490a	Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn	Mixed use	+	-?	++?	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	0	-	+	-	-	+	++
40158	Madingley Mulch, Madingley Road, Cambridge	Employment	0	--?	N/A	+/0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--/+	-?	0	0	+++?	-	-	+	+
40384	Old Highways Depot, Twenty Pence Lane, Cottenham	Employment	0	-?	N/A	+	0	0	-	0	-?	0?	-?	+	-?	0	-	+	-	-	+	+
40427	Land off Longstanton Road, Over	Employment	0	--?	N/A	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	0	-	-	-	-	++	+
40544	Land at Potton Road, Gamlingay	Employment	0	-?	N/A	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--?	-?	-?	0	-	-	-	+	+

GCSP ref	Site	Proposed use	SA 1	SA 2a	SA 2b	SA 3a	SA 3b	SA 3c	SA 4a	SA 4b	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12a	SA 12b	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15
45107	Land to the south of the A14 Services, Boxworth	Employment	0	--?	N/A	+	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	0?	+	0	0	-	-	-	-	++	+
OS057	Over, Norman Way (residue) (Policy E/5(1))	Employment	0	--?	N/A	0	0	0	-	0	-?	0?	-?	--	--?	0	-	-	-	0	+	+
OS250	Land to the south of the A14 Services	Employment	0	--?	N/A	+/0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	0?	-- ?/+	0	0	-	-	-	-	++	+
OS254	Bayer CropScience Site, Hauxton	Employment	0	--?	N/A	+	0	0	-	0	0?	0?	-?	+	--?	-?	-	+	-	-	+	+

## Summary of effects for Social objectives

**4.187** A mix of effects is recorded for Dispersal: Village site options in relation to social objectives (i.e. SA 1, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a and 4b). The residential and mixed use sites would contribute towards housing delivery, therefore all are expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA 1. Dispersal: Village sites are generally expected to have negative effects (both significant and minor, sometimes with uncertainty) for access to services and facilities (SA 2a and 2b), because they are not within close proximity to an existing centre or education facilities. However, a small number of sites are expected to have minor positive effects as they are close to an existing smaller centre or a school. Most sites are expected to have negligible effects for social inclusion and equalities (SA 3a, 3b and 3c). Whilst effects for health are mixed, the majority of sites are likely to have minor negative effects with regards to access to healthcare facilities and/or open space (SA 4a) and very few sites are expected to result in loss of open space or sports facilities (SA 4b).

**4.188** The only significant positive effects recorded are for Bird Farm, Cambridge Road, Fulbourn and Land off Bourney's Manor Close, Willingham, with regards to access to healthcare facilities and/or open space (SA 4a), as these two sites are within 720m of existing facilities.

## Summary of effects for Environmental objectives

**4.189** The Dispersal: Village sites generally perform negatively in relation to the environmental objectives (i.e. SA 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12a, 12b and 13). In particular, the majority of sites are expected to have minor negative effects (with uncertainty) in relation to biodiversity and geodiversity (SA 5), landscape and townscape (SA 6), as officer assessments scored these sites as 'Amber' in the HELAA for these topics.

**4.190** Minor negative effects are also identified for many sites with regards to adaptation to climate change (SA 11), and air quality (SA 13). This is because they are at risk of surface water flooding, or contain smaller areas in flood zones 2 and/or 3 (being assessed as 'Amber' in the HELAA), and there are potential air quality issues, but these can likely be mitigated.

## Chapter 4 Appraisal of Spatial Options

**4.191** Dispersal: Village sites are generally expected to have either minor negative or negligible effects (sometimes with uncertainty) with regards to historic environment (including above-ground assets and archaeology) (SA 7) and water (SA 10). Minor negative effects are recorded where there is potential harm to heritage assets, but this could be reasonably mitigated (SA 7) and where sites coincide with SPZ 2 or SPZ 3 (SA 10).

**4.192** Mostly significant negative effects (sometimes with uncertainty) were identified with regards to efficient use of land (SA 8), given that most sites consist primarily of Grades 1 or 2 agricultural land, although for some sites a minor positive effect is recognised (often mixed with minor negative) because the site is wholly or partly brownfield land.

**4.193** Despite most of the sites performing poorly in relation to proximity to city, district and rural centres (SA 12b), they are located within close proximity of public transport and therefore have potential to reduce reliance on the private car, which could minimise emissions and result in significant positive and minor positive effects in relation to SA 12a.

## Summary of effects for Economic objectives

**4.194** Many of the site options are expected to have significant negative effects with uncertainty with regards to minerals (SA 9) as mineral safeguarding areas cover a large part of the plan area. All of the employment and mixed use site options are likely to have significant positive and minor positive effects in relation to the economy and employment (SA 14 and 15) because as well as providing new job opportunities, they are accessible by public transport. All mixed use sites are likely to have significant positive effects in relation to the employment (SA 15) because they will provide new employment opportunities and housing side by side, enabling good access to employment and a nearby workforce. Residential sites are generally expected to have minor negative effects with regards to employment (SA 15), because they are more than 1.8km from an employment area and from a local, neighbourhood or minor rural centre. However, four of the residential sites are expected to have significant positive effects in relation to SA 15 because they are located within close proximity of an employment area and will therefore ensure easy access to employment opportunities. Significant negative effects are recorded for a small number of residential sites where development would lead to the loss of employment land.

## Dispersal: Villages / Transport Corridors

Table 4.24: Summary of SA findings for site options for Dispersal: Villages / Transport Corridors

GCSP ref	Site	Proposed use	SA 1	SA 2a	SA 2b	SA 3a	SA 3b	SA 3c	SA 4a	SA 4b	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12a	SA 12b	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15
40071	Land on the south side of Cambridge Road, Waterbeach	Residential	+	++?	-	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	-?	-	++	-	-	0	-
40102	93 Impington Lane, Impington	Residential	+	++	++?	+	0	0	+	0	0?	-?	-?	+	--?	0	0	++	+	-	0	++
40277	Land at Fenny Lane Farm, Meldreth	Residential	+	--?	-	+/0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--/+	--?	0	0	++	-	-	0	-
40284	44 North End and Land at Bury End Farm, North End, Meldreth	Residential	+	--?	--	+	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	+	--?	0	0	++	-	-	0	--
40338	Land off Whitecroft Road, Meldreth	Residential	+	--?	++?	0	0	0	+	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	0	-	++	-	0	0	-
40382	19a Fowlmere Road, Foxton	Residential	+	--?	-	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	0	0	++	-	-	0	-
40409	Land r,o no. 7 St Georges Close, Impington	Residential	+	-?	++?	0	0	0	-	0	0?	-?	-?	-	--?	0	-	+	-	-	0	-
40414	Land east of Cambridge Road, Hardwick	Residential	+	--?	++?	0	0	0	+	0	-?	-?	-?	--	0	0	-	++?	-	-	0	-
40415	Land north of Home Close and west of Moat Way, Swavesey	Residential	+	++?	+++?	0	0	0	-	0	0?	-?	-?	--?	--?	0	-	++	-	-	0	-
40418	Land off Royston Road, Foxton	Residential	+	--?	-	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	0	-	++	-	-	0	-
40518	Land south of Hattons Road, east of Home Farm Drive, Longstanton	Residential	+	--?	++?	0	0	0	+	0	-?	-?	-?	--?	--?	-?	-	+	-	-	0	-

GCSP ref	Site	Proposed use	SA 1	SA 2a	SA 2b	SA 3a	SA 3b	SA 3c	SA 4a	SA 4b	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12a	SA 12b	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15
47535	Willow Tree Stables, 110-112 Whitecroft Road, Meldreth	Residential	+	--?	-	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	0	-	++	-	0	0	-
56132	Land to the rear of 124 High Street, Meldreth	Residential	+	--?	-	0	0	0	+	0	-?	-?	-?	--	--?	0	0	++	-	-	0	-
OS157	Land West of Over Road, Longstanton	Residential	+	--?	-	+/0	0	0	+	0	-?	0?	-?	-- ?/+	-?	-?	-	+	-	-	0	-
40190a	Land at Mansel Farm, Station Road, Oakington	Residential	+	--?	-	0	0	0	-	0	0?	-?	-?	--?	--?	0	-	++	-	0	0	-
51599a	Land at Highfields (phase 2), Caldecote	Residential	+	--?	-	0	0	0	-	0	-?	0?	0?	--?	0	0	-	++ ?	-	-	0	++
OS219	East of bypass, Longstanton	Residential	+	-?	-	0	0	0	-	0	-?	0?	-?	--?	--?	0	-	-	-	-	0	-
40224	Land to the north of St Neots Road, Hardwick	Mixed use	+	--?	--	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--	0	0	-	++ ?	-	-	+	++
40260	Land at Evolution Business Park, Milton Road, Impington	Mixed use	+	--?	-	+/0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	0?	--/+	--?	0	-	-	-	-	+	++
40455	Land adj to Buckingham Business Park, Swavesey	Mixed use	+	--?	--	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	0?	--?	0	0	-	-	-	0	+	++
40550	Land between A428 and St Neots Road, Hardwick	Mixed use	+	--?	--	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	0?	--	0	0	-	++ ?	-	-	+	++
51607	Scotland Farm, Dry Drayton	Mixed use	+	--?	--	0	0	0	-	0	0?	-?	-?	--	0	0	-	++ ?	-	-	+	++
56211	Land to the south of Denny End Road, Waterbeach	Mixed use	+	++?	-	0	0	0	-	0	0?	-?	-?	--	--?	0	-	++	-	0	+	++
40224	Land to the north of St Neots Road, Hardwick	Employment	0	--?	N/A	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	-?	--	0	0	-	++ ?	-	-	++	+

GCSP ref	Site	Proposed use	SA 1	SA 2a	SA 2b	SA 3a	SA 3b	SA 3c	SA 4a	SA 4b	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12a	SA 12b	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15
40260	Land at Evolution Business Park, Milton Road, Impington	Employment	0	--?	N/A	+/0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	0?	--/+	--?	0	-	-	-	-	+	+
40455	Land adj to Buckingham Business Park, Swavesey	Employment	0	--?	N/A	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	0?	--?	--?	0	-	-	-	0	+	+
40550	Land between A428 and St Neots Road, Hardwick	Employment	0	--?	N/A	0	0	0	-	0	-?	-?	0?	--	0	0	-	++?	-	-	+	+
51607	Scotland Farm, Dry Drayton	Employment	0	--?	N/A	0	0	0	-	0	0?	-?	-?	--	0	0	-	++?	-	-	++	+
OS058	Longstantion: N of Hattons Road (Policy E/4(1))	Employment	0	--?	N/A	0	0	0	-	0	-?	--?	-?	--?	-?	0	-	+	-	0	++	+

## Summary of effects for Social objectives

**4.195** A mix of effects are recorded for Dispersal: Village/Transport Corridors sites in relation to social objectives (i.e. SA 1, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a and 4b). Because the residential and mixed use sites contribute towards housing delivery, all are expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA 1. Dispersal: Village/Transport Corridors sites are generally expected to have negative effects (sometimes with uncertainty) for access to services and facilities (SA 2a and 2b), because they are not within proximity to an existing centre or education facilities. A small number of sites could have positive effects for one or both of 2a and 2b. Most sites are expected to have negligible effects for social inclusion and equalities (SA 3a, 3b and 3c). The majority of sites are likely to have minor negative effects with regards to access to healthcare facilities and/or open space (SA 4a), although no sites are expected to result in loss of open space or sports facilities (SA 4b).

**4.196** The only significant positive effects recorded are for Land north of Home Close and west of Moat Way, Swavesey, with regards to access to services and facilities (SA 2a), as this site is within 720m of a defined city, district or rural centre.

## Summary of effects for Environmental objectives

**4.197** The Dispersal: Village/Transport Corridors sites generally perform negatively in relation to the environmental objectives (i.e. SA 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12a, 12b and 13). In particular, the majority of sites are expected to have minor negative effects (with uncertainty) in relation to biodiversity and geodiversity (SA 5), landscape and townscape (SA 6) and the historic environment (including above-ground assets and archaeology) (SA 7), as offer assessments scored these sites as 'Amber' in the HELAA for these topics. Longstanton: N of Hattons Road (Policy E/4(1)) is the only site expected to have a significant negative effect against SA 6.

**4.198** Minor negative effects are also identified for many sites with regards to adaptation to climate change (SA 11), and air quality (SA 13). This is because they are at risk of surface water flooding, or contain smaller areas in flood zones 2 and/or 3 (being assessed as 'Amber' in the HELAA), and there are potential air quality issues, but these can likely be mitigated.

**4.199** Mostly significant negative effects (sometimes with uncertainty) were identified with regards to efficient use of land (SA 8), given that most sites consist primarily of Grades 1 or 2 agricultural land, although for some sites a minor positive effect is recognised (often mixed with minor negative) because the site is wholly or partly brownfield land. Dispersal: Village/Transport Corridors sites are generally expected to have mostly negligible effects (sometimes with uncertainty) with regards to water (SA 10).

**4.200** Despite most of the sites performing poorly in relation to proximity to city, district and rural centres (SA 12b), they are located within close proximity of public transport and therefore have potential to reduce reliance on the private car, which could minimise emissions and result in mostly significant positive effects in relation to SA 12a.

## Summary of effects for Economic objectives

The Dispersal: Village/Transport Corridors sites are mostly expected to have significant negative effects with uncertainty with regards to minerals (SA 9) as mineral safeguarding areas cover a large part of the plan area. All of the employment site options are likely to have significant positive and minor positive effects in relation to the economy and employment (SA 14 and 15) because as well as providing new job opportunities, they are accessible by public transport. Mixed use sites are generally likely to have minor positive effects on the economy (SA 14) and significant positive effects in relation to the employment (SA 15) because they will provide new employment opportunities and housing side by side, enabling good access to employment and a nearby workforce. Residential sites are generally expected to have minor negative effects with regards to employment (SA 15), because they are more than 1.8km from an employment area and from a local, neighbourhood or minor rural centre or

significant positive effects, where they are in proximity to an existing employment area. Significant negative effects for SA 15 are only 44 North End and Land at Bury End Farm, North End, Meldreth, where development would lead to the loss of employment land.

## Chapter 5

# Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

## Introduction

**5.1** This chapter sets out the findings of the SA in relation to the policy approaches and reasonable alternatives to these, as set out in the First Proposals document. The assessments are presented by the section of the First Proposals document in which the relevant policy approaches appear. Each preferred policy approach is presented alongside the alternatives considered for that policy. If the Councils do not consider an alternative to be reasonable, this is explained and it has not been assessed. Alternatives considered to be reasonable have been assessed alongside the preferred policy approach.

**5.2** Where reasonable alternatives relate to just one element of the preferred policy approach, it has been assumed that the remainder of the preferred approach would stay the same.

**5.3** Following the explanation of the preferred policy approaches and alternatives considered, each section of this chapter includes a table summarising the sustainability effects (using colour-coded symbols) of each preferred policy approach and any reasonable alternatives, and the findings are described below each table.

**5.4** A number of negative effects have been identified, particularly for site allocation options. It is acknowledged that these negative effects may be addressed through mitigation, either provided by other policies in the plan and/or within the policy itself, once fully developed at the next stage of local

plan making. The assessments in this chapter consider each policy on its own merit – cumulative effects will be presented in the next iteration of SA, once policies have been fully developed. Recommendations on how to mitigate potential negative effects and maximise potential positive effects are set out at the end of this chapter.

## Greater Cambridge in 2041

### Vision

*5.5 We want Greater Cambridge to be a place where a big decrease in our climate impacts comes with a big increase in the quality of everyday life for all our communities. New development must reduce carbon emissions and reliance on the private car; create thriving neighbourhoods with the variety of jobs and homes we need; increase nature, wildlife and green spaces; and safeguard our unique heritage and landscapes.*

*Our Plan takes inspiration from what is unique about our area, and embraces the bold new approaches that will help us achieve this vision.*

**Table 5.1: Vision**

SA Objective	Vision
1. Housing	++
2. Access to services and facilities	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+
4. Health	+
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	++

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	Vision
<b>6. Landscape and townscape</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>7. Historic environment</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>8. Efficient use of land</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>++</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>++</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>++</b>

**5.6** Due to the high level and aspirational nature of the ambitions set out in the Vision for Cambridge, all identified effects are positive. In terms of housing, the Vision states that new development must include a variety of homes to meet needs. As a result, a significant positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 1: Housing. The commitment of the Vision to elevating quality of life for all communities in Cambridge is likely to be supported by the commitment to delivering a variety of homes, which may include groups of people with protected characteristics and elderly people. Therefore, a minor positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion. Improvements to quality of life, along with the Vision’s aspirations for green space are likely to improve resident’s health and wellbeing and therefore a minor positive effect is also identified in relation to SA objective 4: Health.

**5.7** As well as delivery of new green space, the Vision also sets out to increase nature and wildlife, which is likely to promote diversity within Cambridge. As such, a significant positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity. The Vision also commits to safeguarding Cambridge’s unique

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

heritage and landscape and therefore minor positive effects are identified in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and SA objective 7: Historic environment.

**5.8** The Vision's seeks to deliver a big decrease in climate impacts, which it states will be achieved through a reduction in carbon emissions arising from new development and reduced reliance on private car travel. Therefore, a significant positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation. A reduced reliance on private car travel may also mitigate the contribution of new development to air pollution. A minor positive effect is therefore expected in relation SA objective 13: Air quality.

**5.9** The delivery of new development in Greater Cambridge is likely to attract investment to the area. Furthermore, the Vision states that a variety of jobs will be created to support thriving neighbourhoods. As such, significant positive effects are identified in relation to SA objective 14: Economy and SA objective 15: Employment.

## Aims

**5.10** The aims set out in the First Proposals Strategy are set out below:

- Climate change: Help Greater Cambridge transition to net zero carbon by 2050, by ensuring that development is sited in places that help to limit carbon emissions, is designed to the highest achievable standards for energy and water use, and is resilient to current and future climate risks.
- Biodiversity and green spaces: Increase and improve our network of habitats for wildlife, and green spaces for people, ensuring that development leaves the natural environment better than it was before.
- Wellbeing and social inclusion: Help people in Greater Cambridge to lead healthier and happier lives, ensuring that everyone benefits from the development of new homes and jobs.

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

- Great places: Sustain the unique character of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, and complement it with beautiful and distinctive development, creating a place where people want to live, work and play.
- Jobs: Encourage a flourishing and mixed economy in Greater Cambridge which includes a wide range of jobs, while maintaining our area's global reputation for innovation.
- Homes: Plan for enough housing to meet our needs, including significant quantities of housing that is affordable to rent and buy, and different kinds of homes to suit our diverse communities.
- Infrastructure: Plan for transport, water, energy and digital networks; and health, education and cultural facilities; in the right places and built at the right times to serve our growing communities.

**Table 5.2: Aims**

SA Objective	Vision
<b>1. Housing</b>	<b>++</b>
<b>2. Access to services and facilities</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>3. Social inclusion and equalities</b>	<b>++</b>
<b>4. Health</b>	<b>++</b>
<b>5. Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	<b>++</b>
<b>6. Landscape and townscape</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>7. Historic environment</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>8. Efficient use of land</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>++</b>

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	Vision
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>++</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>++</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>++</b>

**5.11** As with the Vision, the high level and aspirational nature of the Aims means that all identified effects are positive.

**5.12** The housing related aim commits to delivering sufficient housing to meet local need, which will include affordable housing (to rent and buy) and different types of housing to meet the needs of diverse communities within Greater Cambridge. As a result, a significant positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 1: Housing. This aim is supported through a wellbeing and social inclusion related aim, which sets out to ensure that everyone benefits from the new homes delivered and to assist people to lead healthier and happy lives. Furthermore, the ‘Great Places’ aim suggests development should be beautiful and distinctive to create places where people will want to live, work and play. Therefore, significant positive effects are identified in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion and SA objective 4: Health. The approach to placemaking is further supported through a commitment to planning for health, education and cultural facilities in appropriate locations to support communities. As such, a minor positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 2: services and facilities.

**5.13** The aim dedicated to biodiversity and open space seeks to improve the network of habitats and green space within Greater Cambridge, with a commitment to leaving the natural environment in a better condition than it was before. As such, a significant positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity. The ‘Great places’ aim seeks to sustain the unique character of Greater Cambridge. Although not explicit, this is likely to afford protection to protected landscapes and heritage assets. Therefore, minor

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

positive effects are identified in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and SA objective 7: Historic environment.

**5.14** Climate change is at the forefront of the aims and a notable commitment is made in respect given the target of reaching net zero by 2050. The aim seeks to achieve this by siting development in locations that will limit carbon emissions and high energy efficiency standards in new development. Therefore, a significant positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation. Additionally, it is also stated that new development should be resilient to current and future climate risks. As such, a significant positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 11: climate adaptation. The commitments made to helping to reduce carbon emissions to net zero are also likely to mitigate air pollution arising from transport in Great Cambridge. As a result. A minor positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 13: Air quality.

**5.15** Strong commitments are made to Greater Cambridge's economy by seeking to deliver a wide range of jobs whilst also maintaining the area's global reputation for innovation. This is supported through the aim of creating attractive places where people want to live and work, which is likely to attract and retain workforce to the area. Therefore, significant positive effects are identified in relation to SA objective 14: Economy and SA objective 15: Employment.

**5.16** The 'Infrastructure' aim also suggests that planning will be made for water, which may ensure that water resources are used responsibly in the area and adequate wastewater capacity is maintained. As such, a minor positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 10: Water.

## How much development and where?

### Policy S/JH: New jobs and homes

#### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy - S/JH: New jobs and homes. This is the preferred option because it would meet the objectively assessed need and most likely future job growth scenario.
  
- B. Alternative option - Planning for the higher jobs forecast and level of homes associated with it. This alternative has not been assessed as it is not considered to be reasonable. This is because the higher jobs forecast could be possible, but is not the most likely future scenario. As such we do not consider that it represents our objectively assessed need, and would therefore not be a reasonable alternative.
  
- C. Alternative option - Planning for the government's standard method local housing need figure. This alternative has not been assessed as it is not considered to be reasonable. This is because it would not support the most likely forecast for future jobs. As such, the Councils do not consider that it represents our objectively assessed need, and would therefore not be a reasonable alternative. Failure to reflect that likely level of growth, would lead to increased commuting into the area (with consequent impacts on quality of life, wellbeing and carbon emissions objectives for the plan).

**Table 5.3: Policy S/JH: New jobs and homes**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	++
2. Access to services and facilities	+/-?
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+
4. Health	+/-?
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	--/+?
6. Landscape and townscape	--/+?
7. Historic environment	--?
8. Efficient use of land	+/-?
9. Minerals	-?
10. Water	--?
11. Adaptation to climate change	-?
12. Climate change mitigation	--/+?
13. Air quality	--/+?
14. Economy	++
15. Employment	++

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.17** The effects of housing and employment growth are largely dependent on the location of development, which is assessed in relation to spatially specific policies. As such, this assessment focuses on high-level implications of the policy and providing the level of growth provided for, regardless of where this is provided.

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

**5.18** Significant effects are provided for SA objective 1: Housing, as this policy would provide housing the meet the objectively assessed need (OAN) and will provide for a range of types and tenures of housing, helping to provide homes suitable for all. Providing homes for all, as well as encouraging neighbourhood planning, is likely to help promote social inclusion and ensure residents have a say in development in their area, leading to minor positive effects for SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities.

**5.19** Mixed minor positive and minor negative effects are recorded for SA objectives 2: Access to services and facilities and SA objective 4: Health, as this level of growth would likely enable provision of new or expanded facilities (including health and recreation facilities) and may help support existing facilities, but could also lead to pressure on existing services and facilities, resulting in them becoming over-capacity or not able to meet demand. These effects are uncertain as they depend on the location of development and whether sufficient new infrastructure is provided.

**5.20** Mixed significant negative and minor positive effects are expected for SA objectives 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity and 7: Landscape and townscape, as this level of growth is likely to adversely affect the sensitive ecological and landscape features present in the area, due to the effects of urbanisation. However, Greater Cambridge has a large potential land supply and therefore it may be possible to avoid the most sensitive areas and provide environmental net gains. These effects are uncertain as they are dependent on the location, layout and design of development. Similarly, significant negative uncertain effects are expected for SA objective 7: Historic environment, but positive effects are less likely, given the likelihood that a large amount of development will take place in and around the historic city of Cambridge, which is the primary economic, academic and social centre in Greater Cambridge.

**5.21** Mixed minor positive and minor negative effects are expected for SA objective 8: Efficient use of land, as this level of growth will require development on greenfield land, although it is likely brownfield sites will also be utilised. This is uncertain as it depends on the location of development.

**5.22** Minor negative uncertain effects are expected for SA objective 9: Minerals. A number of minerals sites and safeguarding areas are located throughout the plan area, therefore development has potential to sterilise some mineral resources, but there are likely to be opportunities to avoid or minimise this, depending on the location of development.

**5.23** Significant negative uncertain effects are expected for SA objective 10: Water. This is because Greater Cambridge is within an area of known water stress and growth will continue to put pressure on already strained water resources. In addition, there are a number of Source Protection Zones in the area, which could be adversely affected, depending on the location and nature of development.

**5.24** There are a number of areas within Greater Cambridge at risk of flooding, particularly around the River Cam. In addition, development is may increase the risk of surface water flooding, particularly development of greenfield land, due to the introduction of impermeable surfaces. As such, minor negative uncertain effects are recorded for SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change.

**5.25** Cambridge itself is a relatively compact city and there are plans for new, efficient public transport networks (such as the new railway station at Cambourne and the public transport projects planned by the Greater Cambridge Partnership) that development will likely be able to take advantage of. In addition, the housing target is intended to match job growth in the area, with the intention of minimising in-commuting, as Greater Cambridge residents will provide the workforce for the growing economy. However, this scale of growth will inevitably lead to an increase in vehicles on the road, including both domestic and commercial vehicles, resulting in an increase in emissions of greenhouse gases and air pollutants. As such, mixed minor positive and significant negative effects are recorded for SA objectives 12: Climate change mitigation and 13: Air pollution. These effects are uncertain due to changing trends in remote working, car ownership, autonomous vehicles and sustainable fuels.

**5.26** Significant positive effects are expected for both SA objectives 14: Economy and 15: Employment as the plan provides for substantial employment growth. In addition, this level of growth is intended to meet the housing needs of local people, as well as providing sufficient housing, and therefore workers, to support the local economy. Increased housing will also likely result in an increase in local spending, particularly within Cambridge city, which is the main centre and historic town, which is likely to attract local people as well as those from further afield.

## Policy S/DS: Development strategy

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – S/DS: Development strategy. This is the preferred option because it plans positively to meet housing and employment needs, whilst supporting the Cambridge economy and seeking to meet net zero targets, including taking advantage of new strategic sustainable transport infrastructure.
  
- B. Alternative options - See the assessment of Strategic Spatial Options in Chapter 4 and Appendix C.

**Table 5.4: Policy S/DS: Development strategy**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	++?
2. Access to services and facilities	+/-?
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+/-
4. Health	--/+

SA Objective	A
<b>5. Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	--/+?
<b>6. Landscape and townscape</b>	++/--?
<b>7. Historic environment</b>	-?
<b>8. Efficient use of land</b>	--/+?
<b>9. Minerals</b>	--?
<b>10. Water</b>	--/+?
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	+/-?
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	++/--
<b>13. Air quality</b>	++/--
<b>14. Economy</b>	+/-
<b>15. Employment</b>	+/-

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.27** The assessment of this policy is based on the assessment of Strategic Spatial Option 9, as set out in Chapter 4. However, it has been updated to account for additional detail set out in the proposed policy direction. As explained in Chapter 4, the Strategic Spatial Option includes development that will continue beyond the plan period. This assessment has focused on effects of development provided for within the plan period. The assessment summarises the findings of the assessment presented in Chapter 4, rather than repeating them here.

**5.28** This policy is expected to have significant positive effects for SA 1: Housing as it will provide sufficient housing and include a range of sources of supply (including development within Cambridge city, on the edge of Cambridge, within the Southern cluster and villages, as well as Cambourne for the preferred option). This effect is uncertain, given that the strategy includes

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

large-scale developments, which may result in a lower level of affordable housing provision due to greater costs to deliver additional infrastructure. It is important to note that the plan will be informed by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and viability assessment, which will be refined as the plan is prepared.

**5.29** Mixed minor positive and minor negative uncertain effects are expected for SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities, as most development will be located close to existing services and facilities. However, existing services and facilities may be put under pressure if not expanded or added to. Easy access to services and facilities is likely to benefit those with protected characteristics, including older people and the less mobile, although this option does allow for some development in villages, which may be less well connected, resulting in mixed minor positive and minor negative effects for SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities. In the long term, new infrastructure is likely to be provided to serve new development, particularly at large-scale sites. Whilst locating development within easy access of services and facilities may enable easy access to healthcare, recreational facilities and encourage walking and cycling, the strategy locates a substantial amount of development in and around Cambridge, which has potential to increase air pollution in the area and expose residents to poor air quality, particularly within the designated AQMAs and where development is more distributed. As such, mixed significant negative and minor positive effects are identified for SA objective 4: Health.

**5.30** The strategy includes development in areas that include, or are close to, designated biodiversity assets, including internationally important assets, such as Eversden and Wimpole SAC. However, it also includes large-scale development which could provide opportunities to enhance the GI network. In addition, the policy direction notes that making efficient use of land will enable more space for nature and wildlife. This needs to be balanced with ensuring there is sufficient open green space for residents. For example, development within Cambridge has potential to increase recreational pressure at sites of biodiversity importance, such as Wicken Fen. However, it could also contribute positively to the Wicken Fen Vision Area, which identifies the area to the north east of Cambridge as an area for enhancing public access. As such, mixed minor positive and significant negative effects are identified for SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity.

**5.31** As the strategy includes substantial development in and around Cambridge, it has potential to alter the historic townscape, the setting of the city, and views into and out of Cambridge. Development in other parts of the plan area also have potential to affect landscape character, particularly large-scale development around Cambourne. However, this depends on the exact location, layout and design of development, and large-scale development could provide landscape enhancements. The policy approach also states that the distinctive character of the city, towns and villages will be reinforced. As such, mixed significant positive and significant negative uncertain effects are recorded for SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape. The Strategic Heritage Impact Assessment Supplement (2021) considers the preferred option to have low/moderate risk to the historic environment, therefore minor negative uncertain effects are recorded for SA objective 7: Historic environment.

**5.32** The strategy includes making use of brownfield land and intensifying some areas of development within Cambridge, leading to an efficient use of land. However, it is also likely to lead to loss of some best and most versatile agricultural land, therefore mixed minor positive and significant negative uncertain effects are expected for SA objective 8: Efficient use of land.

**5.33** The strategy has potential to result in sterilisation of mineral resources, as much of the plan areas lies within Mineral Safeguarding Areas, but effects depend on the exact location of development. As such, significant negative uncertain effects are identified for SA objective 9: Minerals.

**5.34** Greater Cambridge lies within an area of water stress, where water resources are under substantial pressure, which will be exacerbated by new development. In addition, the strategy could result in development within an SPZ and wastewater treatment works may need to be upgraded to accommodate growth. However, development has potential to implement water recycling and new blue-green infrastructure, particularly at larger development sites. As such, a mixed minor positive and significant negative effect with uncertainty is identified for SA objective 10: Water.

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

**5.35** The strategy could result in development within Flood Zones 2 and 3, particularly associated with the River Cam. In addition, it is likely to result in substantial development of greenfield land, which could reduce infiltration rates and increase the risk of surface water flooding. However, the strategy also seeks to make use of previously developed land and could provide some flood betterment, particularly at larger sites, such as through implementation of SUDs. Larger developments may also enhance the green infrastructure network, which could provide benefits such as local cooling and biodiversity corridors. Overall, mixed minor positive and minor negative uncertain effects are recorded for SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change.

**5.36** Mixed significant positive and significant negative effects are expected for SA objectives 12: Climate change mitigation and 13: Air quality. This is because the strategy generally focuses growth in areas with good access to services, facilities, employment opportunities and sustainable transport links, including the new East-West railway station at Cambourne, which will help to minimise the need to travel and reliance on the private car. In addition, larger development will be able to design walking and cycling in from the outset and may provide opportunities to incorporate low-carbon and energy efficient design. However, this scale of development will lead to an inevitable increase in vehicle traffic, and some development may come forward at locations with less good access to services and facilities, such as in the villages.

**5.37** The strategy generally locates residential development close to economic hubs, namely Cambridge city and the Southern cluster. This will enable access to employment opportunities and may also continue to increase inward investment and encourage businesses to the area. However, much employment growth is not expected to come forward until after the plan period. The strategy also provides for new employment land and some more rural development (both residential and employment), which may help maintain the vitality and viability of smaller centres. Mixed minor positive and minor negative effects are expected for SA objective 14: Economy and SA objective 15: Employment.

## Policy S/SH: Settlement hierarchy

### Policy Options

- A. Preferred policy – S/SH: Settlement hierarchy. This option is preferred as it will promote sustainable patterns of development in Greater Cambridge.
  
- B. Alternative option – Having no limits on the scale of individual developments for all settlements was rejected as it could lead to unsustainable patterns of development. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative.

**Table 5.5: Policy S/SH: Settlement hierarchy**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	++
2. Access to services and facilities	++
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0
4. Health	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+/-?
6. Landscape and townscape	+/-?
7. Historic environment	-?
8. Efficient use of land	--/+?
9. Minerals	-?
10. Water	-?
11. Adaptation to climate change	-?

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>A</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>+/-?</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>--/+?</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>+</b>

**5.38** Meeting Cambridge’s identified housing need is likely to be supported by the policy’s approach to settlements in the top levels of the settlement hierarchy (Cambridge, Northstowe, Waterbeach, Cambourne, Great Shelford and Stapleford, Histon and Impington and Sawston), whereby there is no limit on individual scheme size for windfall proposals for residential development. As such, a significant positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 1: Housing.

**5.39** The broad approach to the settlement hierarchy, of permitting larger residential development schemes at larger settlements where there is a high concentration of services and facilities and good public transport connections, is likely to ensure that residents within any development that comes forward will have easy access to key services and facilities. As such, a significant positive effect is identified for the policy in relation to SA objective 2: services and facilities.

**5.40** The broad approach to the settlement hierarchy in the policy is also likely to be beneficial in mitigating carbon emissions arising from new development. If the majority of development comes forward within Cambridge, Towns and Rural Centres, there is potential for a reduced reliance on private car travel amongst residents. This may also mitigate poor air quality arising from transport in Greater Cambridge. Therefore, minor positive effects are identified for the policy in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 13: Air quality. However, the policy does permit some development at Minor Rural Centres and Group Villages, which may encourage unsustainable travel patterns. Negative effects are therefore also identified for the policy in relation to SA objective 12 and SA objective 13. In the case of SA objective 13, a

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

significant negative effect is identified as the large built-up area of Cambridge contains an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). By having no limit on the size of windfall developments the policy may contribute to further reductions in air quality within the AQMA.

**5.41** By permitting higher levels of development at the larger settlements within the District, only permitting larger scale developments in the lower tier settlements on brownfield land, the policy may encourage increased use of previously developed land, which may reduce impacts on the natural environment, landscape and high quality soils. Therefore, a minor positive effect is identified for the policy in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity, SA objective 6: Landscape and SA objective 8: Efficient use of land. However, it is equally possible that the permittance of windfall schemes of any size at higher tier settlements will result in development on greenfield land. There are large pockets of Grade 2 agricultural land around the higher tier settlements, as well as areas of Grade 1 agricultural land around Northstowe and Waterbeach. As such, a significant negative effect is also identified in relation to SA objective 8: Efficient use of land due to the potential for loss of high quality soils. There are a number of SSSIs within 1km of the large built-up area of Cambridge and the higher tier settlements of Sawston and Great Shelford. As a result, a minor negative effect is identified for the policy in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity. Additionally, there is greater potential for windfall development permitted by the policy at Rural Centres (Cambourne, Great Shelford and Stapleford, Histon and Impington and Sawston) to alter the distinctive and smaller scale landscape and rural townscape characteristics of these smaller settlements. A minor negative effect is therefore identified in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and SA objective 6: Landscape.

**5.42** In terms of heritage, there are high concentrations of designated heritage assets within the large built-up area of Cambridge and the other higher tier settlements where the policy permits windfall developments. As such, there is potential for new development that may come forward to have adverse impacts on the setting of heritage assets. Therefore, a minor negative effect is identified for the preferred policy in relation to SA objective 7: Historic environment.

**5.43** Large areas of Greater Cambridge are occupied by Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs), with the higher tier settlements of Cambridge, Great Shelford, Sawston and Waterbeach intersecting with Chalk and Sand and Gravel MSAs and Cambourne, Histon and Impington and Northstowe intersecting with Sand and Gravel MSAs. The development that may be directed through the policy could result in sterilisation of mineral resources at these locations. There are Source Protection Zones in the southeast of Greater Cambridge that intersect with the higher tier settlement of Sawston and areas of Flood Zone 3 adjacent to Waterbeach. Development directed by the policy at these locations may impact water quality or increase flood risk. As a result, minor negative effects are identified for the policy in relation to SA objective 9: Minerals, SA objective 10: Water quality and SA objective 11: climate change adaptation.

**5.44** All the effects identified above are uncertain given that they are dependent on the exact location and scale of any development that comes forward.

**5.45** The approach set out encourages development to come forward in locations where people will be able to access employment opportunities in close proximity and where key town centres and rural centres within Greater Cambridge would be supported. Furthermore, the flexibility to deliver some homes in rural locations will help to maintain and grow the rural economy. As such, minor positive effects are identified in relation to SA objective 14: Economy and SA objective 15: Employment.

## Policy S/SB: Settlement boundaries

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – S/SB: Settlement boundaries. This option is preferred as it protects the existing character and prevents sprawl of settlements.
- B. Alternative option – Not including settlement boundaries and adopting a more flexible approach to settlement edges was rejected as it would not

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

provide certainty regarding development proposals, could impact settlement character and result in gradual expansion of settlements into the countryside. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative.

**Table 5.6: Policy S/SB: Settlement boundaries**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	+
2. Access to services and facilities	+
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0
4. Health	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+
6. Landscape and townscape	+
7. Historic environment	+
8. Efficient use of land	+
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0
12. Climate change mitigation	+
13. Air quality	+
14. Economy	0
15. Employment	0

**5.46** Whilst the policy is designed to prevent development coming forward outside of settlement boundaries, it does permit Neighbourhood Plan allocations and rural exception sites and countryside land uses. This will make some

contribution to meeting rural housing needs within Greater Cambridge and therefore a minor positive effect is identified for the policy in relation SA objective 1: Housing.

**5.47** By ensuring that the settlement boundaries are constrained to the built-up settlements, the policy is likely to promote sustainable patterns of development to come forward, whereby people will be able to access services and facilities in close proximity with potentially less reliance on private car travel. Therefore, minor positive effects are identified for the policy in relation to SA objective 2: services and facilities, SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 13: Air quality.

**5.48** The constraint of the settlement boundaries to the built-up areas of settlements may also encourage the use of brownfield land within settlements and reduce potential landscape impacts of development outside of settlements. As such, minor positive effects are identified for the preferred policy in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and SA objective 8: Efficient use of land. Settlement boundaries also offer some protection to the historic setting of settlements and the loss of further greenfield land and their associated ecological habitats and therefore a minor positive effect is also identified in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and SA objective 7: Historic environment.

## The City of Cambridge

### Policy S/NEC: North East Cambridge

#### Options

- A. Preferred Policy – Policy S/NEC: North East Cambridge. This option is preferred as it will provide a reasonable amount of development in the area, whilst making best use of the opportunities provided by this brownfield site in Cambridge.

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

- B. Alternative option – No policy. This alternative is not the preferred approach as it would not make best use of the opportunities provided by this brownfield site in Cambridge or provide a policy for the future evolution of the site, and the emerging North East Cambridge Area Action Plan.
  
- C. Alternative option – Reduce developable area by retaining a consolidated Waste Water Treatment Works on site as either an indoors or outdoors facility. This alternative has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative. This is because evidence shows that it would not be deliverable or viable.
  
- D. Alternative option – Higher quantum of development. This alternative is not the preferred approach due to placemaking implications, including open space provision, building heights and development mix as well as delivery of the Trip Budget **[See reference 3]**.
  
- E. Alternative option – Lower quantum of development. This alternative has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative. This is because evidence shows that it would not be deliverable or viable.

**Table 5.7: Policy S/NEC: North East Cambridge**

SA Objective	A	B	D
1. Housing	++	0	++/-
2. Access to services and facilities	++	0	++/--
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+	0	+/-
4. Health	++	0	++/--
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	--?	0	--?
6. Landscape and townscape	++	0	++/-

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A	B	D
7. Historic environment	0	0	0
8. Efficient use of land	++	0	++
9. Minerals	++	0	++
10. Water	-?	0	-?
11. Adaptation to climate change	+	0	+
12. Climate change mitigation	++/-	0	++/-
13. Air quality	++/-	0	++/-
14. Economy	++?	0	++
15. Employment	++	0	++

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.49** Policy S/NEC: North East Cambridge sets out the vision for NEC and provides details on the scale and scope of development. The policy proposes the delivery of 8,350 new homes and 15,000 new jobs, which should be located within close proximity of each other so as to ensure easy access to employment opportunities. Therefore, significant positive effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 1: housing, 14: economy and 15: employment. The effects for SA objective 14 are uncertain, as it is unclear whether there will be a net loss of industrial floorspace. The development will be high density and due to the fact it will be on previously developed land, makes efficient use of land. It will also not result in the sterilisation of mineral resources. Therefore, significant positive effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 8: efficient use of land and 9: minerals.

**5.50** The high density development will ensure the city district is compact and walkable, which will reduce reliance on the private car. People will also be located within walking distance of a number of amenities as the policy supports a range of different uses. This will help minimise emissions associated with use

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

of the private car, in addition to minimising air pollution. NEC is already well served by public transport (e.g. Cambridge North Station and the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway) and according to the policy, enhanced and new walking and cycling connections into and through NEC will be provided. This will encourage more active travel choices and promote higher levels of physical exercise. Issues associated with deprivation could also be addressed through the area's regeneration. Therefore, significant positive effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 2: access to services and facilities and 4: health. Mixed significant positive and minor negative effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 12: climate change mitigation and 13: air quality because although the policy supports sustainable and active travel modes, the scale of the proposed development would still be likely to generate car journeys from new residents, particularly as a result of the relationship of NEC with existing main routes into and around Cambridge.

**5.51** Minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities because housing provision will include a proportion of affordable housing, delivering mixed communities. Further to this, the policy supports the delivery of an inclusive city district that contains a mix of social spaces fully integrated into surrounding neighbourhoods.

**5.52** It is not clear from the proposed policy direction whether the Milton Road Hedgerows City Wildlife Site would be conserved. There is also a Local Nature Reserve (Bramblefields) located adjacent to the NEC development area, which could be affected by changing uses in the surrounding area. The development of Chesterton Sidings and the surrounding area could also have adverse effects on biodiversity because the area mainly consists of young trees and open mosaic habitats on previously developed land and a priority habitat. There is also uncertainty as to whether improvements in access to surrounding development could affect the priority habitats at the site. Therefore, significant negative effects with uncertainty are expected in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity.

**5.53** The NEC development will regenerate the area by providing a mix of uses, which is likely to improve the existing landscape and townscape, which already comprises built development (the wastewater treatment works WwTW). The

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

policy also supports the creation of open spaces, which form important physical landscape features. Therefore, significant positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape. Negligible effects are expected in relation to SA objective 7: Historic environment because there are no designated heritage assets within NEC and although there are some located to the southeast and east of the site, the site already comprises built development and is therefore expected to have a limited effect on the historic environment, as well as archaeology.

**5.54** Minor negative effects with uncertainty are expected in relation to SA objective 10: Water because although there are no Source Protection Zones at or near the site, there are a small number of water bodies present, as well as the First Public Drain. Therefore, development of the site could potentially cause a deterioration in water quality through sediment runoff during construction.

**5.55** The NEC development presents an opportunity to address issues such as flood risk, although this is not made clear by the policy direction. Therefore, minor positive effects with uncertainty are expected in relation to SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change.

### **B. No policy**

**5.56** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised it would not provide the positive outcomes that option A would bring in terms of a major new city district to Cambridge.

### **D. Higher quantum of development**

**5.57** Option C would provide a higher quantum of development than the preferred policy and contribute significantly to housing delivery and new jobs, which would be located within close proximity to each other and ensure easy

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

access to employment opportunities. Therefore, significant positive effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 1: housing, 14: economy and 15: employment. However, the effects against SA objective 1 are mixed with minor negative effects because providing a higher quantum of development would involve the development of taller buildings, which may result in a higher proportion of flats and therefore not provide as large a range of housing types. The effects for SA objective 14 are uncertain, as it is unclear whether there will be a net loss of industrial floorspace.

**5.58** The development would be very high density and due to the fact it would be on previously developed land, would be an efficient use of land. It would also not result in the sterilisation of mineral resources. Therefore, significant positive effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 8: efficient use of land and 9: minerals.

**5.59** The high density development would ensure the city district is walkable, which would reduce reliance on the private car. People would also be located within walking distance of a number of amenities as the option supports a range of different uses. This would help minimise emissions associated with use of the private car, in addition to minimising air pollution. NEC is already well served by public transport (e.g. Cambridge North Station and the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway) and according to the proposed policy approach, enhanced and new walking and cycling connections into and through NEC would be provided. This would encourage more active travel choices and promote higher levels of physical exercise. However, a higher quantum of development could place increased strain and pressure on services and facilities (e.g. GP surgeries), as it is unlikely they would have capacity to accommodate the additional growth, reducing people's overall accessibility to them. A higher quantum of development could also result in a relaxation in standards for open space provision. This is particularly concerning following the COVID-19 pandemic, which has highlighted significant inequalities in access to open space. Therefore, mixed significant positive and significant negative effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 2: access to services and facilities and 4: Health. Mixed significant positive and minor negative effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 12: climate change mitigation and 13: air quality because although this option supports sustainable and active travel modes, the

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

scale of the proposed development would still be likely to generate car journeys from new residents, particularly if they need to travel further away to reach certain amenities due to capacity issues.

**5.60** Mixed minor positive and minor negative effects are expected in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities because housing provision will include a proportion of affordable housing but due to the density of development, may result in a higher proportion of flats and therefore not provide as large a range of housing types.

**5.61** It is not clear whether the Milton Road Hedgerows City Wildlife Site in NEC would be conserved under this option. There is also a Local Nature Reserve (Bramblefields) located adjacent to the NEC development area, which could be affected by changing uses in the surrounding area. The development of Chesterton Sidings and the surrounding area could also have adverse effects on biodiversity because the area mainly consists of young trees and open mosaic habitats on previously developed land and a priority habitat. There is also uncertainty as to whether improvements in access to surrounding development could affect the priority habitats at the site. Therefore, significant negative effects with uncertainty are expected in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity.

**5.62** The development of NEC would regenerate the area by providing a mix of uses, which is likely to improve the existing landscape and townscape, which already comprises built development. However, this option supports a higher quantum of development than the preferred option and would therefore involve the development of taller buildings, which could alter the character of the adjacent urban area. This option could also result in losses of open space to development, which otherwise form important physical landscape features. Therefore, mixed significant positive and minor negative effects are expected in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape. Negligible effects are expected in relation to SA objective 7: Historic environment because there are no designated heritage assets within NEC and although there are some located to the southeast and east of the site, the site already comprises built development and is therefore expected to have a limited effect on the historic environment, as well as archaeology.

**5.63** Minor negative effects with uncertainty are expected in relation to SA objective 10: Water because although there are no Source Protection Zones at or near the site, there are a small number of water bodies present and the First Public Drain. Therefore, development of the site could potentially cause a deterioration in water quality through sediment runoff during construction.

**5.64** The development of NEC presents an opportunity to address issues such as flood risk, although this is not made clear by the wording of this option. Therefore minor positive effects with uncertainty are expected in relation to SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change.

## Policy S/WC: West Cambridge

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – S/WC: West Cambridge. This is the preferred option because it is necessary to provide context for the future evolution of the site, to ensure it meets local needs.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This alternative has not been appraised as it is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. This is because it would not provide a context for the future evolution of the site, and would fail to ensure the site is available to contribute to the University’s and the City’s future needs or provide a policy framework for planning decisions.

**Table 5.8: Policy S/WC: West Cambridge**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	+
2. Access to services and facilities	+

SA Objective	A
<b>3. Social inclusion and equalities</b>	<b>0?</b>
<b>4. Health</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>5. Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	<b>0?</b>
<b>6. Landscape and townscape</b>	<b>0?</b>
<b>7. Historic environment</b>	<b>0?</b>
<b>8. Efficient use of land</b>	<b>0?</b>
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>0?</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>0?</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>0?</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>+</b>

## A. Preferred policy

**5.65** There is a resolution to grant planning permission for the West Cambridge Area to become an ‘innovation district’, and therefore development at this location forms part of the future baseline without the plan. As such, negligible uncertain effects are identified for most SA objectives, although these effects are uncertain as they depend on the contents of the policy once fully worked up. This policy will provide additional detail and guidance as to the development to come forward in this area.

**5.66** The proposed approach includes allowing housing to come forward in this area (which is not part of the likely future baseline), therefore minor positive effects are expected for SA objective 1: Housing. In seeking to create a thriving

environment for people, as well as promoting high quality walking, cycling and public transport connections, this policy will help promote active lifestyles, reduce the need to travel by car and provide access to employment, services and facilities. As such, minor positive effects are expected for SA objectives 2: Access to services and facilities, 4: Health, 12: Climate change mitigation, 13: Air quality and 14: Employment.

**5.67** The proposed approach seeks to maximise the contribution of the area to the economy, resulting in minor positive effects for SA objective 14: Economy.

## Policy S/AMC: Areas of Major Change

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – S/AMC: Areas of Major Change. This is the preferred option as it will provide guidance to development opportunities in these areas to ensure that they are progressed in a comprehensive manner, including integration with existing nearby communities.
- B. Alternative option – No Policy. This was rejected as it was considered that this would not provide sufficient guidance for planning in important areas of the city. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative.

**5.68** The appraisal below is based on the inclusion of the Areas of Major Change approach in the Preferred Strategy. The individual site allocations within the Areas of Major Change will be assessed under their respective policies.

**Table 5.9: Policy S/AMC: Areas of Major Change**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	++
2. Access to services and facilities	++
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+
4. Health	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+/-?
6. Landscape and townscape	+/-?
7. Historic environment	+/-?
8. Efficient use of land	++
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0
12. Climate change mitigation	+/-
13. Air quality	+/-
14. Economy	++
15. Employment	++

**5.69** Policy S/AMC sets out to ensure development opportunities within the urban area of Cambridge maximise opportunities in terms of delivering a mix of uses and supporting infrastructure. This will include the delivery of housing and employment uses and as a result significant positive effects are identified in relation to SA objective 1: Housing and SA objective 15: Employment. The comprehensive nature of the development proposed in these areas is likely to bring about improvements that may attract key workers and business to the

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

area. Therefore, a significant positive effect is also identified in relation to SA objective 14: Economy.

**5.70** The policy states that Areas of Major Change will be carefully integrated with nearby communities and that they will require significant infrastructure investment and support. As such, a significant positive effect is identified for the policy in relation to SA objective 2: Access to services, given the central location of these areas that will allow residents to meet every day needs in close proximity. A minor positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities.

**5.71** The policy encourages redevelopment of previously developed land in urban areas and therefore a significant positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 8: Efficient use of land. However, the radical level of change that will come forward in these areas means there is potential for development to impact on sensitive environmental receptors, particularly given Cambridge's unique townscape and heritage. As such, minor negative effects are identified for the policy in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape and SA objective 7: Historic environment. If the proposal within the Areas of Major Change are well designed and reflect local character, then they may have positive impacts on the townscape and setting of heritage assets. Minor positive effects are therefore also identified for the policy in relation to SA objective 6 and 7. In terms of biodiversity, the same balance exists in potential harm arising from new development against potential for delivery of new Green Infrastructure and mitigation. Therefore, a mixed minor positive and minor negative effect is identified in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity. In the case of all of the above, the effects identified are uncertain as they will depend in the exact scale and layout of any proposals that come forward.

**5.72** Mixed minor positive and minor negative effects are identified for Policy S/AMC in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 13: Air quality. Significant new development will create carbon emissions during construction and through new movements in the area following completion. However, significant investment into supporting infrastructure with development may result in improved sustainable transport options in Areas of Major Change.

# Policy S/OA: Opportunity areas in Cambridge

## Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – S/OA: Opportunity areas in Cambridge. This is the preferred option as it is considered that the guidance it provides would maximise opportunities and make best use off these locations in Cambridge to makes spaces that meet the needs of people.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option was rejected as it is considered that this would not provide sufficient guidance for planning in important areas of the city. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative.

**Table 5.10: Policy S/OA: Opportunity Areas in Cambridge**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	++
2. Access to services and facilities	++
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+
4. Health	+
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+/-?
6. Landscape and townscape	+/-?
7. Historic environment	+/-?
8. Efficient use of land	++
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A
11. Adaptation to climate change	+/-
12. Climate change mitigation	+/-
13. Air quality	+/-
14. Economy	++
15. Employment	++

**5.73** Policy S/OA seeks deliver new uses in Opportunity Areas within the urban area of Cambridge. The policy intends to roll forward Opportunity Areas identified in the 2018 Local Plan, as well as introducing new opportunity areas at Newmarket Road Retail Park, Beehive Centre, Abbey Stadium and Shire Hall/Castle Park. The policy states that there is potential to reimagine the current retail uses of Newmarket Road Retail Park and Beehive Centre areas given the increases in online shopping. This could give rise to new employment and residential uses in this area. The policy also proposes potential enhancements to Abbey Stadium or relocation of the stadium and conversion of the existing site into housing. Similarly, the policy suggests that options will be explored for Shire Hall building, which could result in delivery of new employment space or housing. As a result significant positive effects are identified in relation to SA objective 1: Housing, SA objective 14: Economy and SA objective 15: Employment.

**5.74** The policy states that Opportunity Areas will embrace mixed uses and multiple functions and will include improvements to public transport access, infrastructure and the public realm. As such, significant positive effects are identified for the policy in relation to SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities given how highly accessible the new uses in these locations will likely be. Minor positive effects are identified for the policy in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities and SA objective 4: Health as the public realm improvements will offer opportunities for people to meet in attractive places.

**5.75** The policy encourages redevelopment of previously developed land in urban areas and therefore a significant positive effect is identified in relation to

SA objective 8: Efficient use of land. However, there is also potential for development to impact on sensitive environmental receptors, particularly given Cambridge's unique townscape and heritage. As such, minor negative effects are identified for the policy in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape and SA objective 7: Historic environment. There is emphasis in the policy on public realm improvements that will reinforce and create character within key corridors of the city. As such, there is potential also for positive impacts on the townscape and setting of heritage assets. Minor positive effects are therefore also identified for the policy in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape and SA objective 7: Historic environment. In terms of biodiversity, new Green Infrastructure may come forward as part of public realm improvements, but the scale of redevelopment may also cause disturbance to wildlife. Therefore, a mixed minor positive and minor negative effect is identified in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity. In the case of all of the above, the effects identified are uncertain as they will depend in the exact scale and layout of any proposals that come forward.

**5.76** Mixed minor positive and minor negative effects are identified for Policy S/OA in relation to SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change, SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 13: Air quality. Significant new development will increase the density of existing urban areas and generate carbon emissions during construction and through new movements in the area following completion. However, the policy includes improvements to green infrastructure, public transport access, which may reduce reliance on private car travel and counteract any potential adverse increases to the urban heat island effect.

## Policy S/LAC: Land allocations in Cambridge

### Options

- A. Preferred Policy – Policy S/LAC: Land allocations in Cambridge. The reasons for selecting the preferred site options are set out in Appendix E.

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

**5.77** Note that the policy approach incorporates eight residential allocations and five mixed use allocations carried forward from the adopted Cambridge Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, in addition to one new residential allocation and one new employment allocation. All of these existing and new allocations are located within the city of Cambridge. There are also three mixed use allocations that have planning permission and are therefore considered to be part of the baseline. These three mixed use allocations have therefore not been included in this appraisal.

- B. The Councils considered a range of alternative sites within the Cambridge urban area having regard to the overarching development strategy and the conclusions of the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (see Chapter 4).

**Table 5.11: Policy S/LAC: Land allocations in Cambridge**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	+
2. Access to services and facilities	++?/--?
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+/0
4. Health	++/-?
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+/-?
6. Landscape and townscape	+/-?
7. Historic environment	--?
8. Efficient use of land	--/+
9. Minerals	--?
10. Water	-?
11. Adaptation to climate change	--

<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>A</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>++/-</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>++</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>++/--</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.78** Policy S/LAC: Land allocations in Cambridge is expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA objective 1: Housing because all of the residential and mixed use site allocations listed under this policy will contribute towards housing delivery. Mixed significant positive and significant negative effects with uncertainty are expected in relation to SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities because most of the sites allocated by this policy are located within close proximity of a defined city, district or rural centre and/or will make provision for a new local/district centre or superstore. In some cases, they are also located within close proximity of primary and secondary schools, with a small number of sites expected to potentially provide a new primary or secondary school. Therefore, new residents would have easy access to a range of services and facilities, including education. However, some of the sites allocated by this policy are not located within close proximity to the above mentioned centres and primary or secondary schools.

**5.79** Almost all of the sites allocated by this policy comprise brownfield land but there are two sites comprising greenfield land and one site comprising both brownfield and greenfield land. A small number of sites fall within one of the 40% most deprived areas in England and therefore have potential to help regenerate those areas. Overall, mixed minor positive and negligible effects are expected in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities. A small number of the sites allocated by this policy tend to fall within close proximity of a healthcare facility or will make provision for a new health centre and area of open space/sports facility. Therefore, significant positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 4: Health. However, these are mixed with minor

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

negative effects with uncertainty because there are a small number of sites allocated by this policy that would result in a loss of open space or sports facility, but which could be replaced locally.

**5.80** A number of sites allocated by this policy could have an adverse effect on designated biodiversity assets and therefore minor negative effects are expected in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity. The effects are recorded as uncertain because the impact could be reasonably mitigated or compensated for. The policy wording states that with respect to employment site S/C/SCL: Land South of Coldhams Lane, Cambridge, any redevelopment of the eastern portion of the landfill sites will require ecological enhancements, in addition to the provision of enhanced wildlife habitats. Therefore, minor positive effects are also expected in relation to SA objective 5, resulting in mixed effects overall.

**5.81** Minor negative effects with uncertainty are expected in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape because a large number of the sites allocated by the policy scored 'Amber' in the HELAA with respect to landscape character. However, this is mixed with minor positive effects with uncertainty because according to the policy, there is an opportunity to improve the character of the existing garages that comprise residential site S/C/SMS: Garages between 20 St. Matthews Street and Blue Moon Public House, Cambridge.

**5.82** One of the sites, Land at Fen Road, Cambridge, scored 'Red' in the HELAA with respect to the historic environment and archaeology. Therefore, overall, this policy is expected to have significant negative effects with uncertainty in relation to SA objective 7: Historic environment. Although most of the sites allocated by this policy comprise brownfield land, there are two sites that comprise greenfield land and one site that comprises both brownfield and greenfield land. The latter of these is classed as Grade 1 or 2 agricultural quality. Therefore, overall, mixed significant negative and minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 8: Efficient use of land.

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

**5.83** All of the sites allocated under Policy S/LAC fall within a Minerals Safeguarding Area or a Minerals Consultation Area and development of these sites could therefore result in an adverse effect on mineral resources. Therefore, significant negative effects are expected in relation to SA objective 9: Minerals. The effects are recorded as uncertain because it is unknown whether extraction could be achieved prior to any development. One of the sites allocated under this policy, S/C/U1: Old Press/Mill Lane, partially contains a watercourse and its development could therefore have an adverse effect on water quality. For this reason, minor negative effects with uncertainty are expected in relation to SA objective 10: Water. A different site, S/LAC/RM1-H/7: Land at Fen Road, Cambridge, mainly falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and therefore may increase flood risk, although it should be noted that the proposal is for boat moorings. The remaining sites are at risk of surface water flooding and/or contain some land in Flood Zones 2 and 3, but there is sufficient land in Flood Zone 1 to accommodate 5 additional dwellings or an increase of 500 square metres of employment floorspace. Therefore, overall, significant negative effects are expected against SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change.

**5.84** Mixed significant positive and minor negative effects are expected in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation because although most of the sites allocated by this policy fall within close proximity to public transport and a defined city, district or rural centre, some of them do not. Almost all of the sites scored 'Amber' in the HELAA with respect to air quality and therefore minor negative effects are expected against SA objective 13: Air quality.

**5.85** The employment and mixed use sites allocated under this policy will contribute towards employment land and therefore significant positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 14: Economy. Mixed significant positive and significant negative effects are expected against SA objective 15: Employment because although some of the site allocations are located within close proximity to employment areas and will therefore ensure easy access to job opportunities, some of the sites are located a lot further away or could result in a loss of employment land to residential uses.

# The edge of Cambridge

## Policy S/CE: Cambridge East

### Policy options

A. Preferred policy – S/CE: Cambridge East. This is the preferred option because it would miss the opportunity to make use of a large, safeguarded, brownfield site in close proximity to services, facilities and employment.

B. Alternative option - Carry forward the safeguarded land and more limited allocations in the adopted plans. This is not the preferred option given the suitability of the safeguarded land. Marshall’s have confirmed that the site will be available during the plan period, and the evidence suggests that could fit with the themes and vision for the plan.

C. Alternative option - A larger land release reflecting the proposal by Marshall. This is not the preferred option due to the level of harm to Green Belt and landscape that is not justified by exceptional circumstances or a need to meet housing or employment provision in the plan period.

**Table 5.12: Policy S/CE: Cambridge East**

SA Objective	A	B	C
1. Housing	++	+	++
2. Access to services and facilities	++	0	++
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+	0	+
4. Health	++	0	++

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A	B	C
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+/-?	0	--?/+
6. Landscape and townscape	0?	0	--?
7. Historic environment	-?	0	-?
8. Efficient use of land	+	-	--/+
9. Minerals	--?	0	--?
10. Water	0	0	-?
11. Adaptation to climate change	+/-	0	+/-
12. Climate change mitigation	++/-	0	++/-
13. Air quality	++/-	0	++/-
14. Economy	++	0	++
15. Employment	++	+?	++

## A. Preferred policy

**5.86** The preferred policy approach would provide around 7,000 new homes, including affordable housing. This level of housing development is also expected to include a variety of housing types and tenures to meet a range of needs, therefore significant positive effects are expected for SA objective 1: Housing.

**5.87** This site is close to existing services and facilities within Cambridge city and will provide new infrastructure, including a new centre for retail, cultural and other uses to serve the new development and the wider area, as well as educational facilities and employment land. As such, significant positive effects are expected for SA objectives 2: Access to services and facilities, 14: Economy and 15: Employment. Due to the size of the site, it is also expected to provide new healthcare facilities and will provide new open space, resulting in significant positive effects on SA objective 4: Health. The provision of easily

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

accessible services and facilities, community facilities and meeting space (including outdoor space) is expected to help promote community cohesion and equalities, leading to minor positive effects on SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities. In addition, the site partly lies in an area within the most 50% deprived, according to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation.

**5.88** Minor negative uncertain effects are identified for SA objectives 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity and 7: Historic environment as the HELAA identified potential for adverse effects on relevant assets, but these could potentially be mitigated. In particular, the western boundary of the airport abuts Barnwell East Local Nature Reserve and the airport control tower is Grade 2 listed. The effect for SA objective 5 is mixed with a minor positive effect, as the policy states that the site will provide additional wildlife habitat around existing nature designations and contribute to the Eastern Fens green infrastructure initiative. This green infrastructure provision may also help in adapting to the effects of climate change, by providing local cooling and slowing surface water runoff, although some parts of the site are at high risk of surface water flooding, or contain smaller areas in flood zones 2 and/or 3. As such, mixed minor positive and minor negative effects are expected for SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change.

**5.89** Minor positive effects are identified for SA objective 8: Efficient use of land, as this policy utilises a brownfield site. The site lies within Minerals Safeguarding Areas for sand and gravel, although it is considered unlikely minerals would be worked at this site due to its proximity to the existing urban area, resulting in significant negative uncertain effects for SA objective 9: Minerals.

**5.90** Provision of a mix of uses, including employment, services and facilities close to housing, and delivering this development close to existing amenities in Cambridge will help minimise the need to travel. In addition, the policy encourages sustainable transport links to the city centre, railway stations and key employment sites, such as North East Cambridge and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, and will include a trip budget, which will further minimise use of private vehicles and associated emissions of greenhouse gases and air pollutants. However, this scale of development will inevitably lead to an

increase in some cars on the road, although emissions from aircraft would no longer be contributing to local pollution. As such, mixed significant positive and minor negative effects are recorded for SA objectives 12: Climate change adaptation and 13: Air quality.

**5.91** Note that the policy approach states that the new plan will review and incorporate as appropriate four existing allocations from the adopted Local Plans (S/CE/R45, S/CE/R47, S/CE/SS/3(1a), S/CS/SS/3(1b)). All four allocations have planning permission, and are therefore considered to be part of the baseline and not appraised here.

## **B. Carry forward the safeguarded land and more limited allocations in the adopted plans**

**5.92** This alternative would not result in development at the site (other than that already permitted) and would therefore largely reflect the baseline without the plan. A minor positive uncertain effect is identified for SA objectives 1: Housing and 15: Employment, as safeguarding the site would likely allow these uses to come forward if need could not be met elsewhere in the plan period, and land would be earmarked for such development in the longer term. Minor negative effects are identified for SA objective 8: Efficient use of land, as not allocating this site when it is expected to become available would not make best use of brownfield land in a sustainable location. It is also recognised that safeguarding the land, rather than allocating the site, would not bring forward the positive effects in terms of development recognised in the assessment of Option A, particularly with regards to providing new services and facilities for the wider area.

## **C. A larger land release reflecting the proposal by Marshall**

**5.93** This option would have similar effects to the preferred option, given that development would come forward as set out in the preferred approach, but with additional housing and employment, over a larger area.

**5.94** The only differences from Option A, are that Option C would have significant negative effects on SA objectives 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity (mixed with minor positive effect), 6: Landscape and townscape, and 8: Efficient use of land, as the extended site includes Grade 3 greenfield land beyond the airport, effects on biodiversity are less likely to be easily mitigated and landscape impacts are also not likely to be easily mitigated. In addition, minor negative uncertain effects are recorded for SA objective 10: Water, as the extended site intersects with a Source Protection Zone.

## Policy S/NWC: North West Cambridge

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – S/NWC: North West Cambridge. This is the preferred option because it is considered that carrying forward the north West Cambridge AAP without additional housing would not take advantage of the opportunities the area presents to meet future needs for the area.
  
- B. Alternative option – Carry forward guidance in the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan subject to any updates provided by policies in the new Local Plan, and not enabling additional development. This is not the preferred option due to the opportunities the area presents to meet future needs for the area by building upon an emerging new “place” in the city located in a highly sustainable location.

**Table 5.13: Policy S/NWC: North West Cambridge**

SA Objective	A	B
<b>1. Housing</b>	+?	0
<b>2. Access to services and facilities</b>	+	0

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A	B
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0?	0
4. Health	0?	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0?	0
6. Landscape and townscape	-?	0
7. Historic environment	0?	0
8. Efficient use of land	+	0
9. Minerals	0?	0
10. Water	0?	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0?	0
12. Climate change mitigation	0?	0
13. Air quality	0?	0
14. Economy	0?	0
15. Employment	0?	0

## A. Preferred policy

**5.95** This site has permission for housing and commercial space, and therefore development at this location forms part of the future baseline without the plan. As such, negligible uncertain effects are identified for most SA objectives, although these effects are uncertain as they depend on the contents of the policy once fully worked up. This policy will provide additional detail and guidance as to the development to come forward in this area.

**5.96** This policy will allocate additional homes at the site, resulting in minor positive effects for SA objective 1: Housing. This is uncertain as the intensification of housing development could reduce the variety of housing types on the site, for example resulting in more flatted development. This could also

result in an increase in taller buildings, which could have adverse effects on townscape and the setting of Cambridge, resulting in minor negative uncertain effects for SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape. The policy approach clarifies that additional dwellings will be built in areas already identified for development, and would not take land identified for open space and that suitable additional infrastructure contributions would be required to ensure local facilities have capacity to serve the additional housing. As such, minor positive effects are expected for SA objectives 2: Access to services and facilities and 8: Efficient use of land.

**B. Carry forward guidance in the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan subject to any updates provided by policies in the new Local Plan, and not enabling additional development**

**5.97** Carrying forward guidance in the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan represents the likely future baseline without the plan. While this option makes reference to any updates provided by other policies in the Local Plan, such policies are subject to separate assessment. As such, negligible effects are identified for all SA objectives.

## **Policy S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)**

### **Policy options**

- A. Preferred policy – S/CBC Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital). This is the preferred option as it responds to the needs of the campus whilst managing the level of harm to Green Belt, landscape and biodiversity.

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

- B. Alternative option – No release of Green Belt or additional allocation outside the existing Campus. This alternative is not the preferred approach, as it would not respond to the needs of the campus.
  
- C. Alternative option - A larger land release reflecting the proposal by the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (referred to as Cambridge South). This alternative is not the preferred approach, due to the level of harm to Green Belt, landscape and biodiversity.

**Table 5.14: Policy S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke’s Hospital)**

SA Objective	A	B	C
1. Housing	+	0	+
2. Access to services and facilities	+/-?	0	++/-?
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0	0	0
4. Health	++?	0	++?
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+/-?	0	+/-?
6. Landscape and townscape	--?/+	0	--?/+
7. Historic environment	-?	0	--?
8. Efficient use of land	--	0	--
9. Minerals	--?	0	--?
10. Water	0	0	-?
11. Adaptation to climate change	+	0	+/-
12. Climate change mitigation	++/-	0	++/-
13. Air quality	++/-	0	++/-
14. Economy	++	0	++

SA Objective	A	B	C
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>++</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>++</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.98** This policy is expected to have mixed minor positive and minor negative effects for SA objectives 2: Access to services and facilities and significant positive effects for SA objective 4: Health, as it enables development of Cambridge Biomedical Campus to meet local, regional or national healthcare needs and may therefore improve access to healthcare facilities, or enable better health outcomes more broadly. The policy also states that development must contribute towards improving the wellbeing of campus users and surrounding communities. The negative effect recorded against SA objective 2 relates to the distance from the site to an existing centre, although this is uncertain as it is noted that there are a range of amenities at the campus, including food and drink, retail, open space and a sports centre.

**5.99** Mixed minor positive and minor negative uncertain effects are recorded for SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity, as the policy states that development would be required to provide biodiversity improvements, however the site extension has potential to adversely impact biodiversity assets. It is noted that the HELAA assessment suggests the effects could be mitigated.

**5.100** The HELAA assessment identified potential for the site extension to result in significant adverse effects on landscape. However, the policy requires a comprehensive landscaping plan and design that responds to the landscape and townscape of Cambridge, therefore mixed minor positive and significant negative uncertain effects are identified for SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape.

**5.101** Minor negative effects are identified for 7: historic environment, as the site extension has potential to adversely impact heritage, although the HELAA assessment suggests the effects could be mitigated.

**5.102** Significant negative effects are expected for SA objectives 8: Efficient use of land and 9: Minerals, as the extension includes some best and most versatile agricultural land and also lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

**5.103** A minor positive effect is expected for SA objective 11, as the policy requires provision of green infrastructure in the adjoining areas of White Hill and Nine Wells, which could help adapt to climate change through ecosystem services such as local cooling and slowing surface water runoff and the site is not considered to be at high risk of flooding.

**5.104** The site is within close proximity to public transport and the policy seeks to provide a network of cycle and pedestrian routes as well as enhancing connections to the proposed Cambridge South Railway Station. As such, significant positive effects are expected for SA objectives 12: Climate change mitigation and 13: Air quality. These are mixed with minor negative effects, as the site is not near an existing centre and the HELAA recognised potential for adverse effects that may be possible to mitigate with regards to air quality.

**5.105** This policy would provide new employment land within proximity to housing and sustainable transport links, and boost the attractiveness of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, building on Cambridge's strong life sciences economy. As such, significant positive effects are expected for SA objectives 14: Economy and 15: Employment.

## **B. No release of Green Belt or additional allocation outside the existing Campus**

**5.106** This option reflects a 'do nothing' approach and the baseline without the plan. As such, negligible effects are expected for all SA objectives. However, it is recognised that without this policy, the additional support for the life sciences sector, and associated positive effects on economy and employment, may not occur.

## C. A larger land release reflecting the proposal by the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (referred to as Cambridge South)

**5.107** Effects are similar to the preferred option, given that much of the policy and allocated area remain the same. However, mixed significant positive and minor negative effects are expected for SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities, as the additional land lies closer to an existing centre and education facilities. The larger site has potential for significant effects on archaeology, therefore a significant negative effect is expected for SA objective 7: Historic environment. Minor negative effects are expected for SA objectives 10: Water and 11: Adaptation to climate change (mixed with a minor positive effect for SA objective 11), as the larger site coincides with a Source Protection Zone and is at a higher risk of flooding than Option A. Whilst there is no difference in the significance of the other SA effects when compared to Option A, it is noted that the larger scale of this option will likely lead to effects of greater magnitude.

## Policy S/EOC: Other Existing Allocations on the Edge of Cambridge

### Options

- A. Preferred Policy – Policy S/EOC: Other Existing Allocations on the Edge of Cambridge. The reasons for selecting the preferred site options are set out in Appendix E.
  
- B. Alternative option – The Councils considered a range of alternative sites around the edge of Cambridge, having regard to the overarching development strategy and the conclusions of the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (see Chapter 4).

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

**5.108** Note that the preferred policy approach incorporates one residential allocation and two employment allocations carried forward from the adopted Local Plans. All of these existing allocations are located on the edge of the city of Cambridge. There are also four residential allocations that have planning permission and are therefore considered to be part of the baseline. These four residential allocations have therefore not been included in this appraisal.

**Table 5.15: Policy S/EOC: Other Existing Allocations on the Edge of Cambridge**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	+
2. Access to services and facilities	-?
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0
4. Health	-
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	-?
6. Landscape and townscape	-?
7. Historic environment	-?
8. Efficient use of land	--
9. Minerals	--?
10. Water	-?
11. Adaptation to climate change	-
12. Climate change mitigation	++/-
13. Air quality	-
14. Economy	++
15. Employment	++

## A. Preferred policy

**5.109** Policy S/EOC: Other Existing Allocations on the Edge of Cambridge is expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA objective 1: Housing because it allocates a residential site that will contribute towards housing delivery. Minor negative effects with uncertainty are expected in relation to SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities because the site allocations listed under this policy are not located within close proximity of a city, district, local, neighbourhood, rural or minor rural centre. Therefore, residents may need to travel elsewhere for services and facilities. Further to this, the residential site allocation is not located within close proximity of a primary or secondary school. Additionally, all three site allocations are not within close proximity of a healthcare facility or area of open space/sports facility. As such, minor negative effects are also expected in relation to SA objective 4: Health.

**5.110** Two of the sites allocated by this policy could have an adverse effect on designated biodiversity assets and therefore minor negative effects are expected in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity. The effects are recorded as uncertain because the impact could be reasonably mitigated or compensated for. The same two sites are also expected to have minor negative effects with uncertainty in relation to SA objective 7: Historic environment. This is because they could have a detrimental impact on designated or non-designated heritage assets and their settings, but which could be reasonably mitigated. Minor negative effects with uncertainty are also expected in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape because the residential site allocation scored 'Amber' in the HELAA as it could result in an adverse impact on landscape character.

**5.111** The sites allocated by this policy comprise greenfield land and two of them are classed as Grade 1 or 2 agricultural quality. Therefore, significant negative effects are expected in relation to SA objective 8: Efficient use of land. Significant negative effects are also expected in relation to SA objective 9: Minerals because all of the site allocations fall within a Minerals Safeguarding Area or a Minerals Consultation Area. Therefore, development of these sites could result in the sterilisation of mineral resources. The effect is recorded as

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

uncertain because it is unknown whether extraction could be achieved prior to development.

**5.112** Minor negative effects with uncertainty are expected in relation to SA objective 10: Water because one of the allocated sites contains brooks, whilst the other falls within Source Protection Zone 3. Development of these sites therefore has the potential to affect water quality (e.g. through sediment runoff during construction). One of the three site allocations is at risk of surface water flooding and therefore minor negative effects are also expected in relation to SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change.

**5.113** Mixed significant positive and minor negative effects are expected in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation because although the site allocations fall within close proximity to public transport, they do not fall within close proximity of a city, district or rural centre. Two of the three sites scored 'Amber' in the HELAA with respect to air quality and therefore minor negative effects are expected against SA objective 13: Air quality.

**5.114** The employment sites allocated under this policy will contribute towards employment land and therefore significant positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 14: Economy. Significant positive effects are expected against SA objective 15: Employment because job opportunities will be created through the development of employment land and the residential site allocation is located within close proximity of an employment area and will therefore ensure easy access to job opportunities.

# New settlements

## Policy S/CB: Cambourne

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – S/CB: Cambourne. This is the preferred option as it provides an opportunity to deliver development that will make the best use of new transport connections.
  
- B. The alternatives to allocating development around Cambourne were considered as part of consideration of alternative Strategic Spatial Options (see Chapter 4).

**Table 5.16: Policy S/CB: Cambourne**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	++?
2. Access to services and facilities	++/-?
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+
4. Health	+/-?
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	++/--?
6. Landscape and townscape	++/--?
7. Historic environment	-?
8. Efficient use of land	--?
9. Minerals	-?

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>A</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>--/+</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>+/-</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>++/-?</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>++/-?</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>++?</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>++?</b>

**5.115** Large-scale growth at Cambourne will make a significant contribution to housing need within Greater Cambridge and such an allocation will likely include a range of housing types, including affordable housing. As such, a significant positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 1: Housing. However, the effect identified is uncertain given that it is not clear the exact scale of housing that could be deliverable during the plan period. There is an emphasis in the policy on creating sufficient critical mass to deliver services and facilities in local and district centres that will meet the day to day needs of residents. Additionally, the policy states that an expanded Cambourne should be well-connected through high quality public transport, cycling and walking facilities. This will include integration of development at Cambourne with the new East West Rail connections. As such, a significant positive effect is identified for the preferred policy in relation to SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities. However, it is possible that during the earlier stages of construction existing services and facilities in the area will be strained by the new development. Therefore, an uncertain minor negative effect is also identified in relation to SA objective 2.

**5.116** The new proximity of new development at Cambourne to public transport connections and services and facilities is likely to benefit less mobile residents and new local and district centre will offer places for people to meet. Therefore, a minor positive effect is identified for the preferred policy in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities. The inclusion of walking and cycling routes as part of development may support the health of residents in the area

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

through greater participation in active travel. Additionally, the policy suggests that development should help deliver the Western Gateway Green Infrastructure project, which would provide areas to support resident's wellbeing. A significant positive effect is therefore identified in relation to SA objective 4: Health. The scale of development to be delivered could stretch existing healthcare services in the area during the early stages of construction and therefore an uncertain minor negative effect is also identified in relation to SA objective 4.

**5.117** The policy states that delivery of the Western Gateway Green Infrastructure project should positively engage with landscape setting and also pursue biodiversity enhancement opportunities such as woodland planting. As a result, significant positive effects are identified for the preferred policy in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity and SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape. However, the area around Cambourne contains a number of designated and non-designated habitats. For example, Elsworth Wood SSSI is located to the northwest of Cambourne. Additionally, Eversden and Wimpole SAC lies further south, which supports barbastelle bats. Strategic scale development has the potential to cause disturbance to such habitats and therefore a significant negative effect is also identified in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity. In terms of landscape, strategic scale development in a relatively rural location around Cambourne will have significant impacts on the existing landscape and townscape. A significant negative effect is therefore also identified for the preferred policy in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape. Identified effects are uncertain as they will depend on the design, scale and layout of proposed development.

**5.118** Cambourne contains a number of listed buildings but it does not contain any conservation areas, scheduled monuments or registered parks and gardens. Within the wider area, there are registered parks and gardens to the south and northeast and scheduled monuments to the south and west. As such, there is potential for some impacts to arise from development on the setting of designated heritage assets. A minor negative effect is therefore identified for the preferred policy in relation to SA objective 7: Historic environment. The identified effect is uncertain as it will depend on the design, scale and layout of proposed development.

**5.119** Cambourne and the surrounding areas has a large amount of Grade 2 and agricultural land, which could be lost to development. As such, significant negative effect is identified in relation to SA objective 8: Efficient land use. The effect identified is uncertain as the exact location of development has not been confirmed. Cambourne itself does not coincide with any Minerals Safeguarding Areas or Minerals Consultation Areas, but there are Minerals Safeguarding Areas within 5km of Cambourne, particularly to the south and east. Therefore, any expansion of Cambourne may result in development within a Minerals Safeguarding Area and so an uncertain minor negative effect is identified in relation to SA objective 9: Minerals. Any extension to Cambourne may result in wastewater issues as both the Bourn and Uttons Drove WRCs have capacity limitations that would require addressing and the Integrated Water Management Study has identified that strategic scale growth in the area would also require regional-scale solutions to overcome water supply limitations. Therefore, a significant negative effect is identified in relation to SA objective 10: Water. However, there may be potential to implement water recycling and new blue-green infrastructure at strategic scale sites and therefore a minor positive effect is also identified for the preferred policy in relation to this SA objective.

**5.120** Development at Cambourne will be on greenfield land and therefore there is potential for increased flood risk due to an increase in impermeable surfaces. There are patches of Flood Zones 2 and 3 to the south of Cambourne and the Integrated Water Management Study states that the area has some surface water flood risk, but it should be feasible to manage this if development comes forward. As a result, a minor negative effect is identified for the preferred policy in relation to SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change. However, as the policy states that any development that comes should be accompanied by new Green Infrastructure, there is potential to include sustainable drainage systems into these areas that will build climate resilience. A minor positive effect is therefore also expected for the preferred policy in relation to this SA objective.

**5.121** Policy S/CB sets out that development at Cambourne will be well connected to high quality public transport, cycling and walking facilities and that it should be considered how the development can contribute towards the achievement of net zero carbon. The establishment of local and district centres through the policy seeks to reduce people's need to travel by private car by

providing everyday needs within walking distance. Additionally, the development will be integrated with the new East West Rail connections in the area. As a result, significant positive effects are identified for the preferred policy in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 13: Air quality. However, currently Cambourne is not particularly well served by public transport, although this is planned to improve with the Cambourne to Cambridge public transport scheme. The scale of development to be delivered at Cambourne will likely lead to a net increase in traffic on the A428. This road connects to the A14 on which an AQMA is designated and there is also an AQMA designed within Cambridge. Commuters from new development at Cambourne may cause further degradation of air quality in these areas. Therefore, minor negative effects are also identified for the preferred policy in relation to SA objective 12 and SA objective 13. The effects identified are uncertain as they will depend on people's commuting patterns, which are difficult to predict at this stage.

**5.122** The policy sets out to ensure that the economic role of the new development as an employment centre is considered and that the new development includes a mix of uses, including employment. The transport connections to be delivered in the area could improve the potential of the Cambourne area to attract a new workforce. As such, significant positive effects are identified for the preferred policy in relation to SA objectives 14: economy and SA objective 15: Employment. The effects are recorded as uncertain because the actual effects will depend on when employment comes forward within the area. Depending on when employment comes forward, there could be more out commuting during the earlier stages of development.

## Policy S/NS: Existing new settlements

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – S/NS: Existing new settlements. This is the preferred option because the Councils consider that growth at existing new settlements needs considering through the plan.

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

B. Alternative option – No Policy. This was rejected as it is considered that area specific detail needs to be included in the new plan. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative.

**Table 5.17: Policy S/NS: Existing new settlements**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	0?
2. Access to services and facilities	+?
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0?
4. Health	0?
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0?
6. Landscape and townscape	0?
7. Historic environment	0?
8. Efficient use of land	0?
9. Minerals	0?
10. Water	0?
11. Adaptation to climate change	0?
12. Climate change mitigation	0?
13. Air quality	0?
14. Economy	0?
15. Employment	0?

**5.123** All new settlements included in the policy are either under construction, have gained, or the council has resolved to grant, planning permission, and therefore they are part of the future baseline without the plan. Therefore,

negligible effects are identified for the preferred policy in relation to the majority of SA objectives. These effects are uncertain as the proposed policy is expected to help guide this development, but details of this guidance are not explicitly mentioned in the policy text. However, a minor positive effect is identified for the preferred policy in relation to SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities as the policy indicates that higher annual delivery rates of housing are expected for the settlements, which may mean the critical mass of development need to support services and facilities is achieved sooner.

## The rural southern cluster

### Policy S/GC: Genome Campus, Hinxton

#### Policy Options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy S/GC: Genome Campus, Hinxton. This is the preferred option given the scale and range of uses that are now permitted in the site that make the current ‘Established Employment Area in the Countryside’ policy unsuitable.
- B. Alternative – No policy: This has been rejected as without a policy designation the area would be within countryside policies, which would not reflect the scale of change taking place in the area or provide suitable context for future proposals within the site. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative.

**Table 5.18: Policy S/GC: Genome Campus, Hinxton**

SA Objective	A
<b>1. Housing</b>	<b>0</b>

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A
<b>2. Access to services and facilities</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>3. Social inclusion and equalities</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>4. Health</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5. Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>6. Landscape and townscape</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>7. Historic environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>8. Efficient use of land</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>++</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>++</b>

**5.124** The Council has granted planning permission for a major expansion of the campus. The main focus of the policy relates to supporting development which relates to the intended use of the campus as a centre for genomics and associated bioinformatics industries. As such, significant positive effects are identified in relation to SA objective 14: Economy and SA objective 15: Employment, given the long term support the policy will provide towards Greater Cambridge’s innovative economy. Additionally, the policy intends the campus to be opened up to members of the public in the future in order to deliver social benefits. A minor positive effect is therefore also identified for the preferred policy in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities.

**5.125** Supporting uses delivered at the campus have the potential to draw visitors away from other rural centres in the area. The policy requires that any supporting uses to be delivered in the campus should consider their impact on the viability of local and minor rural centres in the area. This offers some further support to the local economy and may be valuable in ensuring smaller settlements in the area have continued access to a range of services and facilities. As a result, a minor positive effect is identified for the preferred policy in relation to SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities.

**5.126** The preferred policy affords some protection to the environment around the campus, by stating that future proposals fully consider potential environmental impacts. Therefore, a minor positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity and SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape.

## Policy S/BRC: Babraham Research Campus

### Options

- A. Preferred Policy – Policy S/BRC: Babraham Research Campus. The reasons for selecting the preferred site option are set out in Appendix E.
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This alternative is not the preferred approach as without a policy, the area would remain in the Green Belt and additional land would not be allocated for development.

**Table 5.19: Policy S/BRC: Babraham Research Campus**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	<b>0</b>
2. Access to services and facilities	<b>--?</b>

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A
<b>3. Social inclusion and equalities</b>	<b>+/0</b>
<b>4. Health</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>5. Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>6. Landscape and townscape</b>	<b>+/-?</b>
<b>7. Historic environment</b>	<b>+/-?</b>
<b>8. Efficient use of land</b>	<b>--/+</b>
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>--?</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>--?</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>++?/-</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>+/-</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>++</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>+</b>

## A. Preferred policy

**5.127** Policy S/BRC: Babraham Research Campus is an employment site allocation and therefore will not affect SA objective 1: Housing. It is expected to have significant negative effects with uncertainty in relation to SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities because the campus is not located within close proximity of a city, district, local, neighbourhood, rural or minor rural centre. Therefore, workers would not have easy access to services and facilities. The Babraham Research Campus comprises a mix of brownfield and greenfield land and is therefore expected to have mixed minor positive and negligible effects in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities. Minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 4: Health because the campus is located within close proximity to a healthcare facility.

**5.128** The Babraham Research Campus scored 'Amber' in the HELAA with respect to biodiversity because it could have a detrimental impact on a designated biodiversity site (River Granta County Wildlife Site). However, the policy requires the River Granta County Wildlife Site to be protected and enhanced as part of development. Therefore, minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity.

**5.129** The developable area of the campus is to be removed from Green Belt. Due to the fact the campus scored 'Amber' in the HELAA with respect to landscape character, it is expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape. The effect is mixed with minor positive effects because according to the wording of Policy S/BRC, the landscape setting of the site must be protected and enhanced. Mixed minor positive and minor negative effects with uncertainty are also expected in relation to SA objective 7: Historic environment because the campus scored 'Amber' in the HELAA with respect to the historic environment and archaeology. Therefore, it is expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA objective 7. However, the policy states that proposals should preserve the appearance of the conservation areas and the setting of the Grade I listed St Peters Church and the Grade II listed Babraham Hall. Therefore, minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 7. The negative effects against both objectives are recorded as uncertain because the actual effects will depend on the final design, scale and layout of development.

**5.130** Mixed significant negative and minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 8: Efficient use of land because the Babraham Research Campus comprises brownfield and greenfield land, the latter of which is classed as Grade 1 or 2 agricultural quality. Significant negative effects with uncertainty are expected in relation to SA objective 9: Minerals because the site falls within a Minerals Safeguarding Area or a Minerals Consultation Area and its development could therefore result in the sterilisation of mineral resources. The effects are recorded as uncertain because extraction may be achieved prior to development. Significant negative effects with uncertainty are also expected in relation to SA objective 10: Water because the site falls within Source Protection Zone 1 and the River Granta runs along the south western edge of

the site. Therefore, development of the site could potentially cause a deterioration in water quality through sediment runoff during construction.

**5.131** Although the River Granta runs along the south western edge of the site, only a small proportion of the site falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3. As such, there is sufficient land in Flood Zone 1 to accommodate five additional dwellings or an increase of 500 square metres of employment floorspace. Therefore, minor negative effects are expected in relation to SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change. The campus is located within close proximity of the proposed rapid public transport stop, which is particularly important considering city, district and rural centres are not located near to the site. Therefore, mixed significant positive and minor negative effects are expected in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation.

**5.132** The Babraham Research Campus scored 'Amber' in the HELAA with respect to air quality and is therefore expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA objective 13: Air quality. These effects are mixed with minor positive effects because the policy supports the inclusion of sustainable travel opportunities, including those provided by the planned Cambridge South East Transport Scheme. Therefore, the policy is expected to help reduce reliance on the private car and minimise associated air pollution, leading to mixed effects overall.

**5.133** The policy will provide a significant number of new employment opportunities and therefore significant positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 14: Economy. Minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 15: Employment because the campus is located within close proximity to a city, district or rural centre and will therefore ensure access to employment opportunities.

## B. No policy

**5.134** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised it

would not provide the positive outcomes that option A would bring in terms of supporting the future success of the Babraham Research Campus.

## Policy S/RSC: Village allocations in the Rural Southern Cluster

### Options

- A. Preferred Policy – Policy S/RSC: Village allocations in the Rural Southern Cluster. The reasons for selecting the preferred site options are set out in Appendix E.

**5.135** Note that the preferred policy approach incorporates two existing residential allocations and one existing employment allocations, in addition to one new residential allocation. All of these existing and new allocations are located in villages to the south of the city of Cambridge, namely Stapleford, Duxford, Little Abington and Sawston. There is also one residential allocation that has planning permission and is therefore considered to be part of the baseline. This residential allocation has therefore not been included in this appraisal.

- B. The Councils considered a range of alternative sites within the southern cluster area having regard to the overarching development strategy and conclusions of the Housing & Employment Land Availability Assessment (see Chapter 4).

**Table 5.20: Policy S/RSC: Village allocations in the Rural Southern Cluster**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	+
2. Access to services and facilities	--?/+?
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+?
4. Health	+/-
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	-?
6. Landscape and townscape	+/-?
7. Historic environment	+/-?
8. Efficient use of land	--/+
9. Minerals	--?
10. Water	--?
11. Adaptation to climate change	-
12. Climate change mitigation	++?/-
13. Air quality	-
14. Economy	+
15. Employment	++/-

### A. Preferred policy

**5.136** Policy RSC: Village allocations in the Rural Southern Cluster is expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA objective 1: Housing because it allocates residential sites that will contribute towards housing delivery. The site allocations listed under this policy are not located within close proximity of a

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

city, district, local, neighbourhood, rural or minor rural centre. Further to this, one of the residential site allocations is not located within close proximity of a primary or secondary school. However, the other residential site allocations are located within close proximity of a primary school. Therefore, mixed significant negative and minor positive effects with uncertainty are expected in relation to SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities. Some of the site allocations are located within close proximity of a healthcare facility or will provide a new health centre or area of open space/sports facility, whereas some of the sites are not located within close proximity of a healthcare facility. According to the proposed policy approach, provision will be made for open space at S/RSC/HW: Land between Hinton Way and Mingle Lane, Great Shelford. Therefore, overall, mixed minor positive and minor negative effects are expected in relation to SA objective 4: Health.

**5.137** Minor positive effects with uncertainty are expected in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities because the employment site allocated by this policy is located on brownfield land and therefore has potential to help promote the achievement of regeneration in the area.

**5.138** Two of the sites allocated by this policy could have an adverse effect on designated biodiversity assets and therefore minor negative effects are expected in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity. The effects are recorded as uncertain because effects depend on the final design, scale and layout of development. Mixed minor positive and minor negative effects with uncertainty are expected in relation to SA objectives 6: landscape and townscape and 7: historic environment. This is because although the sites scored 'Amber' in the HELAA, with respect to the historic environment and archaeology, the proposed policy approach requires the design of development to preserve key views from Stapleford Conservation Area, including from Mingle Lane past St Andrew's Church and the adjacent vicarage. With regard to landscape, although some of the sites scored 'Amber' in the HELAA, protecting key views would help protect the landscape and according to the proposed policy approach, provision will also be made for open space which is a key landscape feature. Further to this, the policy requires space for a substantial landscape edge at residential site S/RSC/MF Land at Maarnford Farm, Hunts Road, Duxford.

**5.139** Mixed significant negative and minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 8: Efficient use of land because although one of the sites is located on brownfield land, which is an efficient use of previously developed land, the remaining three sites comprise greenfield land classed as being Grade 1 or 2 agricultural quality. Therefore, development would result in the loss of high quality agricultural land. Significant negative effects are expected in relation to SA objective 9: Minerals because all of the site allocations fall within a Minerals Safeguarding Area or a Minerals Consultation Area. Therefore, development of these sites could result in the sterilisation of mineral resources. The effect is recorded as uncertain because it is unknown whether extraction could be achieved prior to development.

**5.140** Two of the allocated sites fall with Source Protection Zones 2 and 3, whilst another one falls within Source Protection Zone 1. Development of these sites therefore has the potential to affect water quality. Therefore, significant negative effects with uncertainty are expected in relation to SA objective 10: Water. Minor negative effects are expected in relation to SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change because a couple of the sites are at risk of surface water flooding and/or contain land in Flood Zones 2 and 3, but have sufficient land in Flood Zone 1 to accommodate 5 additional dwellings or an increase of 500 square metres of employment floorspace.

**5.141** Mixed significant positive and minor negative effects with uncertainty are expected in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation because although the site allocations fall within close proximity to public transport, all but one of them do not fall within close proximity of a city, district or rural centre. Three of the four sites scored 'Amber' in the HELAA with respect to air quality and therefore minor negative effects are expected against SA objective 13: Air quality.

**5.142** The employment site allocated under this policy will contribute towards employment land and therefore minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 14: Economy. Mixed significant positive and minor negative effects are expected against SA objective 15: Employment because although job opportunities will be created through the development of employment land, one of the residential site allocations is not located within close proximity of an

employment area or local, neighbourhood or minor rural centre and would therefore not ensure easy access to job opportunities.

## Policy S/SCP: Policy areas in the rural southern cluster

### Options

- A. Preferred Policy – Policy S/SCP: Policy areas in the rural southern cluster. The reasons for selecting the preferred site options are set out in Appendix E.

### Whittlesford Parkway Station Area, Whittlesford Bridge

- B. Alternative option – No policy. This is not the preferred approach as this would not support the redevelopment opportunity that exists in this location.
- C. Alternative option – Allocate the area for specified development amounts and use. This alternative is not the preferred approach as the Council does not currently have evidence that the whole area is available for development.

### South of A1307, Linton

- D. Alternative option – No policy. This alternative has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative. This is because it is necessary to set out within a policy that Land south of the A1307 is not a suitable location for new residential development due to it being severed from the services and facilities within the village.

**Table 5.21: Policy S/SCP: Policy areas in the rural southern cluster**

SA Objective	A	B	C
1. Housing	+	0	+
2. Access to services and facilities	+?	0	+?
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0	0	0
4. Health	0	0	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0
6. Landscape and townscape	+?	0	+?
7. Historic environment	+	0	+
8. Efficient use of land	++	0	++
9. Minerals	++	0	++
10. Water	0	0	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0	0	0
12. Climate change mitigation	+?/-?	0	+?/-?
13. Air quality	+?/-?	0	+?/-?
14. Economy	+	0	+
15. Employment	+	0	+

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.143** Policy S/SCP: Policy areas in the rural southern cluster supports the redevelopment of the Whittlesford Parkway Station area, whilst restricting development in the south of the village of Linton, which is severed from the rest of the village by the A1307. As the policy supports redevelopment of the

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

Whittlesford Parkway Station area (as opposed to new development), the policy is unlikely to result in effects against SA objectives 3: social inclusion and equalities, 4: health, 5: biodiversity and geodiversity, 10: water and 11: adaptation to climate change. The redevelopment of the Whittlesford Parkway Station area will see the provision of a transport hub, in addition to housing and employment development. This will ensure new residents have easy access to job opportunities. Therefore, minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 1: housing, 14: economy and 15: employment. With regard to Linton, although restricting development in the south of the village prevents housing delivery, the location is not considered appropriate for housing delivery and existing residents can still make improvements to their properties.

**5.144** The Greater Cambridge Partnership is considering potential transport infrastructure to be delivered around Whittlesford Parkway railway station and redevelopment of the area is therefore likely to encourage more sustainable travel choices, which will reduce reliance on the private car and associated emissions, in addition to minimising air pollution. Further to this, preventing development in the south of Linton, which has poor access to facilities and services, will ensure that development is provided elsewhere and in locations that may have better access to everyday amenities. Therefore, minor positive effects with uncertainty are expected in relation to SA objectives 12: climate change mitigation and 13: air quality. The effects against these objectives are mixed with minor negative effects with uncertainty because housing provision and the development of employment land could result in an overall increase in cars in the area.

**5.145** The preferred policy is expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities because the redevelopment of the Whittlesford Parkway Station Area would accommodate a new transport hub, improving access to services and facilities across Cambridge and further afield. The effect is recorded as uncertain because with regard to Linton, preventing development in the south of the village which has poor access to services and facilities, could potentially result in development being provided elsewhere in locations that have good access to services and facilities.

**5.146** The Whittlesford Parkway Station area comprises previously developed land and its redevelopment will therefore make efficient use of land and not result in the sterilisation of mineral resources. Therefore, significant positive effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 8: efficient use of land and 9: minerals. Minor positive effects are also expected against SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape because redevelopment of the area is likely to have beneficial effects on the landscape because the area already comprises built development. The effects are recorded as uncertain because the actual effects will depend on the final design, scale and layout of development, although it is recognised that these are being developed through the Greater Cambridge Partnership's Whittlesford Masterplanning Exercise. With regard to the south of Linton, preventing development will ensure there are no adverse effects on the landscape.

**5.147** Due to the fact the Whittlesford Parkway Station area comprises previously developed land, its redevelopment is not considered to have an adverse effect on the historic environment and archaeology. The village of Linton contains the Linton Conservation Area and a number of Listed Buildings and therefore preventing development in the south of the village is expected to protect the historic environment, as well as archaeology. As such, minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 7: Historic environment.

## B. No policy

**5.148** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised it would not provide the positive outcomes that option A would bring in terms of the redevelopment of Whittlesford Parkway Station Area and restricting residential development at Land south of the A1307 due to it being severed from the rest of Linton by the A1307.

## C. Allocate the area for specified development amounts and use

**5.149** Option C would allocate the Whittlesford Parkway Station area for specified development amounts and uses, whilst restricting development in the south of the village of Linton, which is severed from the rest of the village by the A1307. Therefore, the effects identified in the appraisal of the preferred policy would also apply to this alternative option. Specifying development amounts and uses would provide more certainty to the effects identified but due to the fact the Council does not currently have evidence that the whole area is available for development, the same effects apply.

## Rest of the rural area

### Policy S/RRA: Allocations in the rest of the rural area

#### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – S/RRA: Allocations in the rest of the rural area. The reasons for selecting the preferred site options are set out in Appendix E.

**5.150** Note that the policy approach incorporates two employment allocations and one mixed use allocation carried forward from the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, in addition to three new housing allocations, one new mixed use allocation and four new employment allocations. These sites are distributed across the rural area of Greater Cambridge. The policy approach states that the new plan will carry forward housing allocation S/RRA/H/1 (d) from the existing Local Plan. This allocation has planning permission and is therefore considered to be part of the baseline. In addition, site S/RRA/H/3 has

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

been carried forward. The principle of development on this site is part of the baseline, as it has permission for new residential use, but this policy allocated the site as mixed use.

- B. Alternative option – The Councils considered a range of alternative sites within the rest of the rural area having regard to the overarching development strategy and the conclusions of the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (see Chapter 4).

**Table 5.22: Policy S/RRA: Allocations in the rest of the rural area**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	+
2. Access to services and facilities	--/+
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+
4. Health	-
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+/-?
6. Landscape and townscape	+/-?
7. Historic environment	+/-?
8. Efficient use of land	--/+
9. Minerals	--?
10. Water	-?
11. Adaptation to climate change	+/-
12. Climate change mitigation	-
13. Air quality	-
14. Economy	++

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>A</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	++/-

**5.151** This policy provides for just over 100 new homes in the rural area, resulting in minor positive effects for SA objective 1: Housing.

**5.152** Most sites allocated in this policy have potential for significant negative effects for SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities, as none are within close proximity to an existing centre. Only Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn (S/RRA/CR) and The Moor (S/RRA/ML) are expected to have a (minor and uncertain) positive effect with regards to proximity to educational facilities. Therefore, mixed minor positive and significant negative effects are expected in relation to SA objective 2. In addition, all of the sites are further than 720m from either a healthcare facility or an open space/sports facility, resulting in minor negative effects for SA objective 4: Health.

**5.153** Three of the employment sites allocated in this policy include previously developed land, which may help regenerate the local area, leading to minor positive effect for SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities.

**5.154** Mixed minor positive and minor negative uncertain effects are identified with regards to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity, SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape and SA objective 7: Historic environment. This is because a number of sites allocated in this policy have potential to adversely affect biodiversity, geodiversity, landscape, townscape and/or heritage assets, although these effects are likely to be able to be mitigated (according to the HELAA assessment). In addition, some of the site allocations are required to retain and provide habitat features, such as trees and hedgerows, landscape buffers and some require development to be in keeping with the character of the area and protect the setting of heritage assets.

**5.155** The majority of sites under this option include Grades 1, 2 or 3 agricultural land, although three of the employment sites (S/RRA/S, S/RRA/OHD and S/RRA/H/2) make use of previously developed land. As such,

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

mixed minor positive and significant negative effects are expected for SA objective 8: Efficient use of land. Most sites coincide with or are located in close proximity to Mineral Safeguarding Areas, therefore significant negative uncertain effects are identified for SA objective 9: Minerals.

**5.156** The majority of sites in this policy do not coincide with a Source protection Zone, except for S/RRA/H/2: Bayer CropScience Site, Hauxton. Given that development at this site has potential to degrade water quality in the SPZ, minor negative uncertain effects are identified for SA objective 10: Water.

**5.157** All policies may coincide with areas of flood risk (either flood zones 2 and 3 or areas at risk of surface water flooding), resulting in minor negative effects for SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change. These are mixed with minor positive effects, as a number of sites will be required to provide planting, including trees, which may help adapt to the effects of climate change by providing local cooling and reducing surface water runoff. Minor negative effects are recorded for SA objectives 12: Climate change mitigation and 13: Air pollution, as the sites allocated in this policy are generally not located in proximity to public transport links or existing centres, and were identified in the HELAA as having potential air quality issues, but these can likely be mitigated.

**5.158** The mixed use and employment sites will provide for employment land in the rural area, which may help to boost and diversify the rural economy, resulting in significant positive effects for SA objective 14: Economy. This policy will also provide employment land, resulting in significant positive effects for SA objective 15: Employment. However, these are mixed with minor negative effects, as one of the residential sites allocated by this policy is not located in close proximity to existing employment areas.

# Policy S/RRP: Policy areas in the rest of the rural area

## Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – S/RRP: Policy areas in the rest of the rural area. This is the preferred policy option as development needs to respond to specific local circumstances.
- B. Alternative – No policy. For the majority of policy areas, the alternative of no policy was considered and rejected as specific policy context is required so development responds to specific local circumstances. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative.
- C. Alternative – Allocate Papworth hospital area for residential development. This was rejected due to the desire to maintain employment levels in the village. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative.
- D. Alternative – Allocate hospital area for employment without the preference for healthcare uses. This was rejected due to the opportunities provided by the current site, and local workforce. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative.

**Table 5.23: Policy S/RRP: Policy areas in the rest of the rural area**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	+
2. Access to services and facilities	+

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A
<b>3. Social inclusion and equalities</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>4. Health</b>	<b>+?</b>
<b>5. Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6. Landscape and townscape</b>	<b>+/-?</b>
<b>7. Historic environment</b>	<b>+/-?</b>
<b>8. Efficient use of land</b>	<b>++</b>
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>+?</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>+?</b>

**5.159** For the policy, generally positive effects are identified in relation to SA objectives given the policy’s facilitation of the positive transformations or safeguarding of key locations in the rural areas of Greater Cambridge. Re-use of previously used buildings/land is supported by the policy in the Papworth, Fen Drayton and Histon and Impington policy areas and therefore a significant positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 8: Efficient use of land.

**5.160** In terms of housing, the policy has revised the East of bypass, Longstanton policy area to now consider housing instead of the originally intended employment uses. Conversion to residential uses is also encouraged at Fen Drayton former land settlement associated estate, where it is suggested that the policy approach from the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018, of replacing existing building floorspace with residential development, should be continued. The contribution that these commitments will make to rural housing

need means a minor positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 1: Housing. The policy approach proposes that the housing delivery at Longstanton will support the completion of community facilities in the village. Furthermore, the policy supports continued reinvigoration of the village centre at Papworth Everard and the station area at Histon & Impington with a provision of mixed uses. A minor positive effect is therefore identified for the policy option in relation to SA objective 2: services and facilities. The delivery of community facilities in particular may offer opportunities for increased social interaction in rural areas. As such, a minor positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities.

**5.161** The policy opts to continue a sequential approach in relation to the development of the former Papworth hospital site, whereby replacement uses should prioritise healthcare uses. As a result, a minor positive effect is identified for the policy in relation to SA objective 4: Health. However, the sequential approach means that if suitable healthcare uses are not found, employment uses or residential would then be selected. Therefore this minor positive effect is recorded as uncertain. Protecting current employment uses is also considered at the Imperial War Museum policy area in Duxford, where any proposals that come forward must complement the character, vitality and sustainability of the site. As such, a minor positive effect is identified for the policy in relation to SA objective 14: Economy and SA objective 15: Employment. Again, these effects are recorded as uncertain in acknowledgement of the sequential approach adopted by the policy in certain locations and the alternative uses which may be brought forward as a result.

**5.162** Retention of the Imperial War Museum as a major tourist attraction and educational facility is recognised as having a minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 7: Historic environment. The transformational nature of the development supported by the policy across the locations will result in significant alterations to landscape/townscape and may involve conversions of historically important buildings. As a result, minor negative effects are identified in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape and SA objective 7: Historic environment due to the potential for development to have adverse impacts. These effects are uncertain as they will depend on the extent to which design takes into account local character. The opportunities for enhancement of

rural areas through the policy mean that a minor positive effect is also identified in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape.

## Climate Change

### Policy CC/NZ: Net zero carbon new buildings

#### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy CC/NZ: Net zero carbon new buildings. This option is preferred as it will help Greater Cambridge to achieve its carbon budget.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy: Leaving the delivery of net zero carbon to Building Regulations and the Future Homes/Buildings Standard. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because it does not fulfil the Councils' statutory duty set out in the Climate Change Act and Planning Act and will not enable Greater Cambridge to achieve its carbon budget. This option would also not deliver net zero carbon in line with the Paris Agreement 1.5°C trajectory.

**Table 5.24: Policy CC/NZ: Net zero carbon new buildings**

SA Objective	A
<b>1. Housing</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2. Access to services and facilities</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3. Social inclusion and equalities</b>	<b>0</b>

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A
4. Health	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0
7. Historic environment	0
8. Efficient use of land	0
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0
12. Climate change mitigation	++
13. Air quality	+
14. Economy	0
15. Employment	0

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.163** Policy CC/NZ: Net zero carbon new buildings sets levels of energy use within new development and requires the generation of renewable energy to meet at least that energy need. Alternatively, a carbon offset mechanism should be used whereby the capital generated is invested into additional renewable energy generation. Consideration is also given in this policy to embodied carbon (i.e. the carbon associated with the construction process and the materials used to construct new buildings). The policy also supports a move to renewables, as well as flexibility of energy supply by requiring that no new homes be connected to the gas grid (they will rely only on electricity). Therefore, a significant positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation.

**5.164** Setting an energy use level for all new development and requiring on-site renewable energy generation is expected to minimise carbon emissions and could subsequently help minimise air pollution, as carbon emissions result from the combustion of fossil fuels, which also release air pollution. This could help improve air quality, although this will not necessarily be local to development. with a minor positive effect expected in relation to SA objective 13: Air quality.

## Policy CC/WE: Water efficiency in new developments

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy CC/WE: Water efficiency in new developments. This option is preferred as it will help minimise the pressure on water resources in the area.

#### **For residential development:**

- B. Alternative option – No policy: Rely on standard Building Regulations (125 litres per person per day). This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because it would not respond to the level of water stress in the area.
- C. Alternative option – Implement the Building Regulations alternative standard (the current policy of 110 litres per person per day). This is not the preferred approach as, whilst this does seek to reduce water use, the level of reduction is not sufficient to respond to the pressure on water resources in the area.

#### **For non-residential development:**

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

D. Alternative option: No policy (there is currently no standard in Building Regulations for water efficiency in non-residential developments). This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because it would not respond to the level of water stress in the area.

E. Alternative option – Require a minimum water efficiency standard of 2 credits for category Wat 01 of BREEAM. This is not the preferred approach as whilst this does seek to reduce water use, the level of reduction is not sufficient to respond to the pressure on water resources in the area.

**Table 5.25: Policy CC/WE: Water efficiency in new developments**

SA Objective	A	C	E
1. Housing	0	0	0
2. Access to services and facilities	0	0	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0	0	0
4. Health	0	0	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+	++?	+
6. Landscape and townscape	0	0	0
7. Historic environment	0	0	0
8. Efficient use of land	0	0	0
9. Minerals	0	0	0
10. Water	++?	+	+
11. Adaptation to climate change	0	0	0
12. Climate change mitigation	0	0	0

SA Objective	A	C	E
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.165** Policy CC/WE: Water efficiency in new developments sets a requirement of 80 litres per person per day in new residential developments. This is a very high standard that will help minimise pressure on water resources. For non-residential developments, full credits should be achieved for category Wat 01 of BREEAM. Therefore, a significant positive effect is expected against SA objective 10: Water. This is uncertain, as the policy states these levels of water use are to be applied ‘unless demonstrated impractical’, which could mean it is not met in all development.

**5.166** The preferred policy supports a high water efficiency standard and would therefore help to minimise water abstraction, which can have an adverse effect on the environment by altering natural river flow and resulting in a loss of aquatic habitats and biodiversity. Therefore, a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity.

**C. Implement the Building Regulations alternative standard (the current policy of 110 litres per person per day)**

**5.167** Alternative option C sets a requirement of 110 litres per person per day in new residential developments. Although this is not as high as the standard under the preferred policy, it will still help reduce pressure associated with residential development on water resources. Therefore, overall, this option is expected to have a minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 10: Water.

**5.168** This alternative option would help to minimise water abstraction, which can have an adverse effect on aquatic habitats and biodiversity. Therefore, a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity. The effect is recorded as uncertain because this option would not minimise water abstraction to the same extent as the preferred policy.

## E. Require a minimum water efficiency standard of 2 credits for category Wat 01 of BREEAM

**5.169** Alternative option E requires a minimum water efficiency standard of 2 credits for category Wat 01 of BREEAM, which will help reduce pressure associated with non-residential development on water resources. Therefore, this option is expected to have a minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 10: Water.

**5.170** This alternative option would help to minimise water abstraction, which can have an adverse effect on aquatic habitats and biodiversity. Therefore, a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity.

## Policy CC/DC: Designing for a changing climate

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy CC/DC: Designing for a changing climate. This option is preferred as it would respond to the need for climate change mitigation and adaptation.
- B. Alternative option – No policy: Rely on national guidance. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because local authorities have a legal duty to include policies

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

related to both climate change mitigation and adaptation, as contained within the Planning Act.

**Table 5.26: Policy CC/DC: Designing for a changing climate**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	0
2. Access to services and facilities	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+
4. Health	+
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+
6. Landscape and townscape	+
7. Historic environment	0
8. Efficient use of land	0
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	++
12. Climate change mitigation	+
13. Air quality	0
14. Economy	0
15. Employment	0

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.171** Policy CC/DC: Designing for a changing climate sets out measures for adapting to climate change and requires new dwellings and non-domestic

buildings to achieve a low overheating risk using the Good Homes Alliance Overheating in New Homes Tool and Guidance, and low energy cooling. Developments are required to take a design-led approach to climate change adaptation through passive/natural cooling and/or mixed mode cooling. Reference is also made in the policy to flash flooding and the integration of sustainable drainage systems so as to reduce flood risk. For these reasons, a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 11: climate change adaptation. Reducing overheating in the summer months and protecting people from flood risk will also have beneficial effects on people's health and wellbeing, including potentially lowering the risk of heat stroke and heat-related deaths. Therefore, a minor positive effect is expected against SA objective 4: Health.

**5.172** The preferred policy seeks to reduce risks associated with climate change (e.g. overheating) through urban greening, including increased tree canopy cover and an enhanced treescape, in addition to integrating green spaces into new developments. This is expected to help connect wildlife, habitats, species and sites of biodiversity interest, at the same time as ensuring new residents have access to green open spaces which can act as community focal points in new developments. As such, minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 3: social inclusion and equalities and 5: biodiversity and geodiversity. Integrating green spaces into new developments can also form important landscape features and therefore a minor positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape.

**5.173** According to the preferred policy, passive design will be used to minimise internal heat generation through energy efficient design, with consideration given to building orientation, overhangs and external shading, in addition to albedo, fenestration and insulation. All of these measures will promote energy efficiency, with a minor positive effect expected against SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation.

# Policy CC/FM: Flooding and integrated water management

## Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy CC/FM: Flooding and integrated water management. This option is preferred as it will respond to local water management issues.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy: Rely on national guidance. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative. This is because there is a need to respond to local issues and include a robust approach to drainage and water management, which this option would not achieve.

**Table 5.27: Policy CC/FM: Flooding and integrated water management**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	0
2. Access to services and facilities	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0
4. Health	+
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+
6. Landscape and townscape	0
7. Historic environment	0
8. Efficient use of land	0

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>++</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.174** Policy CC/FM: Flooding and sustainable water management seeks to direct development away from areas at risk of flooding and requires potential flood risk to be fully addressed. The policy also requires development to provide integrated water management and sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), which help prevent flooding. Therefore, a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 11: climate change adaptation.

**5.175** A sustainable drainage system is a form of water management and can collect, store, slow and treat the quality of surface water to mitigate the impacts of development on run-off rates, volumes and quality. As such, a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 10: Water. A minor positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objectives 4: health and 5: biodiversity and geodiversity because SuDS and green roofs, the latter of which is also mentioned in the policy, can enhance biodiversity at the same time as providing an amenity space, with beneficial effects on health and wellbeing.

# Policy CC/RE: Renewable energy projects and infrastructure

## Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy CC/RE: Renewable energy projects and infrastructure. This option is preferred as it will encourage a shift to more sustainable energy sources.
  
- B. Alternative option – Not identifying areas suitable for wind turbines, leaving it to other types of renewable energy to contribute towards Greater Cambridge’s share of renewable energy. This is not the preferred approach, as there is a risk with this approach that this could place a risk on delivering sufficient renewable energy to meet carbon budgets, which would not be compatible with net zero carbon given the need for an increase in renewable energy generation to support this.
  
- C. Alternative option – No policy: Rely on national guidance. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative. This is because it would not be in accordance with the NPPF.

**Table 5.28: Policy CC/RE: Renewable energy projects and infrastructure**

SA Objective	A	B
1. Housing	0	0
2. Access to services and facilities	0	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0	0
4. Health	+?	+?

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A	B
<b>5. Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	<b>+?</b>	<b>+?</b>
<b>6. Landscape and townscape</b>	<b>+?</b>	<b>+?</b>
<b>7. Historic environment</b>	<b>+?</b>	<b>+?</b>
<b>8. Efficient use of land</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>+?</b>	<b>+?</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>+++?</b>	<b>+++?</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.176** Policy CC/RE: Renewable energy projects and infrastructure promotes renewable energy generation and associated infrastructure. Therefore, a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation. However, it is noted that a set of criteria are going to be identified that apply to renewable energy projects and may therefore prevent development of renewable energy projects from taking place in certain areas, for example due to adverse effects on the landscape or amenity. As such, this significant positive effect is uncertain.

**5.177** Minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 4: health, 5: biodiversity and geodiversity, 6: landscape and townscape, 7: historic environment and 10: water. This is because consideration must be given to residential amenity and quality of life, highways safety, landscape character, biodiversity, geodiversity and water quality, in the development of the

aforementioned criteria. The effects are recorded as uncertain because although consideration will be given to these impacts, no detail is provided on how.

## B. Not identifying areas suitable for wind turbines

**5.178** It is assumed that alternative Option C would comprise the same wording as the preferred policy but would not seek to identify areas for wind turbines, whereas the preferred policy does. Therefore, although alternative Option C is expected to have the same effect as the preferred policy, it may not contribute as strongly to the significant positive effect recorded against SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation, as it would rely on a more restricted range of energy technologies. It is acknowledged that other energy technologies may be more suitable in a lot of circumstances than wind turbines, which can have significant landscape and amenity impacts, and contribute to bird and bat strike.

## Policy CC/CE: Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy CC/CE: Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy. This option is preferred as it addresses the policy gap in relation to construction waste.
- B. Alternative option – No policy: Leave to the Minerals and Waste Plan. This is not the preferred approach as the Minerals and Waste Plan does not give consideration to construction waste and as such there would be a policy gap in relation to this important element of achieving net zero carbon.

**Table 5.29: Policy CC/CE: Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy**

SA Objective	A	B
1. Housing	0	0
2. Access to services and facilities	0	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0	0
4. Health	0	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0	0
7. Historic environment	0	0
8. Efficient use of land	0	0
9. Minerals	+	0
10. Water	0	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0	0
12. Climate change mitigation	+	0
13. Air quality	0	0
14. Economy	0	0
15. Employment	0	0

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.179** Policy CC/CE: Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy sets out how developers should manage the waste generated by construction, how new developments should provide for waste and recycling storage and collection, and how circular economy principles should be considered in

development proposals. According to the policy, in order to manage waste from construction more effectively, a Construction Environmental Management Plan should be produced. This will ensure that waste from construction is minimised and where possible reused, reducing the need to manufacture new materials, which is an important element in achieving net zero carbon. Storage space and collection systems for waste must be provided and all major proposals are required to submit a Circular Economy Statement. As such, materials will be retained in use at their highest value for as long as possible and then be reused or recycled, leaving a minimum of residual waste. This ensures that new developments are designed for adaptation, reconstruction and deconstruction so as to extend their useful life, which will help minimise the generation of CO2 emissions associated with the built environment. Therefore, the preferred policy is expected to have a minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation.

**5.180** As set out above, the preferred policy promotes the sustainable use of materials, including the reuse and recycling of materials which will minimise the need for primary mineral extraction. Therefore, a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 9: Minerals. The policy is also expected to have a minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 14: Economy because a circular economy is a more sustainable economy and will therefore provide more opportunities in the long-term.

## B. No policy

**5.181** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised it would not provide the important, positive outcomes that option A would bring in terms of sustainable management of construction waste.

## Policy CC/CS: Supporting land-based carbon sequestration

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy CC/CS: Supporting-land based carbon sequestration. This option is preferred as it will contribute towards achieving Greater Cambridge’s net zero carbon target and will contribute to nature conservation.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy: Leave the protection and enhancement of carbon sinks to existing policy related to sites of nature conservation importance. This is not the preferred approach as not all sites of importance for their role as carbon sinks will be covered by designations to protect their nature conservation importance, so this approach could still lead to the loss of areas of land that act as carbon sinks.

**Table 5.30: Policy CC/CS: Supporting land-based carbon sequestration**

SA Objective	A	B
1. Housing	0	0
2. Access to services and facilities	0	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0	0
4. Health	+	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	++	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0	0
7. Historic environment	0	0

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A	B
<b>8. Efficient use of land</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.182** Policy CC/CS: Supporting land-based carbon sequestration promotes the creation of land and habitats that play a role as carbon sinks, in addition to protecting existing carbon sinks from development. The creation of habitats is expected to result in a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity. Preventing the development of land capable of becoming an important carbon sink would conserve the soil, whilst also potentially promoting the intensification of existing built development elsewhere. Therefore, a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 8: Efficient use of land.

**5.183** The presence of carbon sinks helps to draw down carbon and therefore a minor positive effect is likely against SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation.

## B: No policy

**5.184** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised it would not provide the positive outcomes that option A would bring and therefore existing and potential carbon sinks may be lost under this option.

# Biodiversity and Green Spaces

## Policy BG/BG: Biodiversity and geodiversity

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy BG/BG: Biodiversity and geodiversity. This option is preferred as it provides a balance between ensuring nature recovery and development viability.
- B. Alternative option – Rely on emerging national legislation, likely to state a 10% mandatory biodiversity net gain.
- C. Alternative option – Require biodiversity net gain higher than 20%. This alternative is not the preferred approach as it would be likely in most instances to require significant off-site measures, whereas the national approach to net gain prioritises on-site measures. Requiring high net gain might also negatively affect development viability.
- D. Alternative option – Rely on national policy for protection of sites of biodiversity importance. This alternative is not the preferred approach as we consider that additional clarity is required to set out how the principles set out in national policy should be applied at a local level.

**Table 5.31: Policy BG/BG: Biodiversity and geodiversity**

SA Objective	A	B	C	D
1. Housing	0	0	-?	0
2. Access to services and facilities	+	0	+	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0	0	0	0
4. Health	+	0	+	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	++	+	++	+
6. Landscape and townscape	0	0	0	0
7. Historic environment	0	0	0	0
8. Efficient use of land	0	0	0	0
9. Minerals	0	0	0	0
10. Water	0	0	0	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	+	0	+	0
12. Climate change mitigation	0	0	0	0
13. Air quality	0	0	0	0
14. Economy	0	0	-?	0
15. Employment	0	0	0	0

### A. Preferred policy

**5.185** Policy BG/BG: Biodiversity and geodiversity requires development to achieve a minimum 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). BNG should be achieved on-site where possible, although the policy approach recognises that for smaller sites, it may be more effective for contributions to be made towards larger scale projects. Therefore, a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA

objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity. Habitat creation under this policy could have multiple benefits, including the provision of green space and connections to nature which could have beneficial effects on people's health and wellbeing. As such, minor positive but uncertain effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 2: access to services and 4: health. A minor positive but uncertain effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change because BNG, which could include the provision of wildlife areas or trees, would help reduce overheating in the summer months and protect people and wildlife from the effects of climate change.

## **B. Rely on emerging national legislation, likely to state a 10% mandatory biodiversity net gain**

**5.186** Alternative option B is reliant on national policy, which is likely to require 10% BNG, although this is uncertain. Therefore, although this option supports an increase in biodiversity, it does not support as large an increase in biodiversity as the preferred policy and is unlikely to lead to substantial green space provision. However, it is expected that designated sites would still be protected by the Plan. Overall, a minor positive but uncertain effect is expected in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity.

## **C. Require biodiversity net gain higher than 20%**

**5.187** Alternative option C requires development to achieve BNG higher than 20% and is therefore expected to have the same effects as the preferred policy, but to contribute more towards the significant positive effect recorded against SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity. Minor positive but uncertain effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 2: access to services, 4: health and 11: adaptation to climate change for the reasons outlined above under the preferred policy.

**5.188** The requirement to achieve BNG higher than 20% could make development unviable and therefore a minor negative but uncertain effect is expected in relation to SA objectives 1: housing and 14: economy.

#### D. Rely on national policy for protection of sites of biodiversity importance.

**5.189** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised it would not provide the positive outcomes that option A would bring in terms of BNG.

## Policy BG/GI: Green infrastructure

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy BG/GI: Green infrastructure. This option is preferred as it provides strong support for green infrastructure.
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because national planning policy requires plans to address green infrastructure.
- C. Alternative option – Identify the green infrastructure strategic initiatives in a supplementary planning document rather than the plan itself. This alternative is not the preferred approach, as it would not provide such strong support for the initiatives.
- D. Alternative option – Restrict development within respective green infrastructure strategic initiative areas. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

because the strategic initiatives include very broad areas within which it would not be appropriate to restrict development.

- E. Alternative option – Include an urban greening factor in the policy. This alternative is not the preferred approach, as the Councils think that measurement of Biodiversity Net Gain and Urban Greening via a metric-based assessment systems would be likely to overlap, making it overly complex to run two of these concurrently. The Plan does though require urban greening measures (see BG/TC, CC/DC and CC/FM).

**Table 5.32: Policy BG/GI: Green Infrastructure**

SA Objective	A	C	E
1. Housing	0	0	0
2. Access to services and facilities	+	+	+
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+	+	+
4. Health	+	+	+
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	++	++	++
6. Landscape and townscape	++	++	++
7. Historic environment	+	+	+
8. Efficient use of land	0	0	0
9. Minerals	0	0	0
10. Water	++	++	++
11. Adaptation to climate change	+	+	+
12. Climate change mitigation	+	+	+
13. Air quality	0	0	+
14. Economy	+	+	+

SA Objective	A	C	E
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.190** Policy BG/GI: Green infrastructure identifies the green infrastructure network within Greater Cambridgeshire and requires all new development proposals to include green infrastructure. The protection and enhancement of green infrastructure will support net gains in biodiversity and connect habitats to one other. Therefore, a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity.

**5.191** According to the preferred policy, green infrastructure provision will help reinforce and enhance the landscape and townscape, whilst ensuring the green infrastructure is appropriate to its local context. Therefore, a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape. Green infrastructure comprises a network of green spaces and will therefore likely provide open green spaces for members of the public to use for recreation, which will have beneficial effects on their health and wellbeing. Green infrastructure can also contribute to mental wellbeing, and provision of food growing space, including allotments, can encourage healthy eating. As such, minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 2: access to services and 4: health. A minor positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion because the policy states that spaces will be designed to be physically accessible and socially inclusive, and these spaces may provide meeting places for the community. The policy highlights that the green infrastructure network also consists of heritage assets and for this reason, a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 7: Historic environment.

**5.192** A significant positive effect is expected against SA objective 10: Water because as set out in the policy, green infrastructure will protect and enhance the water environment. Minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 11: climate change adaptation and 12: climate change mitigation

because the provision of green infrastructure will support climate mitigation and adaptation and may help reduce the need to travel by car. Lastly, green infrastructure is likely to entice people to the area, including workers, which has the potential to increase productivity and generate inward investment. Therefore, a minor positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 14: Economy.

### C. Identify the green infrastructure strategic initiatives in a supplementary planning document rather than the plan itself.

**5.193** Alternative option C is expected to have the same effects as the preferred policy, although it is acknowledged that the green infrastructure strategic initiatives would be presented in a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) rather than the Plan itself. The green infrastructure strategic initiatives outlined in the preferred policy were appraised at a very high level and due to the fact the policy is already supportive of green infrastructure, identifying them in an SPD rather than the Plan itself would not alter the effects already recorded.

### E. Include an urban greening factor in the policy

**5.194** Alternative option E supports the inclusion of an urban greening factor in the preferred policy. Therefore, this option is expected to have the same effects as the preferred policy but would contribute more towards the significant positive effect recorded against SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity. It would also contribute more towards the minor positive effect recorded against SA objective 14: Economy but would not alter the significance of this effect. The inclusion of urban greening measures in new development (e.g. an office block) can make a place more attractive to workers through the provision of amenity space, in addition to enhancing biodiversity and addressing the urban heat island effect. This option is expected to have a minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 13: Air quality because urban greening would help filter air

pollutants in urban areas which experience high levels of air pollution, helping minimise air pollution.

## Policy BG/TC: Improving tree canopy cover and the tree population

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy BG/TC: Improving tree canopy cover and the tree population. This option is preferred as it provides a balance between promoting tree planting, protecting existing trees and hedgerows, whilst respecting that woodland is not always the most appropriate landscape or habitat feature.
  
- B. Alternative option – Rely on national policy. This alternative is not the preferred approach as it would not provide protection for trees of amenity or other value that are not part of ancient woodland or having Tree Protection Order status.
  
- C. Alternative option – Set a specific requirement for tree canopy cover in new development. This alternative is not the preferred approach as high canopy cover requirements could mean that woodland would dominate a development site’s landscape and biodiversity provision, at the expense of a more biodiverse mix of habitats and landscapes.

**Table 5.33: Policy BG/TC: Improving tree canopy cover and the tree population**

SA Objective	A	B	C
1. Housing	0	0	0

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A	B	C
2. Access to services and facilities	0	0	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0	0	0
4. Health	+	0	+
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	++	0	+
6. Landscape and townscape	+	0	+/-
7. Historic environment	+	0	0
8. Efficient use of land	0	0	0
9. Minerals	0	0	0
10. Water	0	0	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	+	0	+
12. Climate change mitigation	+	0	+
13. Air quality	0	0	0
14. Economy	0	0	0
15. Employment	0	0	0

## A. Preferred policy

**5.195** Policy BG/TC: Improving tree canopy cover and the tree population promotes the provision of tree canopy cover and the protection of existing tree canopies, in addition to hedgerows and the surrounding land that supports them. Where felling is necessary, provision must be made for replacement tree and hedgerow planting. The policy supports tree diversity and also seeks to provide space above and below ground for trees and other vegetation to mature. Trees and other vegetation provide habitats for wildlife and therefore this preferred policy is expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity.

**5.196** Minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 11: climate change adaptation and 4: health because trees provide shade and reduce excessive heat in urban areas, which is particularly important as the summer months get hotter as a result of climate change. This will have beneficial effects on people's health. It has also been proven that trees have beneficial effects on people's physical and mental health and wellbeing, partly as a result of encouraging walking. Certain tree species can address issues with drainage and soil can slow surface water runoff, therefore contributing to the minor positive effect against SA objective 11.

**5.197** A minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation because the preferred policy promotes woodland, which acts as a carbon sink. Although the placing of trees along roads can prevent pollutants from reaching houses on the other side of the trees, they do not significantly reduce air pollution.

**5.198** According to the preferred policy, development proposals will be required to protect existing trees of value, including those of landscape, heritage and cultural amenity. Hedgerows are also important cultural features and can have historic importance, that are often used to help define the landscape character of an area. Therefore, minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 6: landscape and townscape and 7: historic environment.

## **B. Rely on national policy**

**5.199** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised it would not provide the positive outcomes that option A would bring in terms of protecting existing trees and providing new woodland.

## C. Set a specific requirement for tree canopy cover in new development

**5.200** Alternative option C would specify a requirement for tree canopy cover in new development. However, high canopy cover can result in a development site being dominated by woodland at the expense of a greater mix of habitats. Therefore, a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity. Tree canopy cover in new developments will ensure there are shaded areas, potentially very near to new buildings, which may help cool temperatures and improve the energy efficiency of these buildings. This could have beneficial effects on people's health and wellbeing. For these reasons, minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 11: climate change adaptation and 4: health. A minor positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation because the creation of new woodlands is promoted, which can act as carbon sinks.

**5.201** A mixed minor positive and minor negative effect is expected in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape, because although tree canopy cover in new developments may have positive effects on the landscape overall, there may be an over dominance of woodland, altering the landscape.

## Policy BG/RC: River corridors

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy BG/RC: River corridors. This option is preferred as it recognises the importance of river corridors and ensures they are protected.
  
- B. Alternative option – Not to have a specific river corridors policy, relying instead on overarching green infrastructure and landscape policies (no

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

policy). This alternative is not the preferred approach because of the need to ensure that the important cross-cutting role that our river corridors play in relation to biodiversity, landscape, heritage, recreation and tourism is protected and enhanced.

**Table 5.34: Policy BG/RC: River corridors**

SA Objective	A	B
1. Housing	0	0
2. Access to services and facilities	0	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+	0
4. Health	+	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	++	0
6. Landscape and townscape	++	0
7. Historic environment	+	0
8. Efficient use of land	0	0
9. Minerals	0	0
10. Water	++	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	+	0
12. Climate change mitigation	0	0
13. Air quality	0	0
14. Economy	+	0
15. Employment	0	0

## A. Preferred policy

**5.202** Policy BG/RC: River corridors requires any development located along the River Cam and its tributaries to protect, enhance and restore natural features, including the renaturalisation of the river and its tributaries, restoring natural floodplains and the integration of green infrastructure. This would help conserve and enhance biodiversity and connect wildlife habitats, species and sites of biodiversity, in addition to improving water quality. Therefore, significant positive effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 5: biodiversity and geodiversity and 10: water. According to the policy, development will be supported that promotes enhanced access to, from and along the river corridors for walking and cycling, whilst balancing this with the need to protect and enhance habitats for biodiversity. A minor positive effect is therefore expected in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities because the policy would ensure easy access to river corridors. Improving access to the river corridors is also likely to encourage the use of river corridors for walking, cycling and other recreational purposes, with a minor positive effect also expected in relation to SA objective 4: Health.

**5.203** The preferred policy places an emphasis on protecting and enhancing the landscape, with reference made to the Greater Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment. According to the policy, the location, scale and design of development must protect and enhance the character of the area, in addition to the visual amenity of the river corridors and connected locations, including in particular considering views to and from rivers. Therefore, a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape. The policy also requires development to protect and enhance the historic significance of river corridors and therefore a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 7: Historic environment.

**5.204** Restoring natural floodplains, integrating green infrastructure and supporting the renaturalisation of rivers can help mitigate flood risk. As such, a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 11: climate change adaptation. A minor positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective

14: Economy because the policy seeks to support tourism and recreation associated with river corridors.

**B. Not to have a specific river corridors policy, relying instead on overarching green infrastructure and landscape policies**

**5.205** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised it would not provide the positive outcomes that option A would bring in terms of improving and restoring rivers.

## Policy BG/PO: Protection of open spaces

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy BG/PO: Protection of open spaces. This option is preferred as it plans positively for open space.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative. This is because it would not plan positively for the provision of open space, which is required by national planning policy and would damage the character and quality of life in settlements.

**Table 5.35: Policy BG/PO: Protection of open spaces**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	<b>0</b>

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A
<b>2. Access to services and facilities</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>3. Social inclusion and equalities</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>4. Health</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>5. Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	<b>+?</b>
<b>6. Landscape and townscape</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>7. Historic environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>8. Efficient use of land</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>

## A. Preferred policy

**5.206** Policy BG/PO: Protection of open spaces supports the identification of new open spaces, in addition to the protection of existing open spaces with reference made to village greens, parks, recreation areas, allotments, community orchards, Protected Village Amenity Areas and Local Green Space. Open spaces can provide a community focal point and promote equality in access to open space, which is particularly important following the COVID-19 pandemic which highlighted the inequalities in access to open space. Access to open space can have beneficial effects on people's health and wellbeing and support increased levels of physical activity. Therefore, minor positive effects

are expected in relation to SA objectives 2: access to services, 3: social inclusion and equalities and 4: health. A minor positive but uncertain effect is expected in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity because providing open green spaces may result in habitat creation.

**5.207** Green open spaces can be important landscape features, particularly in Cambridge, and therefore a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape. The preferred policy is also expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA objectives 11: adaptation to climate change and 12: climate change mitigation because the provision of open space, which includes allotments and community orchards, would reduce food miles and the emissions associated with transportation of food, in addition to preventing the loss of undeveloped land which has more capacity to absorb surface runoff.

## Policy BG/EO: Providing and enhancing open spaces

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy BG/EO: Providing and enhancing open spaces. This option is preferred as it plans positively for open space.
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative. This is because the NPPF requires local authorities to plan positively for the provision of open space, which would not be achieved through this option.

**Table 5.36: Policy BG/EO: Providing and enhancing open spaces**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	0
2. Access to services and facilities	++
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+
4. Health	++
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+
6. Landscape and townscape	+
7. Historic environment	0
8. Efficient use of land	0
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	+
12. Climate change mitigation	+
13. Air quality	0
14. Economy	0
15. Employment	0

### A. Preferred policy

**5.208** Policy BG/EO: Providing and enhancing open spaces supports open space provision in new developments, including sports pitches, play spaces for children and teenagers and more informal spaces. The amount of space provided will be determined by the Councils' adopted open space standards,

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

which are currently being reviewed. The provision of open space is likely to have beneficial effects on people's health and wellbeing by increasing opportunities for outdoor recreation and socialising. Where open space provision cannot be achieved on-site, financial contributions should be sought to improve off-site facilities. Therefore, overall, significant positive effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 2: access to services and 4: health. According to the policy, allotments and other community food growing opportunities such as community orchards should be sought. This will encourage consumption of healthy, locally grown produce, in addition to reducing food miles and associated emissions. This would result in a minor positive effect against SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and contribute to the significant positive effect already recorded against SA objective 4: Health.

**5.209** The policy states that it is important that green spaces are multifunctional and encourage people to socialise. This could encourage spontaneous interaction between different groups of people. In addition, the policy refers to providing facilities for different age groups (a protected characteristic), and therefore a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion. A minor positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity because open space provision may provide opportunities for habitat creation, particularly as the policy states green spaces should be multi-functional.

**5.210** The preferred policy is expected to have a minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape because open green spaces can form important landscape features. A minor positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 11: climate change adaptation because open green spaces are likely to include water spaces and therefore help reduce the heat island effect in urban areas, in addition to flood risk mitigation and water storage.

## Wellbeing and Inclusion

### Policy WS/HD: Creating healthy new developments

#### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy WS/HD: Creating healthy new developments. This is the preferred approach because the health of communities is a fundamental issue that development plans must consider.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because the health of communities is a fundamental issue that development plans must consider.

**Table 5.37: Policy WS/HD: Creating healthy new developments**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	0
2. Access to services and facilities	+
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+
4. Health	++
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+?
6. Landscape and townscape	0
7. Historic environment	0

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A
8. Efficient use of land	0
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	+?
11. Adaptation to climate change	+?
12. Climate change mitigation	++
13. Air quality	++
14. Economy	0
15. Employment	+?

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.211** Policy WS/HD: Creating healthy new developments contains a graphic setting out the health principles to be applied to new developments, drawing on the ten principles developed from the Healthy New Towns initiative. However, it is unclear how the graphic will be translated into the preferred policy approach. Whilst it is noted that some elements of the graphic are likely to be addressed by other policies within the plan (which have been appraised separately within this chapter), Policy WS/HD has been appraised on its own merits.

**5.212** The graphic included in the preferred policy approach states that healthcare, leisure and other local services should be clustered together with adequate public transport connections and new developments must provide legible and permeable environments that conserve local landmarks and features and ensure that the public realm is accessible. New developments must also protect, enhance and create multi-functional blue and green infrastructure. The graphic also promotes a healthy diet by requiring that new developments provide opportunities for local food production and seeks to control the establishment of hot-food takeaways. However, it is unclear how this will be translated into the preferred policy approach. In addition, the policy

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

seeks to draw on principles from the Healthy New Towns initiative, including the assessment of local health, care needs and assets (Principle 2), inspire and enable healthy eating (Principle 6), enable healthy play and leisure (Principle 8) and develop health services that help people to stay well (Principle 9).

Therefore, the policy is likely to have a significant positive effect against SA objective 4: Health as it is likely to promote health and wellbeing and encourage healthy lifestyles, promote mental wellbeing through the design of attractive places and opportunities for social interaction and provide sufficient access to local health services and facilities, such as healthcare centres. Although it is not clear how this will be translated into the preferred policy approach, the graphic included in the policy seeks to provide development within proximity to existing or new services and facilities that benefit and are accessible for residents on Greater Cambridge, while Principle 4 of the Healthy New Town initiative seeks to create compact neighbourhoods. The clustering of development would generate activity in centres, creating social hubs and meeting places and promote their vitality. Therefore, minor positive effects are expected against SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities and SA objective 3: Social inclusion.

**5.213** Although it is not clear how this will be translated into the preferred policy approach, the graphic included in the policy requires that new developments protect, enhance and create multi-functional blue and green infrastructure to support human and natural life, contributing to tackling air pollution, improving water quality and reducing flood risk. Therefore, uncertain minor positive effects are expected against SA objective 10: Water, SA objective 11: Climate change adaptation, and SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity because the policy is likely to provide opportunities for people to come into contact with wildlife, encouraging respect for and raising awareness of the sensitivity of biodiversity.

**5.214** The graphic included in the policy states that walking, cycling and public transport should be prioritised over the use of private vehicles, that facilities for these modes of transport should be provided in new developments and seeks to promote connectivity and safe routes between neighbourhoods, local services and new developments. However, it is unclear how this will be translated into the preferred policy approach. The Healthy New Town initiative on which the preferred policy approach will draw from seeks to maximise active travel

(Principle 5) in new development. As such, Significant positive effects are also expected against SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 13: Air quality as the policy promotes the use of more sustainable transport and seeks to reduce the need to travel. In addition, the graphic included in the policy seeks to ensure that new developments are connected to the walking and cycling network and public transport system to ensure that there is good access to employment opportunities. New developments must also take the opportunity to employ local labour and provide training and skills. However, it is unclear how this will be translated into the preferred policy approach. Therefore, the policy is likely to provide for employment opportunities that are easily accessible via sustainable modes of transport and an uncertain minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 15: Employment.

## Policy WS/CF: Community, sports, and leisure facilities

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy WS/CF: Community, sports, and leisure facilities. This is the preferred approach because it would enable the Plan to provide sufficient provision to support local growth and encourage greater social interaction for more cohesive and resilient communities
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because there is a need to respond to local issues and provide sufficient provision to support growth in a sustainable form.

**Table 5.38: Policy WS/CF: Community, sports, and leisure facilities**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	0
2. Access to services and facilities	++
3. Social inclusion and equalities	++
4. Health	++
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0
7. Historic environment	0
8. Efficient use of land	0
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0
12. Climate change mitigation	+
13. Air quality	+
14. Economy	0
15. Employment	0

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.215** Policy WS/CF: Community, sports, and leisure facilities sets out what new community, sports and leisure facilities should be provided and sustained through new development. The policy supports the development of new facilities in sustainable, accessible locations where there is a local need. The

policy requires that new and enhanced facilities address a wide variety of needs, including maximising access for all ages and abilities, but take into account of what already exists in the area as not to undermine their long-term viability. As well as requiring new and improved facilities, existing facilities will be protected where the loss would cause an unacceptable reduction in the level of community or service provision. The policy supports community development strategies in large scale developments and new communities in order to foster greater community interaction and place making, as well as social infrastructure to provide support to new residential developments. Therefore, the policy will ensure the provision of sufficient local services and facilities to benefit local residents and encourage community cohesion and support social inclusion, resulting in significant positive effects against SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities and SA objective 3: Social inclusion. In addition, the policy will encourage healthy lifestyles by maintaining, creating and enhancing recreation and sports facilities and is therefore likely to have a significant positive effect against SA objective 4: Health.

**5.216** Policy WS/CF: Community, sports, and leisure facilities also promotes the co-location of different services in highly accessible locations to improve overall accessibility for everyone by reducing the need for people to travel. Therefore, minor positive effects are expected against SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 13: Air quality.

## Policy WS/MU: Meanwhile uses during long term redevelopments

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy WS/MU: Meanwhile uses during long term redevelopments. This is the preferred approach because it will enable the Council to maximise opportunities provided by vacant sites

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

- B. Alternative option – No policy. This is not the preferred approach because it would not encourage a sense of community early on in major new developments or maximise opportunities provided by vacant sites
  
- C. Alternative option – Policy that only relates to phased development on major sites. This is not the preferred approach because it would not enable the Council to maximise opportunities provided by vacant sites

**Table 5.39: Policy WS/MU: Meanwhile uses during long term redevelopments**

SA Objective	A	B	C
1. Housing	0	0	0
2. Access to services and facilities	++?	0	+
3. Social inclusion and equalities	++	0	+
4. Health	0	0	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0	0	0
7. Historic environment	0	0	0
8. Efficient use of land	++	0	+
9. Minerals	0	0	0
10. Water	0	0	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0	0	0
12. Climate change mitigation	0	0	0
13. Air quality	0	0	0
14. Economy	0	0	0

SA Objective	A	B	C
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.217** Policy WS/MU: Meanwhile uses during long term redevelopments sets out how meanwhile uses should be provided on vacant sites or in underused buildings as part of the phased development of major development sites and in other vacant sites and premises where a longer-term use is still being resolved in order to support the local community and contribute to the vitality, vibrancy and viability of the area as new communities develop. The preferred policy option is therefore expected to encourage the provision of services and facilities including pop-up shops or cultural or creative uses that support sustainable growth in new communities, resulting in a significant positive effect against SA objective 2: Access to services and 3: Social inclusion. However, as it is no known what services and facilities would be provided, the effect in relation to SA objective 2 is uncertain. In addition, the policy will contribute to an efficient use of land in Greater Cambridge through the maximisation of development on vacant sites or underused buildings. As such, a significant positive effect is expected against SA objective 8: Efficient use of land.

**B. No Policy**

**5.218** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised it would not provide the positive outcomes that option A would bring to the local community and may mean that it takes longer to foster a sense of community in new communities.

## C. Policy that only relates to phased development on major sites

**5.219** Option C would restrict the preferred policy requirements to phased development on major sites, excluding meanwhile uses in vacant and underused buildings. Whilst benefits of allowing and encouraging meanwhile uses would still occur, this option would reduce the likelihood of and scale of benefits to the local community in relation to the contribution to the vitality and vibrancy of the area as well as the efficient use of land as a result of the development of previously developed land. As such, minor positive effects are expected against SA objectives 2: Access to services. 3: Social inclusion and 8: Land.

## Policy WS/IO: Creating inclusive employment and business opportunities through new developments

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy WS/IO: Creating inclusive employment and business opportunities through new developments. This is the preferred approach because it would encourage more skilled and semi-skilled employment and support the need of lower skilled workers in the area.
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This is not the preferred approach because it would not contribute towards maximising opportunities to respond to the skills issues identified in Greater Cambridge.

**Table 5.40: Policy WS/IO: Creating inclusive employment and business opportunities through new developments**

SA Objective	A	B
1. Housing	0	0
2. Access to services and facilities	+	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+	0
4. Health	0	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0	0
7. Historic environment	0	0
8. Efficient use of land	0	0
9. Minerals	0	0
10. Water	0	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0	0
12. Climate change mitigation	0	0
13. Air quality	0	0
14. Economy	++	0
15. Employment	++	0

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.220** Policy WS/IO: Creating inclusive employment and business opportunities through new developments requires new developments to contribute to the skills and training needs of local residents and provide access for local businesses to supply chain opportunities. New developments can therefore

provide opportunities to maximise skills development and employment opportunities for local people, providing an opportunity to support new and growing communities in the area and address financial exclusion. As such, significant positive effects are expected against SA objective 14: Economy and SA objective 15: Employment, and minor positive effects are expected against SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities and SA objective 3: Social inclusion.

## B. No policy

**5.221** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised it would not provide the positive outcomes that option A would bring in terms of employment opportunities.

## Policy WS/HS: Pollution, health and safety

### Policy options

- D. Preferred policy – Policy WS/HS: Pollution, health and safety. This is the preferred approach because it will enable the Plan to prevent development from contributing to, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability.
- E. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because these are key planning issues that need to be addressed to ensure the creation of healthy places.

**Table 5.41: Policy WS/HS: Pollution, health and safety**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	0
2. Access to services and facilities	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0
4. Health	++
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0
7. Historic environment	0
8. Efficient use of land	+
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0
12. Climate change mitigation	0
13. Air quality	++
14. Economy	0
15. Employment	0

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.222** Policy WS/HS: Pollution, health and safety sets out how development should take into account sources of pollution. It requires that new development does not result in, or is subject to, significant adverse effects as a result of noise, vibration, odour and light pollution and, therefore, will contribute to the conservation of public health and wellbeing. As such, a significant positive effect

is expected against SA objective 4: Health. In addition, the preferred policy approach is likely to benefit wildlife in the area by preventing unacceptable levels of environmental pollution, resulting in a minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity.

**5.223** The policy requires that proposals are appropriate for the air quality in the area and that they address impacts on air quality. This is likely to contribute to the minimisation of adverse effects on air quality, particularly in air quality management areas (AQMAs), such as in the city centre and part of the A14. Therefore, a significant positive effect is expected against SA objective 13: Air quality.

**5.224** In addition, policy WS/HS: Pollution, health and safety requires consideration to be given to land contamination and to ensure that the land is suitable for the end use, resulting in a minor positive effect against SA objective 8: Efficient use of land.

## Great Places

### Policy GP/PP: People and place responsive design

#### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy GP/PP: People and place responsive design. This option is preferred as it will help set out a clear design vision and provide clarity about design expectations.
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative due to the requirement

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

for plans to set out a clear design vision and provide clarity about design expectations.

**Table 5.42: Policy GP/PP: People and place responsive design**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	0
2. Access to services and facilities	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	++
4. Health	++
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+
6. Landscape and townscape	++
7. Historic environment	+
8. Efficient use of land	0
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	+
12. Climate change mitigation	++
13. Air quality	+
14. Economy	+
15. Employment	0

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.225** Policy GP/PP: People and place responsive design seeks to achieve high quality design standards in both urban and rural areas. Development proposals

## **Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

are required to demonstrate how they will maintain and enhance the unique qualities of Greater Cambridge, which include the different landscape and settlement forms within the area. All planning applications are required to submit a Design and Access Statement and development will only be supported where proposals respond positively to the physical features of the area and enhance its character. According to the policy, development proposals should give consideration to the landscape and townscape and not have any adverse impact on available views, using appropriate local characteristics to inform the landscape design of new developments. Therefore, this policy is expected to protect and enhance the landscape and townscape, with a significant positive effect expected in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape. A minor positive effect is expected against SA objective 7: Historic environment because the City of Cambridge is recognised for its historic buildings and the policy requires development proposals to respond positively to features of historical importance.

**5.226** The preferred policy requires proposals to meet the principles of inclusive and healthy design, particularly meeting the needs of disabled people, the elderly and those with young children. The policy also seeks to protect those with protected characteristics under the Equality Act by removing the threat or perceived threat of crime through design. Therefore, significant positive effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 3: social inclusion and equalities and 4: health. The policy supports the location of development in areas that are well connected to their immediate locality, as well as transport infrastructure, and is therefore expected to reduce people's reliance on the private car and encourage more active modes of travel (i.e. walking and cycling). This would contribute to the positive effect already recorded against SA objective 4: Health, in addition to helping minimise emissions associated with use of the private car. The policy also requires proposals to support the climate emergency response by being low impact in delivery and maintenance. Therefore, a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and a minor positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change.. A minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 13: Air quality because car use contributes significantly to poor air quality and promoting more sustainable modes of travel will minimise pollution.

**5.227** The preferred policy promotes high quality design and the protection and enhancement of the character of Greater Cambridge. The measures outlined in this policy would ensure that Greater Cambridge remains an attractive place to live and would entice people to the area, including workers, which has the potential to increase productivity and generate inward investment. Therefore, a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 14: Economy.

**5.228** A minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity because the preferred policy seeks to protect the landscape, which includes the fen landscapes to the north of Greater Cambridge, which are rich in biodiversity.

## Policy GP/LC: Protection and enhancement of landscape character

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy GP/LC: Protection and enhancement of landscape character. This option is preferred as it will help ensure landscape issues are addressed in planning decisions.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative as policy guidance is needed to guide how landscape issues are addressed in planning decisions.

**Table 5.43: Policy GP/LC: Protection and enhancement of landscape character**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	0
2. Access to services and facilities	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0
4. Health	+
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+
6. Landscape and townscape	++
7. Historic environment	+
8. Efficient use of land	0
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0
12. Climate change mitigation	0
13. Air quality	0
14. Economy	0
15. Employment	0

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.229** Policy GP/LC: Protection and enhancement of landscape character outlines the different ways in which development should address landscape character. The policy supports the protection and enhancement of local landscape character and the overall setting of Cambridge, with reference made

to the Greater Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment. It also aims to maintain important gaps between settlements and to improve the overall visual amenity of the area. The policy is therefore expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape. A minor positive effect is also expected for SA objective 7: Historic environment, as this policy will help to protect the historic character of Cambridge city.

**5.230** A minor positive effect is expected for SA objective 4: Health, as protecting landscape, amenity and green space is likely to benefit the mental wellbeing of people in the area. A minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity because the policy seeks to enhance biodiversity and strengthen the well-defined and vegetated edge of Cambridge, which is likely to involve the planting of new hedgerows and vegetation.

## Policy GP/GB: Protection and enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy GP/GB: Protection and enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt. This option is preferred as it will provide a policy framework to ensure the Green Belt fulfils its role and opportunities to enhance the Green Belt are not missed.
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative due to the need to provide a clear policy framework specific to the Cambridge Green Belt.

**Table 5.44: Policy GP/GB: Protection and enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	-?
2. Access to services and facilities	+
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0
4. Health	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+
6. Landscape and townscape	++
7. Historic environment	+
8. Efficient use of land	+?
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0
12. Climate change mitigation	0
13. Air quality	0
14. Economy	-?
15. Employment	0

### A. Preferred policy

**5.231** Policy GP/GB: Protection and enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt seeks to protect the landscape character around Cambridge and avoid settlements merging into one another by limiting development in the Green Belt. This will have positive effects on the setting of the city of Cambridge, with a

significant positive effect expected in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape. The policy makes reference to the historic centre of Cambridge and aims to protect the unique character of Cambridge, which includes its historic buildings. Therefore, a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 7: Historic environment.

**5.232** According to the preferred policy, enhancement of the Green Belt is supported, including for recreation and biodiversity. Therefore, it may increase opportunities for people to use the Green Belt for recreation purposes, which could have beneficial effects on their health and wellbeing through an increase in physical activity. The preferred policy is therefore expected to have a minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities, in addition to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity because biodiversity enhancement in the Green Belt is supported.

**5.233** The preferred policy is expected to have a minor positive but uncertain effect in relation to SA objective 8: Efficient use of land because preventing development in the Green Belt may result in development being confined to areas elsewhere but which already contain built development. This would be an efficient use of previously developed land.

**5.234** Minor negative but uncertain effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 1: housing and 14: economy because land within the Green Belt cannot be developed but there may not be enough suitable sites available elsewhere, which could inhibit residential and employment development.

# Policy GP/QD: Achieving high quality development

## Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy GP/QD: Achieving high quality development. This option is preferred as it will ensure development responds to local design issues.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative due to the need to respond to local design issues.

**Table 5.45: Policy GP/QD: Achieving high quality development**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	0
2. Access to services and facilities	+
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+
4. Health	+
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0
6. Landscape and townscape	++
7. Historic environment	+
8. Efficient use of land	0
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0

SA Objective	A
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>+/-</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>+?</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.235** Policy GP/QD: Achieving high quality development outlines the requirements for design quality in new developments, including alterations and extensions to existing development. The policy supports active ground floor frontages which as well as providing passive surveillance would also create a vibrant and thriving building frontage, with beneficial effects on the townscape. The policy supports development that contributes and responds to local character and positively enhances the streetscape. For proposals that have the potential to break the existing skyline or which are significantly taller than the surrounding built form, they will need to demonstrate how they will enhance the existing landscape and townscape and not cause an adverse impact on the historic environment, through the submission of a Visual Assessment or Appraisal. Therefore, overall, a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape and a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 7: Historic environment, as this will also likely protect Cambridge’s historic core. The measures towards achieving high quality development in this policy would also ensure that Greater Cambridge remains an attractive place to live and may therefore entice people to the area, including workers, which could potentially increase productivity and generate inward investment. Therefore, a minor positive uncertain effect is expected in relation to SA objective 14: Economy.

**5.236** A minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 4: Health because as mentioned above, the policy supports passive surveillance through

active frontages, which may help minimise crime and the fear of crime. Further to this, all building entrances and exits must be safe and accessible for all users, with lighting and security integrated into the design. There is also a requirement in the policy for development to be designed in a way that does not have an adverse effect on neighbouring buildings in terms of amenity. A minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities because the policy supports inclusive design.

**5.237** The preferred policy avoids the mixing of incompatible uses and therefore residents are likely to be within close proximity of a range of services and facilities, which would reduce the need for them to travel elsewhere for certain amenities. This would reduce reliance on the private car and encourage walking and cycling, which would minimise emissions associated with use of the private car. Therefore, a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities. A mixed minor positive and minor negative effect is expected in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation because the policy makes provision for bicycle parking as well as car parking. Therefore, although the policy would support cycling, it would also support continued use of the private car, which generates CO2 emissions. A minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 13: Air quality because use of the private car contributes towards poor air quality. Support is also given in the policy to the development of adaptable buildings that can be adapted and reused so as to extend their lifespan and reduce the carbon impacts of demolition. This would contribute towards the minor positive effect already recorded against SA objective 12.

# Policy GP/QP: Establishing high quality landscape and public realm

## Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy GP/QP: Establishing high quality landscape and public realm This option is preferred as it will help respond to local landscape and townscape issues.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative due to the need to respond to local issues.

**Table 5.46: Policy GP/QP: Establishing high quality landscape and public realm**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	0
2. Access to services and facilities	+
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+
4. Health	+
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+
6. Landscape and townscape	++
7. Historic environment	+
8. Efficient use of land	0
9. Minerals	0

SA Objective	A
10. Water	<b>0</b>
11. Adaptation to climate change	<b>+</b>
12. Climate change mitigation	<b>+</b>
13. Air quality	<b>+</b>
14. Economy	<b>0</b>
15. Employment	<b>0</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.238** Policy GP/QP: Establishing high quality landscape and public realm outlines design quality expectations for landscape and public realm proposals. There is a requirement for proposals to relate to the character and intended function of the space in which they are located, in addition to the use of high quality and well-designed materials. Open spaces should be provided that are appropriate to the area, in addition to space for trees. These measures are expected to have beneficial effects on the landscape as they form important physical features. Therefore, a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape. According to the policy, historic street furniture should be retained and enhanced. Therefore, a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 7: Historic environment.

**5.239** The preferred policy promotes inclusive design, prioritises pedestrian movement and ensures good connectivity throughout the area, in addition to making provision for open space. This, along with ensuring routes are clear, navigable and there is space for seating, water fountains and other street furniture may encourage people to walk and cycle by making the environment more pleasant and comfortable to do so, including for those with protected characteristics, such as the physically disabled and neurodiverse. Therefore, minor positive effects are expected against SA objectives 2: access to services and facilities, 3: social inclusion and equalities and 4: Health. Minor positive

effects are also identified for SA objectives 12: Climate change mitigation and 13: Air pollution as encouraging people to walk and cycle will help minimise travel by car.

**5.240** A minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity because the policy seeks to retain and enhance existing features including trees and natural habitats, whilst also ensuring that biodiversity is enhanced through the siting of species native to the area and which are capable of adapting to the changing climate.

**5.241** The policy requires the provision of shade and shelter, both of which are important features as the climate changes and the summer months get hotter with more extreme rainfall events. With regard to flooding, the policy seeks to integrate surface water management into design so as to reduce flood risk. Therefore, for the reasons outlined above, a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change.

## Policy GP/HA: Conservation and enhancement of heritage assets

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy GP/HA: Conservation and enhancement of heritage assets. This option is preferred as it will help to ensure that development takes account of Greater Cambridge’s historic buildings and structures, and its historic places.
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative due to the requirements to set out a strategy regarding heritage, and the need to respond to local issues.

**Table 5.47: Policy GP/HA: Conservation and enhancement of heritage assets**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	0
2. Access to services and facilities	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0
4. Health	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0
6. Landscape and townscape	++
7. Historic environment	++
8. Efficient use of land	0
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0
12. Climate change mitigation	0
13. Air quality	0
14. Economy	0
15. Employment	0

### A. Preferred policy

**5.242** Policy GP/HA: Conservation and enhancement of heritage assets outlines requirements for development that could involve or affect historic buildings or structures. There is a requirement for proposals to demonstrate how it preserves or enhances the significance of the heritage assets, their

setting and the wider townscape, including views into, within and out of conservation areas. These measures are expected to have positive effects on landscape, townscape and historic assets as they form important physical features. Therefore, a significant positive effect is identified for SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape and SA objective 7: Historic environment.

## Policy GP/CC: Adapting heritage assets to climate change

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy GP/CC Adapting heritage assets to climate change. This option is preferred as it will help Greater Cambridge ensure that the environmental performance of heritage assets are balanced against the need to protect and enhance the character and value of that asset.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative as given the scale of heritage assets in the area, and the challenge of climate change, a policy is needed.

**Table 5.48: Policy GP/CC: Adapting heritage assets to climate change**

SA Objective	A
<b>1. Housing</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2. Access to services and facilities</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3. Social inclusion and equalities</b>	<b>0</b>

SA Objective	A
4. Health	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0
7. Historic environment	+
8. Efficient use of land	0
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	++
12. Climate change mitigation	++
13. Air quality	0
14. Economy	0
15. Employment	0

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.243** Policy GP/CC: Adapting heritage assets to climate change outlines requirements for development that includes historic buildings to ensure that energy improvements are being made and that their environmental performance is enhanced. Moreover, measures are taken to reduce carbon emissions and assist with adaptation to the climate change. Therefore, significant positive effects are identified in relation to SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change and SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation.

**5.244** In helping heritage assets adapt to climate change, this policy is likely to contribute to preservation of these assets and keep them in active use, where relevant. Therefore minor positive effects are expected for SA objective 7: Historic environment.

## Policy GP/PH: Protection of public houses

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy GP/PH: Protection of public houses. This option is preferred as it will help Greater Cambridge to ensure the loss of public houses is managed appropriately.
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option is not the preferred approach. The adopted local plan policies which protect public houses have reduced the loss of safeguarded public houses. If there was no future policy to safeguard these sites/uses, there is significant risk of additional losses.

**Table 5.49: Policy GP/PH: Protection of public houses**

SA Objective	A	B
1. Housing	0	0
2. Access to services and facilities	+	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+	0
4. Health	0	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0
6. Landscape and townscape	+?	0
7. Historic environment	+?	0
8. Efficient use of land	0	0
9. Minerals	0	0
10. Water	0	0

SA Objective	A	B
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>0</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.245** Policy GP/PH: Protection of public houses safeguards public houses, only allowing their loss to other uses where they are no longer needed within the community as a public house or other form of community facility. This policy ensures provision of public houses as they play important roles in a neighbourhood, street or village life providing a focal point for meeting and recreational activities and can help to promote a sense of community. Therefore, a minor positive effect is identified for SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities and SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equality.

**5.246** The policy supports diversification of public houses where this would respect the character of the site, therefore minor positive uncertain effects are identified in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape. Many pubs are also historic local buildings, therefore minor positive uncertain effects are identified for SA objective 7: Historic environment. These effects depend on the exact pub to be affected.

**5.247** Public houses are part of the local economy and provide employment opportunities directly at the premises and indirectly in the pub supplies, food and brewing industries. Moreover, they attract local people, office workers, shoppers and tourists, contributing to local spending. Therefore, minor positive effects are identified in relation to SA objective 14: Economy and SA objective 15: Employment.

# Jobs

## Policy J/NE: New employment development proposals

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy J/NE: New employment development proposals.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because it would not provide adequate policy guidance and would fail to support the economy, including the rural economy.

**Table 5.50: Policy J/NE: New employment development proposals**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	<b>0</b>
2. Access to services and facilities	<b>0</b>
3. Social inclusion and equalities	<b>0</b>
4. Health	<b>0</b>
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	<b>0</b>
6. Landscape and townscape	<b>+</b>
7. Historic environment	<b>0</b>
8. Efficient use of land	<b>0</b>

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>++</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.248** Part of this policy supports employment development at sites set out in the Strategy section. As the effects of locating development at those locations is assessed in relation to the allocation policies, it is not repeated here.

**5.249** Policy J/NE: New employment development proposals will include considerations to help determine whether proposals for employment development are acceptable. The policy will seek to support employment proposals where they are of an appropriate scale and character and in a sustainable location. The policy will therefore enable an adequate supply of employment land and would ensure that Greater Cambridge's sensitive and special landscapes and townscapes are protected, resulting in a significant positive against SA objective 14: Economy and a minor positive effect against SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape.

## Policy J/RE: Supporting the rural economy

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy J/RE: Supporting the rural economy.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This is not the preferred approach as it would not provide sufficient support for land based businesses or the re-use of buildings.
  
- C. Alternative option – Greater flexibility for residential uses of rural buildings. This is not the preferred approach as it would reduce opportunities to support the rural economy and instead encourage residential development in the countryside where there is greater reliance on the private car.

**Table 5.51: Policy J/RE: Supporting the rural economy**

SA Objective	A	B	C
1. Housing	0	0	+
2. Access to services and facilities	0	0	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0	0	0
4. Health	0	0	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+	0	0
6. Landscape and townscape	+	0	0
7. Historic environment	+	0	0

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A	B	C
8. Efficient use of land	++	0	++
9. Minerals	0	0	0
10. Water	+?	0	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0	0	0
12. Climate change mitigation	+?	0	-
13. Air quality	0	0	-
14. Economy	++	0	-?
15. Employment	0	0	0

### A. Preferred policy

**5.250** Policy J2/RE: Supporting the Rural Economy will support proposals for diversification schemes which enable the continued operation of agricultural and other land based rural businesses, supporting opportunities for the expansion and diversification of rural businesses and resulting in a significant positive effect against SA objective 14: Economy.

**5.251** The policy will also support schemes which are engaged in sustainable land management as well as the re-use of existing rural buildings for employment purposes and the replacement of buildings where it would bring an environmental improvement and where they are in keeping with their surroundings. As such, a significant positive effect is expected against SA objective 8: Efficient use of land and minor positive but uncertain effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 5: biodiversity and geodiversity, 6: Landscape and townscape, 7: Biodiversity and geodiversity and 10: Water.

**5.252** The policy states that, in particular, it will support schemes which are engaged in renewable / low carbon energy and will therefore encourage the

provision of energy from renewable sources. As such, a minor positive but uncertain effect is expected against SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation.

## B. No policy

**5.253** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised that it would not provide sufficient support for land based businesses or the re-use of buildings.

## C. Greater flexibility for residential uses of rural buildings

**5.254** Current policy requires buildings to be effectively marketed for employment first. Therefore, Option C, which seeks to provide greater flexibility for residential uses of rural buildings, may reduce the opportunities available to support the rural economy and may lead to residential development in the countryside where there is greater reliance on the private car to access everyday services. As such, this option will not reduce the need to travel, resulting in minor negative effects against SA objectives 12: Climate change mitigation and 13: Air quality, and a minor negative but uncertain effect against SA objective 14: Economy. However, Option C would encourage the re-use of existing rural buildings for residential use and would therefore provide for local housing need in rural areas and make an efficient use of land, resulting in a significant positive effect against SA objective 8: Efficient use of land and a minor positive effect against SA objective 1: Housing.

## Policy J/AL: Protecting the best agricultural land

### Policy options

A. Preferred policy – Policy J/AL: Protecting the best agricultural land.

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because national planning policy requires the impact of development on agricultural land to be considered.

**Table 5.52: Policy J/AL: Protecting the best agricultural land**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	0
2. Access to services and facilities	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0
4. Health	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0
7. Historic environment	0
8. Efficient use of land	++
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0
12. Climate change mitigation	0
13. Air quality	0
14. Economy	0
15. Employment	0

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.255** Policy J/AL: Protecting the best agricultural land will ensure that the impact of development on agricultural land and soils are given appropriate consideration. The policy seeks to ensure that development which would lead to the irreversible loss of the best agricultural land is restricted, unless the need for the development is sufficient to override the need to protect the agricultural value of the land. As such, the policy is likely to contribute towards minimising the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land, resulting in a significant positive effect against SA objective 8: Efficient use of land.

**Policy J/PB: Protecting existing business space**

**Policy options**

- A. Preferred policy – Policy J/PB: Protecting existing business space.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy: Allow employment land to be changed to other uses without restriction. This is not the preferred approach as it is considered there is a need to protect employment sites.

**Table 5.53: Policy J/PB: Protecting existing business space**

SA Objective	A	B
<b>1. Housing</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2. Access to services and facilities</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3. Social inclusion and equalities</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>4. Health</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5. Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A	B
6. Landscape and townscape	0	0
7. Historic environment	0	0
8. Efficient use of land	0	0
9. Minerals	0	0
10. Water	0	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0	0
12. Climate change mitigation	0	0
13. Air quality	0	0
14. Economy	++	0
15. Employment	0	0

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.256** Policy J/PB: Protecting existing business space will seek to control the change of use of existing business space in order to protect the loss of employment land. However, exceptions will be made where it can be demonstrated that the employment land is no longer needed. The policy sets out particular industrial sites within Cambridge that will be protected from the loss of employment floorspace. As such, the policy will help to ensure that an adequate supply of land is provided to meet local economic needs. However, by restricting the change of use of land within particular locations, this policy direction may prevent development of different planning use classes that may bring other benefits to the local area. Therefore, a significant positive effect is expected against SA objective 14: Economy.

## B. No policy

**5.257** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised that it would allow employment land to be changed to other uses without restriction when there is a need to protect employment sites and could therefore result in the loss of employment land.

## Policy J/RW: Enabling remote working

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy J/RW: Enabling remote working.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This is not the preferred approach as the COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted the need to support flexible working arrangements.

**Table 5.54: Policy J/RW: Enabling remote working**

SA Objective	A	B
1. Housing	0	0
2. Access to services and facilities	+/-	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+	0
4. Health	+	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0
6. Landscape and townscape	+	0

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A	B
7. Historic environment	0	0
8. Efficient use of land	+?	0
9. Minerals	0	0
10. Water	0	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0	0
12. Climate change mitigation	+	0
13. Air quality	+	0
14. Economy	+	0
15. Employment	++	0

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.258** Policy J/RW: Enabling remote working seeks to support remote working and working from home through the creation of local employment hubs and the partial conversion, extension or change of use of residential dwellings. The policy outlines criteria for acceptable types and scale of development, in addition to addressing impacts on neighbours including the generation of traffic, noise and disturbance, and the character and appearance of proposals. The policy is therefore likely to facilitate the delivery of employment space and home workspace and ensure employment opportunities are accessible to all while ensuring that local amenity, landscapes and townscapes are protected. Therefore, a significant positive effect is expected against SA objective 15: Employment and minor positive effects are expected against SA objectives 6: Landscape and townscape and 14: Economy. The policy is also expected to have a minor positive effect against SA objective 4: Health because, as mentioned already, the policy seeks to protect the amenity of neighbours and also supports flexible working which can have positive health implications by allowing people to fit work around their lives and not have to commute, which can reduce stress.

**5.259** In addition, by enabling residents to work from home, the policy will reduce the need to travel to work, reducing traffic congestion and therefore minimising greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution. As such, minor positive effects are expected against SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 13: Air quality. The policy direction could also contribute towards making an efficient use of land by reducing the overall amount of employment floorspace needed, resulting in a minor positive uncertain effect against SA objective 8: Efficient use of land.

**5.260** However, as the policy would encourage some residents to remain in close proximity to their homes, which may be located in rural areas, it may not promote the vitality and viability of the City of Cambridge but may support district and local centres located in close proximity to people's homes. Therefore, a mixed minor positive and minor negative effect is expected against SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities. The preferred policy direction would enable flexibility for working arrangements that would meet the needs of people in Greater Cambridge, resulting in a minor positive effect against SA objective 3: Social inclusion.

## B. No policy

**5.261** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised that it would not support flexible working arrangements following the COVID-19 pandemic.

# Policy J/AW: Affordable workspace and creative industries

## Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy J/AW: Affordable workspace and creative industries.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This is not the preferred approach as the market has not provided a sufficient supply of small workspaces to meet demand for such spaces in Greater Cambridge.

**Table 5.55: Policy J/AW: Affordable workspace and creative industries**

SA Objective	A	B
1. Housing	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2. Access to services and facilities	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
3. Social inclusion and equalities	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
4. Health	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
6. Landscape and townscape	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
7. Historic environment	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
8. Efficient use of land	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
9. Minerals	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
10. Water	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

SA Objective	A	B
11. Adaptation to climate change	0	0
12. Climate change mitigation	0	0
13. Air quality	0	0
14. Economy	+	0
15. Employment	+	0

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.262** Policy J/AW: Affordable workspace and creative industries will seek to address the availability of affordable workspace within Greater Cambridge by supporting proposals that incorporate affordable workspace at rents maintained below the market rate and requiring affordable workspace as a proportion of larger commercial developments. As such, the policy will ensure an adequate variety of employment floorspace to meet the economic and employment needs of Greater Cambridge and support opportunities for the expansion of businesses and business start-ups, all of which are likely to generate job opportunities. Minor positive effects are therefore expected against SA objectives 14: Economy and 15: Employment.

**B. No policy**

**5.263** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised that historically the market has not provided a sufficient supply of small workspaces to meet demand and without a policy this under provision would continue.

## Policy J/EP: Supporting a range of facilities in employment parks

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy J/EP: Supporting a range of facilities in employment parks.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This is not the preferred approach due to the need to support the ancillary facilities that make business parks and campuses more effective.

**Table 5.56: Policy J/EP: Supporting a range of facilities in employment parks**

SA Objective	A	B
1. Housing	0	0
2. Access to services and facilities	+	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+	0
4. Health	+	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0	0
7. Historic environment	0	0
8. Efficient use of land	0	0
9. Minerals	0	0
10. Water	0	0

SA Objective	A	B
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.264** Policy J/EP: Supporting a range of facilities in employment parks will provide support to appropriately scaled facilities including leisure, eating and social hub facilities within employment parks and campuses where they support the functioning of the employment area and are aimed primarily at meeting the needs of workers on site. The policy will therefore seek to provide for sufficient services and facilities for employment developments and, depending on the facilities provided, is likely to promote social interaction and healthier lifestyles (e.g. through the provision of multifunctional open spaces, green infrastructure and recreation/sports facilities which support leisure activities). In addition, if the services provided included creche, or day care services, this could assist working parents, although this is not specified in the proposed policy direction. Therefore, minor positive effects are expected against SA objectives 2: Access to services and facilities, 3: Social inclusion, 4: Health and 14: Economy.

**5.265** The policy will also support such facilities where they help to manage the transport impacts of the development and will therefore contribute to minimising traffic and congestion. As such, the policy is likely to help minimise greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution. Therefore, minor positive effects are expected against SA objectives 12: Climate change mitigation and 13: Air quality.

## B. No policy

**5.266** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised that it would not help increase the effectiveness of business parks and campuses.

## Policy J/RC: Retail and centres

### Policy options

A. Preferred policy – Policy J/RC: Retail and centres

B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because in the Council's opinion, consideration needs to be given to the different centres, along with the shops and services they provide, which are essential in supporting the long-term vitality and vibrancy of centres.

**Table 5.57: Policy J/RC: Retail and centres**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	0
2. Access to services and facilities	++
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0
4. Health	+?
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0
6. Landscape and townscape	+

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A
7. Historic environment	<b>0</b>
8. Efficient use of land	<b>0</b>
9. Minerals	<b>0</b>
10. Water	<b>0</b>
11. Adaptation to climate change	<b>0</b>
12. Climate change mitigation	<b>0</b>
13. Air quality	<b>0</b>
14. Economy	<b>++</b>
15. Employment	<b>0</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.267** Policy J/RC: Retail and centres will guide the consideration and treatment of retail, leisure and other city centre proposals and will seek to adapt to the changing retail environment. It will support the retention of retail and leisure and the revitalisation of high streets and will establish a hierarchy of centres across Greater Cambridge to guide considerations for the development of shops and high street related services. The policy will seek to ensure that the provision of new services and facilities are guided to the most appropriate and suitably accessible locations, while existing services and facilities which support the needs of local communities are protected. The policy states that out of centre locations will be considered with a preference for those most accessible to a centre. As such, the preferred policy direction will support opportunities for business, promote the vitality and viability of centres within Greater Cambridge and ensure the provision of sufficient local services and facilities to support communities, resulting in significant positive effects against SA objectives 2: Access to services and facilities and 14: Economy.

**5.268** The policy states that it will encourage leisure uses, which may include sport and recreation and therefore encourage physical activity. As such, an uncertain minor positive effect is expected against SA objective 4: Health. The policy will also seek to ensure that the development of new businesses and shops support the character, safety and vibrancy of existing centres and high streets, thereby protecting the local character of Greater Cambridge's centres. As a result, a minor positive effect is expected against SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape.

## Policy J/VA: Visitor accommodation, attractions and facilities

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy J/VA: Visitor accommodation, attractions and facilities.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because the sustainability and amenity impacts of visitor accommodation, as well as the significant role of tourism in Greater Cambridge, mean that policy guidance is required.

**Table 5.58: Policy J/VA: Visitor accommodation, attractions and facilities**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	+
2. Access to services and facilities	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A
4. Health	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0
6. Landscape and townscape	+
7. Historic environment	+
8. Efficient use of land	+
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0
12. Climate change mitigation	++/-?
13. Air quality	++/-?
14. Economy	+
15. Employment	+

## A. Preferred policy

**5.269** Policy J/VA: Visitor accommodation, attractions and facilities will outline where hotels and other types of visitor accommodation development will be supported and protected subject to the viability of the current use, thereby promoting the visitor economy in Cambridge and supporting associated employment opportunities, resulting in minor positive effects against SA objectives 14: Economy 15: Employment. The policy seeks to ensure that the development of visitor accommodation does not result in the loss of residential accommodation within and on the edge of Cambridge and will therefore contribute to ensuring that there is a sufficient supply of housing in the area. As a result, a minor positive effect is expected against SA objective 1: Housing.

**5.270** The preferred policy promotes the development of visitor accommodation in accessible locations where a range of services and facilities are available, which would reduce reliance on the private car and associated emissions, in addition to helping minimise air pollution. However, the policy also supports the development of visitor accommodation outside of settlement boundaries in locations that may not be as easily accessible. Therefore, mixed minor positive and minor negative but uncertain effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 12: climate change mitigation and 13: Air quality.

**5.271** According to the policy, visitor attractions should be limited in scale to complement the existing cultural heritage of the city and therefore a minor positive effect is expected against SA objective 7: Historic environment. A minor positive effect is also expected against SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape because the policy requires the conversion of residential properties to permanent visitor accommodation to not adversely affect the character of an area. The policy enables the change of use, conversion or replacement of suitable buildings to new visitor accommodation, appropriate to local circumstances, supporting an efficient use of previously developed land within Greater Cambridge. Therefore, a minor positive effect is expected against SA objective 8: Efficient use of land.

## Policy J/FD: Faculty development and specialist/language schools

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy J/FD: Faculty development and specialist/language schools.
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because it could result in unsustainable development, such as the location of new faculty developments in locations with poor accessibility. Additionally, there

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

would be no mitigation measures for reducing the impact of new development.

**Table 5.59: Policy J/FD: Faculty development and specialist/language schools**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	+
2. Access to services and facilities	+
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0
4. Health	+
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0
7. Historic environment	0
8. Efficient use of land	+
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0
12. Climate change mitigation	+
13. Air quality	+
14. Economy	0
15. Employment	+

## A. Preferred policy

**5.272** Policy J/FD: Faculty development and specialist/language schools will set out how higher education development and teaching facilities will be supported within Greater Cambridge and will therefore contribute towards supporting opportunities for young people and job seekers and delivering access to employment opportunities resulting in a minor positive effect against SA objective 15: Employment. The policy seeks to make an effective use of land, including a mix of uses on larger sites, resulting in a minor positive effect against SA objective 8: Efficient use of land.

**5.273** In addition, the policy aims to ensure that proposals contribute towards improvements in pedestrian and cyclist circulation and reductions in car parking provision. This is likely to encourage more healthy lifestyle choices, reduce the use of private vehicles and promote more sustainable modes of transport. Proposals involving public realm improvements and the introduction of active frontages at ground floor level will also be supported, which are likely to limit the potential for crime, as well as contribute to a reduction in the fear of crime. As such, minor positive effects are expected against SA objective 4: Health, SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 13: Air quality.

Policy J/FD will provide support for the development of specialist colleges and language schools which provide residential accommodation, social and amenity facilities for non-local residents. As such, the policy will seek to ensure that the supply of accommodation is sufficient for visiting students and that services and facilities are sufficiently accessible in order to protect the capacity of local services and facilities from exceedance, resulting in minor positive effects against SA objective 1: Housing and SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities.

## Homes

### Policy H/AH: Affordable housing

#### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy H/AH: Affordable housing. This is the preferred approach because it ensures provision is made for affordable housing, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning policies should specify the type of affordable housing that is required.
- C. Alternative option – Higher percentage of affordable homes. This is not the preferred approach because a higher percentage would impact on the viability and delivery of sites.
- D. Alternative option – Lower percentage of affordable homes. This is not the preferred approach because local authorities should continue to seek as much affordable housing delivery as viability allows.
- E. Alternative option – Continue adopted Cambridge Local Plan approach of seeking 25% affordable homes on sites of 10-14 dwellings and 40% affordable homes on sites of 15 dwellings or more. This is not the preferred approach because local authorities should continue to seek as much affordable housing delivery as viability allows and the Greater Cambridge Local Plan Strategic Spatial Options Viability Assessment (Aspinall Verdi, November 2020) indicates that securing 40% affordable homes on major developments is deliverable across Greater Cambridge.

**Table 5.60: Policy H/AH: Affordable housing**

SA Objective	A	C	D	E
1. Housing	++	++?	+	++
2. Access to services and facilities	0	0	0	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	++	++?	+/-	++
4. Health	0	0	0	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0	0	0	0
7. Historic environment	0	0	0	0
8. Efficient use of land	+	+	+	+
9. Minerals	0	0	0	0
10. Water	0	0	0	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0	0	0	0
12. Climate change mitigation	0	0	0	0
13. Air quality	0	0	0	0
14. Economy	0	0	0	0
15. Employment	0	0	0	0

### A. Preferred policy

**5.274** Policy H/AH: Affordable housing sets out the size of developments on which affordable homes will be provided and specifies the types of affordable housing required to address identified needs. It requires that 40% of new homes

on sites of 10 or more dwellings to be affordable. However, the policy sets out exceptions to this including where the development is solely for build to rent or for residential caravans, or the development is for specialist accommodation. The preferred policy option also sets out that Local Lettings Plans will be required where appropriate to help achieve mixed and balanced communities or to prioritise housing such as for local workers or for specific groups of people. As such, the policy will ensure the delivery of affordable homes in the area to meet the needs of mixed communities, resulting in significant positive effects against SA objective 1: Housing and SA objective 3: Social inclusion.

**5.275** Further exceptions to the requirement that 40% of new homes on sites of 10 or more dwellings to be affordable include where there can be a proportionate reduction as a result of vacant buildings being re-used or redeveloped. This will contribute to maximising the provision of housing on previously developed land and will make an efficient use of land in the area, resulting in a minor positive effect against SA objective 8: Efficient use of land.

### C. Higher percentage of affordable homes

**5.276** Although option C would ensure the delivery of affordable homes in the area to meet the needs of mixed communities, resulting in significant positive effects against SA objective 1: Housing and SA objective 3: Social inclusion, there is potential for a higher percentage of affordable homes to affect the viability and delivery of sites. As such, these effects are uncertain. An exception to the requirement of a particular percentage of new homes on sites of 10 or more dwellings to be affordable include where there can be a proportionate reduction as a result of vacant buildings being re-used or redeveloped. This will contribute to maximising the provision of housing on previously developed land and will make an efficient use of land in the area, resulting in a minor positive effect against SA objective 8: Efficient use of land.

## D. Lower percentage of affordable homes

**5.277** This is not the preferred approach because the Cambridgeshire and West Suffolk Housing Needs of Specific Groups study recommends that local authorities should seek as much affordable housing delivery as viability allows. The requirement for a lower percentage of affordable homes would reduce the benefits provided by the provision of affordable homes in new residential developments compared to Option A, resulting in minor positive effects against SA objectives 1: Housing and 3: Social inclusion. However, option D may not result in the provision of affordable housing to meet local needs and, therefore, the effect expected against SA objective 3 is mixed minor positive and minor negative. An exception to the requirement of a particular percentage of new homes on sites of 10 or more dwellings to be affordable include where there can be a proportionate reduction as a result of vacant buildings being re-used or redeveloped. This will contribute to maximising the provision of housing on previously developed land and will make an efficient use of land in the area, resulting in a minor positive effect against SA objective 8: Efficient use of land.

## E. Continue adopted Cambridge Local Plan approach of seeking 25% affordable homes on sites of 10-14 dwellings and 40% affordable homes on sites of 15 dwellings or more.

**5.278** Option D is likely to result in a reduced number of affordable homes being provided in the area, reducing the benefits provided by the provision of affordable homes in new residential developments. However, this option would only apply to development of 10-14 dwellings and would therefore reflect the preferred policy approach quite closely. This option would provide greater certainty for the delivery and viability of affordable housing within residential developments of this size. As a result, significant positive effects are expected against SA objectives 1: Housing and 3: Social inclusion. An exception to the requirement of a particular percentage of new homes on sites of 10 or more dwellings to be affordable include where there can be a proportionate reduction as a result of vacant buildings being re-used or redeveloped. This will contribute to maximising the provision of housing on previously developed land and will

make an efficient use of land in the area, resulting in a minor positive effect against SA objective 8: Efficient use of land.

## Policy H/ES: Exception sites for affordable housing

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy H/ES: Exception sites for affordable housing. This is the preferred approach because it will support the delivery of affordable housing, particularly in rural communities where current levels are low and new delivery is restricted by affordable housing only being required on sites of more than 10 dwellings.
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because it would restrict the planning authority's ability to deliver additional affordable housing where it is needed the most.
- C. Alternative option – Apply a more restrictive approach to rural exception sites. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because previous policies have been successful in bringing forward sites.
- D. Alternative option – Apply a more laissez-faire approach to the development of exception sites. This is not the preferred approach because it could lead to inappropriate sites coming forward, housing mixes being driven more by commercial gain than local need and rural exception sites being excluded by First Homes exception sites.

**Table 5.61: Policy H/ES: Exception sites for affordable housing**

SA Objective	A	D
1. Housing	++	++
2. Access to services and facilities	-?	-?
3. Social inclusion and equalities	++	++
4. Health	-?	-?
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0	0
7. Historic environment	0	0
8. Efficient use of land	-?	-?
9. Minerals	0	0
10. Water	0	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	-?	0
12. Climate change mitigation	-?	-?
13. Air quality	-?	-?
14. Economy	0	0
15. Employment	0	0

### A. Preferred policy

**5.279** Policy H/ES: Exception sites for affordable housing will support exception sites for residential development in appropriate locations including community-led housing where it meets an identified need for affordable housing and market housing where it can be justified on viability or deliverability grounds. The policy will therefore ensure the delivery of housing, particularly affordable housing,

resulting in a significant positive effect against SA objective 1: Housing and SA objective 3: Social inclusion. Encouraging any accompanying market housing to include custom and self-build housing may also contribute to SA objective 3: Social inclusion, as housing could be designed to meet individual needs.

**5.280** The policy also sets out that rural exception sites will be allowed in the Green Belt when it can be demonstrated that non-Green Belt alternative sites are not available. This may result in the loss of agricultural land and would not make use of previously developed land, leading to increased potential for surface water runoff and resulting in an uncertain minor negative effect against SA objective 11: Climate change adaptation. This may also result in the development of dwellings with poor access to services and facilities, which could encourage the use of private vehicles. As such, minor negative effects are expected against SA objectives 2: Access to services, 4: Health, 8: Efficient use of land, 12: Climate change mitigation and 13: Air quality. The preferred policy approach states that exception sites would be sited in 'appropriate locations', which may imply locations where there is good access to services and facilities. However, it is not clear from the preferred policy approach whether this is the case and so these effects will depend on the location and proximity of services and facilities, resulting in uncertainty against these SA objectives.

#### D. Apply a more laissez-faire approach to the development of exception sites

**5.281** The alternative option to apply a more laissez-faire approach to the development of exception sites and therefore implement fewer restrictions is likely to result in the development of more dwellings and affordable homes, resulting in significant positive effects against SA objectives 1: Housing and SA objective 3: Social inclusion. However, this is also likely to result in an increased loss of countryside and the potential for more homes with poor access to services and facilities in the area, leading to an increase in the use of private vehicles. Therefore, uncertain minor negative effects are expected against SA objectives 2: Access to services, 4: Health, 8: Land, 12: Climate change mitigation and 13: Air quality.

## Policy H/HM: Housing mix

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy H/HM: Housing mix. This is the preferred approach because it sets out the housing mix for new developments, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.
  
- B. Alternative option – Not including a policy setting out a housing mix for new developments and instead relying on the housing market to determine the housing mix. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because the National Planning Policy Framework requires that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community to be assessed and reflected in planning policies. Without a policy, the housing market and local circumstances determine the housing mix and there is a risk that the housing mix provided on new developments would not meet the needs of the area.
  
- C. Alternative option – Apply housing mix policy to all developments, including small sites. This option has not been appraised as it is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. This is because it is not practical to apply the housing mixes suggested to sites of less than 10 dwellings, and for smaller sites it is important to make best use of the land and to take account of local circumstances.
  
- D. Alternative option – Not including a policy setting out a housing mix for affordable dwellings, and therefore relying on local circumstances to determine the housing mix. This option has not been appraised as it is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. This is because without guidance in the Local Plan there is a risk that the affordable housing mix provided on new developments would not meet the needs of the area.

**Table 5.62: Policy H/HM: Housing mix**

SA Objective	A
<b>1. Housing</b>	<b>++</b>
<b>2. Access to services and facilities</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3. Social inclusion and equalities</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>4. Health</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5. Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6. Landscape and townscape</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>7. Historic environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>8. Efficient use of land</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>

### A. Preferred policy

**5.282** Policy H/HM: Housing mix sets out the requirement for new housing developments of 10 or more dwellings to provide an appropriate mix of housing sizes, with the proportions of dwellings of each size to be guided by the housing mix recommendations for each tenure, as set out in the policy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. As the proportion of dwellings of each size is

provided as a range, this allows flexibility for local circumstances. As such, the policy will ensure that an appropriate mix of housing is provided to meet a range of local needs, resulting in a significant positive effect against SA objective 1: Housing and a minor positive effect against SA objective 3: Social inclusion. A minor positive effect is expected against SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape because the policy states that exceptions will be allowed where an alternative housing mix is justified by site specific circumstances, such as local character, the built form of the new development and existing housing mix in the surrounding area, which will help conserve the character of local surroundings.

## Policy H/HD: Housing density

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy H/HD: Housing density. This is the preferred approach because it sets out the requirements for housing density, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because the National Planning Policy Framework requires plans to address housing density and the efficient use of land.
- C. Alternative option – Apply a blanket density across whole plan area. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because it would not reflect the range of settlements, and their differing characteristics, within Greater Cambridge.

**Table 5.63: Policy H/HD: Housing density**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	+
2. Access to services and facilities	+
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0
4. Health	+
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0
6. Landscape and townscape	+?
7. Historic environment	+?
8. Efficient use of land	+
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0
12. Climate change mitigation	+
13. Air quality	+
14. Economy	0
15. Employment	0

### A. Preferred policy

**5.283** Policy H/HD: Housing density seeks to use land efficiently by delivering site specific appropriate net densities across Greater Cambridge. Higher density developments will be encouraged in accessible and sustainable locations, which will ensure easy access to services and facilities. According to the policy, these locations will be highly accessible by walking, cycling and public

transport. This will reduce reliance on the private car and associated emissions, in addition to encouraging more active and sustainable travel choices. Reducing reliance on the private car will also help minimise air pollution. Therefore, minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 2: Access to services and facilities, 4: Health, 8: Efficient use of land, 12: Climate change mitigation and 13: Air quality. A minor positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 1: Housing because the policy will meet the needs of a growing population through housing delivery.

**5.284** A minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape because the policy proposes a design-led approach to determine the optimum development capacity of a site, giving consideration to such things as the character of the area and local circumstances. This would involve consideration of the historic environment and therefore a minor positive effect is also expected against SA objective 7: Historic environment. However, both effects are recorded as uncertain because the city of Cambridge, which has a strong historic character, is where the higher densities are likely to be.

## Policy H/GL: Garden land and subdivision of existing plots

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy H/GL: Garden land and subdivision of existing plots. This is the preferred approach because it sets what approach should be taken with respect to the development of garden land and subdivision of existing plots.
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This is not the preferred approach as it would not provide clear guidance on the approach that would be taken to development on garden land and subdivision of existing plots, leading to inconsistent outcomes.

**Table 5.64: Policy H/GL: Garden land and subdivision of existing plots**

SA Objective	A	B
1. Housing	0	0
2. Access to services and facilities	0	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0	0
4. Health	+	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+	0
6. Landscape and townscape	+	0
7. Historic environment	+	0
8. Efficient use of land	0	0
9. Minerals	0	0
10. Water	0	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0	0
12. Climate change mitigation	0	0
13. Air quality	0	0
14. Economy	0	0
15. Employment	0	0

### A. Preferred policy

**5.285** Policy H/GL: Garden land and subdivision of existing plots prevents inappropriate development of residential gardens and the subdivision of existing plots. Therefore, many homes would still have access to a garden, which is identified as an important environmental resource and therefore a minor positive

effect is expected in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity. A minor positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 4: Health because access to a garden can have beneficial effects on wellbeing, particularly following the COVID-19 pandemic which highlighted the importance of outdoor space.

**5.286** The preferred policy prevents inappropriate development of residential gardens and the subdivision of existing plots, with consideration given to the local character of an area and heritage. Therefore, minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 6: Landscape and townscape and 7: historic environment.

## B. No policy

**5.287** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised that it would not provide clear policy guidance on the approach taken to the development of garden land and the subdivision of existing plots.

## Policy H/SS: Residential space standards and accessible homes

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy H/SS: Residential space standards and accessible homes. This is the preferred approach because it ensures that new homes meet nationally described residential space standards.
- B. Alternative option – Not implementing nationally described space standards. This is not the preferred approach because evidence shows that developments would provide new homes below these standards.

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

- C. Alternative option – Not requiring new homes to meet the Building Regulations M4(2) standard. This is not the preferred approach because the Housing Needs of Specific Groups – Addendum for Greater Cambridge (2021) provides recommendations on the percentage of new homes that should meet this standard based on evidence of need. Furthermore, accessible and adaptable housing enables people to live more independently.
  
- D. Alternative option – Not requiring new homes to meet Building Regulations M4(3) standard. This is not the preferred approach because there is evidence of a need for wheelchair user homes.
  
- E. Alternative option – Not provide guidance on the provision of private amenity space for all new homes. This is not the preferred approach because national planning policy states that planning policies should ensure that developments create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

**Table 5.65: Policy H/SS: Residential space standards and accessible homes**

SA Objective	A	B	C	D	E
<b>1. Housing</b>	++	+	-	-	++
<b>2. Access to services and facilities</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>3. Social inclusion and equalities</b>	++	++	--	--	++
<b>4. Health</b>	++	-	++	++	-
<b>5. Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>6. Landscape and townscape</b>	0	0	0	0	0

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A	B	C	D	E
7. Historic environment	0	0	0	0	0
8. Efficient use of land	0	0	0	0	0
9. Minerals	0	0	0	0	0
10. Water	0	0	0	0	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0	0	0	0	0
12. Climate change mitigation	0	0	0	0	0
13. Air quality	0	0	0	0	0
14. Economy	0	0	0	0	0
15. Employment	0	0	0	0	0

A. Preferred policy

**5.288** Policy H/SS: Residential space standards and accessible homes sets out the internal space standards for new homes and the proportion of accessible and adaptable dwellings to be provided as part of the dwelling mix so as to ensure different people's housing needs are met. Therefore, a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 1: Housing. The policy requires all new homes to meet the nationally described residential space standard and for residential conversions and homes created via change of use, to meet or exceed this national standard. This will ensure that new residents have a decent amount of space to live in, which will have beneficial effects on their mental health and wellbeing. As such, a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 4: Health.

**5.289** The preferred policy requires all new homes to be accessible and adaptable, in line with the Building Regulations M4(2). There is also a

requirement for 5% of affordable homes on new developments that include 20 or more affordable homes to be wheelchair user friendly, in accordance with the Building Regulations M4(3)(a). This will ensure that new homes meet the specialist needs of those with protected characteristics, including the elderly and disabled. Therefore, a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities.

## **B. Not implementing nationally described space standards**

**5.290** This option is not the preferred approach because without a specific requirement for residential space standards, some developments may be designed below acceptable standards, which can have adverse effects on people's mental wellbeing. Therefore, this option has the potential to result in a minor negative effect against SA objective 4: Health.

**5.291** A significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities because there is a requirement for all new homes to be accessible and adaptable, in line with the Building Regulations M4(2). There is also a requirement for 5% of affordable homes on new developments that include 20 or more affordable homes to specifically be designed for wheelchair users. This will ensure that new homes meet the specialist needs of those who are physically less able, including the elderly and disabled. A minor positive effect is expected against SA objective 1: Housing because the policy supports the development of accessible and adaptable dwellings so as to ensure different people's housing needs are met.

## **C. Not requiring new homes to meet the Building Regulations M4(2) standard**

**5.292** This option is not the preferred approach because without a specific requirement for new homes that meet the Building Regulations M4(2) standard, people's specialist housing needs would not be met. This would exclude certain groups of people from finding a house suitable to their needs and therefore a

significant negative effect is expected against SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities. In addition, the Cambridgeshire and West Suffolk Housing Needs of Specific Groups – Addendum for Greater Cambridge (2021) provides recommendations on the percentage of new homes that should meet this standard based on evidence of need. This option is therefore expected to have a minor negative effect against SA objective 1: Housing.

**5.293** This option requires all new homes to meet the nationally described residential space standard, which will ensure that residents have a decent amount of space to live in. This will have beneficial effects on their mental health and wellbeing, with a significant positive effect expected against SA objective 4: Health.

#### D. Not requiring new homes to meet the Building Regulations M4(3) standard

**5.294** This option is not the preferred approach because without a specific requirement for new homes that meet the Building Regulations M4(3) standard, there would be no 'wheelchair user' dwellings. Yet evidence points to a need for wheelchair user homes. Therefore, a significant negative effect is expected against SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities and a minor negative effect is expected against SA objective 1: Housing.

**5.295** This option requires all new homes to meet the nationally described residential space standard, which will ensure that residents have a decent amount of space to live in. This will have beneficial effects on their mental health and wellbeing, with a significant positive effect expected against SA objective 4: Health.

## E. Not provide guidance on the provision of private amenity space for all new homes

**5.296** This option is not the preferred approach because without a specific requirement for private amenity space, some developments may be designed to provide new homes with low standards of private amenity space for existing and future users. Yet the COVID-19 pandemic highlighted the importance of access to private amenity space. Not providing any or a very limited amount of private amenity space can have adverse effects on people's mental wellbeing and therefore a minor negative effect is expected against SA objective 4: Health.

This option sets out the internal space standards for new ones and the proportion of accessible and adaptable dwellings to be provided as part of the dwelling mix so as to ensure different people's housing needs are met. Therefore, a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 1: Housing. This option requires all new homes to be accessible and adaptable, in line with the Building Regulations M4(2). There is also a requirement for 5% of affordable homes on new developments that include 20 or more affordable homes to be wheelchair user friendly, in accordance with the Building Regulations M4(3)(a). This will ensure that new homes meet the specialist needs of those with protected characteristics, including the elderly and disabled. Therefore, a significant positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities.

## Policy H/SH: Specialist housing and homes for older people

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy H/SH: Specialist housing and homes for older people. This is the preferred approach because the considerations for specialist housing are different to other types of housing development

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

and it enables the delivery of sufficient specialist housing to meet the identified need.

B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because it is considered that a criteria based policy is needed as the considerations for specialist housing are different to other types of housing development.

C. Alternative option – Not to allocate sites for new specialist housing at new settlements and within urban extensions. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because Councils need to set out how they will deliver sufficient specialist housing to meet the identified need, and these new developments should seek to deliver balanced and mixed communities. In addition, national planning policy requires that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies.

**Table 5.66: Policy H/SH: Specialist housing and homes for older people**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	++
2. Access to services and facilities	+?
3. Social inclusion and equalities	++
4. Health	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0
7. Historic environment	0

SA Objective	A
<b>8. Efficient use of land</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>

## A. Preferred policy

**5.297** Policy H/SH: Specialist housing and homes for older people sets out criteria for considering proposals for new specialist housing in order to ensure that new specialist housing is provided where there is a need, in suitably accessible locations, without resulting in an excessive concentration of such housing. Therefore, the policy will provide for local specialist housing need that meet the requirements of specific groups in Greater Cambridge, resulting in significant positive effects against SA objective 1: Housing and SA objective 3: Social inclusion. Suitably accessible locations are likely to be those that are in proximity to existing or new services and facilities. However, this is not made clear within the policy, resulting in an uncertain minor positive in relation to SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities.

## Policy H/CB: Self and custom-build homes

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy H/CB: Self and custom-build homes. This is the preferred approach because it reflects the needs of those who wish to commission or build their own homes and will enable the Council to meet local demand.
  
- B. Alternative option – Allow the development of custom and self-build housing generally as an exception to policy. This is not the preferred approach because it is likely to restrict the delivery of rural exception sites for affordable housing.
  
- C. Alternative option – No policy. This option was not appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because Local planning authorities are required to have regard to need for self and custom build by Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 and therefore must permit sufficient plots to meet local demand. The provision of sufficient plots is unlikely without a policy.

**Table 5.67: Policy H/CB: Self and custom-build homes**

SA Objective	A	B
<b>1. Housing</b>	<b>++</b>	<b>+/-</b>
<b>2. Access to services and facilities</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3. Social inclusion and equalities</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>4. Health</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5. Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A	B
<b>6. Landscape and townscape</b>	<b>-?</b>	<b>-?</b>
<b>7. Historic environment</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>8. Efficient use of land</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## A. Preferred policy

**5.298** Policy H/CB: Self and custom-build homes seeks to create available plots to meet the demand for custom and self-build homes and sets out criteria such as the requirement that 5% of all homes in residential developments of 20 dwellings or more. The preferred policy approach will therefore enable the Council to meet local demand for those who wish to commission or build their own homes and contributing towards housing provision, resulting in a significant positive effect against SA objective 1: Housing.

**5.299** Individuals wishing to acquire a new home via self/custom build rather than buying it from a traditional housebuilder are likely to be motivated by a desire to have greater influence on the design and layout, and to have the ability to create a home to suit their individual needs and aspirations. In seeking to provide the flexibility for this to happen there is a risk that this policy, which facilitates provision of new homes via self-custom build, could result in inappropriate development design (e.g. inconsistent with surrounding landscape

and townscape) with potential minor negative effects in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape. However, this effect is uncertain as it will depend on housing design.

**5.300** The policy also sets out criteria to allow for community led self and custom build projects, which is likely to help facilitate the integration of new neighbourhoods with existing neighbourhoods. In addition, self- and custom build homes can help ensure homes meet the needs of individuals, including those with protected characteristics, resulting in a minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion.

## **B. Allow the development of custom and self-build housing generally as an exception to policy**

**5.301** Option B to allow for the development of custom and self-build housing generally as an exception to policy is likely to limit the delivery of rural exception sites for affordable housing due to unrestricted custom and self-build housing that may occupy sites which would otherwise be reserved as exception sites for affordable housing. However, option B would still allow for the development of custom and self-build housing which will support local housing need, resulting in a mixed minor positive and minor negative effect against SA objective 1: Housing.

**5.302** Individuals wishing to acquire a new home via self/custom build rather than buying it from a traditional housebuilder are likely to be motivated by a desire to have greater influence on the design and layout, and to have the ability to create a home to suit their individual needs and aspirations. In seeking to provide the flexibility for this to happen there is a risk that this policy, which facilitates provision of new homes via self-custom build, could result in inappropriate development design (e.g. inconsistent with surrounding landscape and townscape) with potential minor negative effects in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape. However, this effect is uncertain as it will depend on housing design.

## Policy H/BR: Build to Rent Homes

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy H/BR: Build to Rent Homes. This is the preferred approach because it reflects the local housing needs of those who rent their homes.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option was not appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because national planning policy requires the housing needs of different groups, including those who wish to rent their homes, to be reflected in planning policies.
  
- C. Alternative option – Include a policy with a presumption against Build to Rent development. This is not the preferred approach because national planning policy requires the housing needs of different groups, including those who rent their homes, to be reflected in planning policies and there is evidence of local need for this housing type.

**Table 5.68: Policy H/BR: Build to Rent Homes**

SA Objective	A	C
<b>1. Housing</b>	<b>++</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>2. Access to services and facilities</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3. Social inclusion and equalities</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>4. Health</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5. Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6. Landscape and townscape</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>7. Historic environment</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A	C
<b>8. Efficient use of land</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.303** Policy H/BR: Build to Rent Homes sets out criteria for how proposals for solely Build to Rent homes or where they are proposed as part of mixed tenure developments are considered. The policy requires that at least 20% of homes on Build to Rent development of 10 or more homes will be affordable private rented dwellings that contribute towards the 40% affordable homes required to be provided on a mixed tenure development. As such, minor positive effects are expected against SA objective 1: Housing and SA objective 3: Social inclusion.

**5.304** The policy also requires that all Build to Rent developments must meet nationally described residential space standards and accessible home standards. As such, a minor positive effect is expected against SA objective 4: Health.

## C. Include a policy with a presumption against Build to Rent developments

**5.305** Option C to include a policy with a presumption against Build to Rent developments is unlikely to ensure that the provision of such housing is sufficient to meet local demand. As there is evidence of local need for this type of housing, the Local Plan will need to specify how proposals for this type of development will be considered. As such, minor negative effects are expected against SA objective 1: Housing and SA objective 3: Social inclusion. In addition, national planning policy requires the housing needs of different groups, including those to rent their homes, to be reflected in planning policies.

## Policy H/MO: Houses in multiple occupation (HMOs)

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy H/MO: Houses in multiple occupation (HMOs). This is the preferred approach because HMOs form an important part of the housing market in Cambridge and enables the Council to reflect and meet the local housing need.
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This is not the preferred approach because it is considered that a criteria based policy is needed as the considerations for HMOs are different to other types of development and therefore it is necessary to safeguard local amenity.
- C. Alternative option – Include a policy with a presumption against further HMOs. This is not the preferred approach because it would not allow for sufficient flexibility in the housing market to deliver the housing needed for different groups.

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

D. Alternative option – Not requiring HMOs to meet space and amenity standards. This is not the preferred approach because national planning policy states that planning policies should ensure that developments create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

**Table 5.69: Policy H/MO: Houses in multiple occupation**

SA Objective	A	B	C	D
1. Housing	+	0	-	+
2. Access to services and facilities	0	0	0	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	++	0	-	+
4. Health	++	0	0	-
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0	0	0	0
7. Historic environment	0	0	0	0
8. Efficient use of land	0	0	0	0
9. Minerals	0	0	0	0
10. Water	0	0	0	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0	0	0	0
12. Climate change mitigation	0	0	0	0
13. Air quality	0	0	0	0
14. Economy	0	0	0	0

SA Objective	A	B	C	D
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.306** Policy H/MO: Houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) will set out criteria to be used when considering proposals for new HMOs, which will ensure that new HMOs are provided in suitable locations with appropriate facilities. Therefore, the policy will contribute towards ensuring the provision of such housing to meet local needs, resulting in a minor positive effect against SA objective 1: Housing.

**5.307** The policy will also ensure that HMOs provide a good standard of amenity for their occupiers, requiring all new larger HMOs to meet the nationally described residential space standards as well as accessible and adaptable home standards and provide direct access to amenity space as required for all new homes. The policy would therefore support the housing needs of specific groups of people such as students and ensure that developments create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Therefore, significant positive effects are expected against SA objective 3: Social inclusion and SA objective 4: Health.

**B. No policy**

**5.308** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised it would not provide the positive outcomes that option A would bring in terms of providing for a variety of housing needs and ensuring good levels of amenity.

## C. Include a policy with a presumption against further HMOs

**5.309** Option C to include a policy with a presumption against further HMOs would not provide sufficient flexibility to reflect site specific circumstances and may restrict the development of such housing types where it is needed most. This option is also unlikely to ensure that the provision of such housing is sufficient to meet local demand. As HMOs form an important part of the housing market in Cambridge, the Local Plan will need to specify how proposals for this type of development will be considered. As such, minor negative effects are expected against SA objective 1: Housing and SA objective 3: Social inclusion.

## D. Not requiring HMOs to meet space and amenity standards

**5.310** Option D to include a policy that does not require HMOs to meet space and amenity standards has the potential to result in a minor negative effect against SA objective 4: Health because without a specific requirement for residential space and amenity standards, some developments of this type may be designed to provide new homes with low standards of residential space and amenity for existing and future residents. The need for sufficient residential space and amenity standards was emphasised during the coronavirus pandemic, and the lack of which may result in negative impacts on mental health and wellbeing.

**5.311** As option D would still contribute to the delivery of HMOs, just not adhere to space and amenity standards. It is therefore likely to contribute towards meeting local housing demand and will support the housing needs of specific groups of people such as students, resulting in minor positive effects against SA objective 1: Housing and SA objective 3: Social inclusion.

# Policy H/SA: Student accommodation

## Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy H/SA: Student accommodation. This is the preferred approach because it will enable the Council because students make up a significant proportion of the population of Cambridge and if adequate provision is not made for their needs in suitable locations this would lead to significant pressures on the local housing market. This approach will therefore enable the Council to reflect and meet the local housing need.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because national planning policy requires that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies.
  
- C. Alternative option – Include a policy with a presumption against further student accommodation. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because national planning policy requires that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies.

**Table 5.70: Policy H/SA: Student accommodation**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	+
2. Access to services and facilities	+
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A
4. Health	<b>0</b>
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	<b>0</b>
6. Landscape and townscape	<b>0</b>
7. Historic environment	<b>0</b>
8. Efficient use of land	<b>0</b>
9. Minerals	<b>0</b>
10. Water	<b>0</b>
11. Adaptation to climate change	<b>0</b>
12. Climate change mitigation	<b>0</b>
13. Air quality	<b>0</b>
14. Economy	<b>0</b>
15. Employment	<b>+</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.312** Policy H/SA: Student accommodation will guide the Council's consideration of proposals for student accommodation for higher education institutions and will set out criteria for the type and location of development that will be permitted to support the identified growth for student accommodation in the future. The policy will therefore ensure that new student accommodation is suitable in type, layout, affordability and that existing student accommodation will continue to be protected to avoid increasing demand for housing in the private rental market. As such, policy H/SA: Student Accommodation will make provision for local housing needs, resulting in a minor positive effect against SA objective 1: Housing. As students make up a significant proportion of the population of Cambridge, the preferred policy approach will contribute towards

ensuring that adequate provision is made for their needs, resulting in a minor positive effect against SA objective 3: Social inclusion.

**5.313** Furthermore, the preferred policy approach would ensure the provision of accommodation that enables younger people to attend academic institutions in the area. Therefore, it will support access to education and result in the provision of employment opportunities. As such, a minor positive effect is expected against SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities and SA objective 15: Employment.

## Policy H/DC: Dwellings in the countryside

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy H/DC: Dwellings in the countryside. This is the preferred approach because it sets out how development proposals in the countryside should be addressed, in line with national planning policy.
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because it would lead to uncertainty as to how development proposals would be considered and determined. In addition, national planning policy requires local development plans to address rural housing issues.

**Table 5.71: Policy H/DC: Dwellings in the countryside**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	+
2. Access to services and facilities	0

SA Objective	A
<b>3. Social inclusion and equalities</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>4. Health</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5. Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6. Landscape and townscape</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>7. Historic environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>8. Efficient use of land</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>

## A. Preferred policy

**5.314** Policy H/DC: Dwellings in the countryside sets out criteria for the types of residential development that may be acceptable in the countryside. As such, the policy will enable the development of dwellings in the countryside where they are needed the most, resulting in a minor positive effect against SA objective 1: Housing.

**5.315** The policy only supports new dwellings, replacement dwellings and the extension of existing dwellings where they are in scale and character with the area. Further to this, the change of use and adaptation of redundant or disused buildings to residential use will only be permitted if there will be an enhancement to the immediate setting of the buildings. Therefore, overall, a

minor positive effect is expected against SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape.

**5.316** The policy will also ensure that the change of use and adaptation of redundant or disused buildings to residential use will only be permitted where they are unsuitable for employment use or it is demonstrated that there is no demand for their development for employment use. Furthermore, the policy will ensure that proposals for dwellings for workers in businesses where a rural location is essential are supported where they are needed and where the enterprise is likely to remain financially viable. As such, the policy will ensure that there is an adequate supply of land to meet local economic needs, resulting in a minor positive effect against SA objective 14: Economy.

## Policy H/RM: Residential moorings

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy H/RM: Residential moorings. This is the preferred approach because the considerations for residential moorings are different to other types of development and therefore require a policy.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because it is considered that a criteria based policy is required to maintain the quality of the river environment and safeguard local amenity, as the considerations for residential moorings are different to other types of development. In addition, national planning policy requires that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies.

**Table 5.72: Policy H/RM: Residential moorings**

SA Objective	A
<b>1. Housing</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>2. Access to services and facilities</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3. Social inclusion and equalities</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>4. Health</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5. Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6. Landscape and townscape</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>7. Historic environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>8. Efficient use of land</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>

### A. Preferred policy

**5.317** Policy H/RM: Residential moorings will set out criteria for new residential moorings and will ensure that new moorings are provided in suitable locations with appropriate infrastructure. The policy will therefore provide for the local housing need, contribute to meeting the needs of people who wish to live in residential boats and ensure that the required infrastructure is provided. As

such, a minor positive effect is expected against SA objective 1: Housing. A minor positive effect is also expected against SA objective 3: Social inclusion because the policy makes provision for non-conventional housing needs.

**5.318** The policy will seek to ensure that new moorings do not have significant negative impacts on the local landscape and townscape, as well as local amenity. As a result, a minor positive effect is expected against SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape.

## Policy H/RC: Residential caravan sites

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy H/RC: Residential caravan sites. This is the preferred approach because it will ensure that provision is made for residential caravan sites.
  
- B. Alternative option – Include criteria-based policy for new residential caravan sites/mobile home parks with additional flexibility. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because the considerations for residential caravan sites / mobile home parks are not sufficiently different to other residential developments. In addition, national planning policy requires that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies.

**Table 5.73: Policy H/RC: Residential caravan sites**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	+
2. Access to services and facilities	0

SA Objective	A
<b>3. Social inclusion and equalities</b>	?
<b>4. Health</b>	?
<b>5. Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6. Landscape and townscape</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>7. Historic environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>8. Efficient use of land</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.319** The proposed policy direction in relation to Policy H/RC: Residential Caravan sites will support proposals for new residential caravan sites/mobile home parks. Therefore, it would make provision for housing and meeting the needs of people who wish to live in residential caravans/mobile homes. Therefore, a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 1: Housing. However, this policy would not necessarily ensure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users or provide for specialist housing needs. As such, uncertain effects are expected in relation to SA objectives 3: Social inclusion and 4: Health.

# Policy H/GT: Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites

## Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy H/GT: Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites. This is the preferred approach because it will ensure provision is made for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople, in line with national planning policy.
  
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because national planning policy requires that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies.

**Table 5.74: Policy H/GT: Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	+
2. Access to services and facilities	+
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+
4. Health	+
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0
6. Landscape and townscape	+
7. Historic environment	+

SA Objective	A
<b>8. Efficient use of land</b>	<b>+</b>
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.320** Policy H/GT: Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites will seek to ensure that provision is made for the housing needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The policy sets out criteria to guide land supply allocations where there is identified need that cannot be met on existing sites, resulting in minor positive effects against SA objectives 1: Housing and 3: Social inclusion. It is required that sites are capable of providing an appropriate environment for residents in relation to health, safety and living conditions, including safe vehicle and pedestrian access, the provision of essential utilities and to be within a reasonable distance of local facilities and services without placing undue pressure on them. As such, the policy will ensure sufficient local services and facilities to support growing communities (which is expected to include health facilities) while protecting local amenity, resulting in minor positive effects against SA objectives 2: Access to services and facilities and 4: Health.

**5.321** The allocation of pitches or plots must also be appropriate to the site size and location, avoiding unacceptable adverse impacts on the amenity of surrounding land uses and rights of way, the countryside and landscape

character, heritage interests, biodiversity interests, or from traffic that is generated. As such, minor positive effects are expected against SA objectives 6: Landscape and townscape, 7: Historic environment and 8: Biodiversity and geodiversity.

## Policy H/CH: Community-led housing

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy H/CH: Community-led housing. This is the preferred approach because it ensures that community-led housing schemes are addressed by the Local Plan.
  
- B. Alternative option – To include a specific-criteria based policy for community-led housing. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative because community led housing is a way of delivering housing developments, and therefore the considerations for these housing developments are no different to other residential developments.
  
- C. Alternative option – To allow the development of community-led housing generally as an exception to policy

**Table 5.75: Policy H/CH: Community-led housing**

SA Objective	A	C
1. Housing	+	+
2. Access to services and facilities	0	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0	+?/-?

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A	C
<b>4. Health</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5. Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>6. Landscape and townscape</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>7. Historic environment</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>8. Efficient use of land</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>9. Minerals</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>10. Water</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>11. Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>12. Climate change mitigation</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>13. Air quality</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>14. Economy</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>15. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.322** Policy H/CH: Community-led housing sets out that any proposals for community led housing developments, including rural exception sites for affordable housing (see H/ES) and self and custom build homes (see H/CB), will be considered against the policies applicable to residential development. The policy is therefore likely to support the provision of housing and ensure that there is a range of delivery models that meet the needs of local communities, resulting in a minor positive effect against SA objective 1: Housing.

## C. To allow the development of community-led housing generally as an exception to policy

**5.323** This is not the Councils' preferred approach because this option is likely to hamper the delivery of rural exception sites for affordable housing. This is due to the fact community-led housing schemes can create competition for sites on the edge of settlements and when it is possible to get permission for higher value uses outside of settlements, this limits the delivery of affordable housing via rural exception sites. Although this option could help contribute to the delivery of affordable homes in the area to meet the needs of local communities, the contribution toward affordable housing would be limited. Therefore, a minor positive effect is expected against SA objective 1: Housing.

**5.324** A mixed minor positive and minor negative effect with uncertainty is expected in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion because although a community-led housing scheme could promote social inclusion by involving different members of a community in housing delivery, it could also have the opposite effect and result in some members feeling excluded from decisions.

## Infrastructure

### Policy I/ST: Sustainable Transport and Connectivity

#### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy I/ST: Sustainable Transport and Connectivity. This option is preferred as it would ensure that sustainable transport is fully considered through the planning application process, taking into account the local context.

B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it is not considered to be a reasonable alternative because relying on the Local Transport Plan or national policy would not providing sufficient detail to address the local context and ensure that sustainable transport is fully considered through the planning application process.

**Table 5.76: Policy I/ST: Sustainable Transport and Connectivity**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	0
2. Access to services and facilities	++
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+
4. Health	++
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0
7. Historic environment	0
8. Efficient use of land	0
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0
12. Climate change mitigation	++
13. Air quality	++
14. Economy	+
15. Employment	+

## A. Preferred policy

**5.325** Policy I/ST: Sustainable Transport and Connectivity maximises opportunities for sustainable travel in new developments and aims to improve connectivity for all users. This would deliver sustainable communities by encouraging walkable neighbourhoods and healthy towns, providing better access to services and facilities. Therefore, a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities.

**5.326** A significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 4: Health because the policy would deliver new and improved active travel connections and refers developers to additional targeted active travel guidance which should be used in the design of new developments. The policy is also expected to minimise vehicle use through innovative and flexible solutions by making journeys by active travel modes more convenient than by car. This would minimise the number of polluting vehicles on roads, helping to minimise congestion and related greenhouse gas emissions, and air pollution in Greater Cambridge. Therefore, a significant positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 13: Air quality. Minimising air pollution would also further add to the positive effects identified for SA objective 4: Health.

**5.327** A minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities because developers will be encouraged to promote inclusive communities through improving sustainable transport modes and supporting high levels of pedestrian activity in communities as a result. The policy would also increase accessibility of town centres for a variety of people and therefore make these areas more attractive for potential businesses. Therefore, minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 14: Economy and SA objective 15: Employment.

## Policy I/EV: Parking and Electric Vehicles

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy I/EV: Parking and Electric Vehicles. This option is preferred as it would provide flexibility to parking requirements but also responds to climate change and the need to adapt to changing vehicle types.
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been appraised as it is not considered to be a reasonable alternative because national planning policy requires consideration of parking.
- C. Set specific standards for car parking provision. This is not the preferred approach as the flexibility provided by a design-led approach to car parking is favoured.
- D. Do not set requirements for vehicle charging. This is not the preferred approach given the need for developments to respond to climate change, and to adapt to changing vehicle types.

**Table 5.77: Policy I/EV: Parking and Electric Vehicles**

SA Objective	A	C	D
1. Housing	0	0	0
2. Access to services and facilities	+	+	+
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+	+	+
4. Health	+	+	+
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

SA Objective	A	C	D
6. Landscape and townscape	+/-?	+?	+/-?
7. Historic environment	0	0	0
8. Efficient use of land	0	0	0
9. Minerals	0	0	0
10. Water	0	0	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0	0	0
12. Climate change mitigation	++/-	++/--?	--/+
13. Air quality	++/-	++/--?	--/+
14. Economy	0	0	0
15. Employment	0	0	0

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.328** Policy I/EV: Parking and Electric Vehicles will make provision for cycle and car parking, including electric vehicle charging points. The increased provision of a range of cycle parking and electric charging infrastructure would contribute to minimising vehicle emissions in Greater Cambridge. However, the provision of car parking could discourage the use of other active modes of transport for some users and maintain their reliance on travelling by car, which would increase vehicle emissions. Therefore, mixed significant positive and minor negative effects are expected in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 13: Air quality.

**5.329** The provision of cycle and car parking infrastructure would improve the ability for residents to access important services and facilities. This would also likely make the option of travelling via active modes of transport (namely cycling) more attractive, subsequently promoting a healthier lifestyle for Greater Cambridge residents. Therefore, minor positive effects are expected in relation

to SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities and SA objective 4: Health and wellbeing. A minor positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities because the policy makes provision for non-standard cycles and disabled people parking to be delivered which could both meet the needs of a more diverse range of users, including those with protected characteristics such as age and disability.

**5.330** A mixed minor positive and minor negative but uncertain effect is expected in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape because the policy favours a site by site design-led approach that is flexible to local needs by setting out indicative, rather than maximum, car parking standards. Whilst in many developments this would improve the overall quality of place, in other developments the lack of maximum standards could conversely result in comparably more car parking provision than other policy options. Furthermore, the townscape quality and setting of towns in Greater Cambridge could be impacted as a result of car parking being accommodated within the public realm, resulting in a loss of sense of place.

### C. Set specific standards for car parking provision

**5.331** Alternative option C effects are all uncertain because the car parking standards have not been specified and it is not known whether this would lead to greater or lesser parking provision than Option A. This policy option would have similar effects to option A in relation to SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities, SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities, and SA objective 4: Health. However, this option would make provision for car parking and electric charging infrastructure which would be set to specific standards and ensure developments respond to the effects of climate change. Whilst this could contribute to reducing vehicle emissions, which improve local air quality, it could be used in some developments as the default level and result in more vehicles using the site than the approach taken in option A. Therefore, mixed significant positive and significant negative but uncertain effects are expected in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 13: Air quality. The effects are uncertain because no parking standards have been specified and the level of vehicle use, and subsequent vehicle emissions, is unknown.

**5.332** A minor positive but uncertain effect is expected in relation to SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape because this option would set out maximum, rather than indicative, car parking standards. This could improve the overall quality of place by limiting car parking which would otherwise impact the quality and setting of towns in Greater Cambridge by losing sense of place. The effect is uncertain because this is dependent on the parking standards used and whether they differ between Cambridge city and the rest of the plan area, as per current policy.

## D. Do not set requirements for vehicle charging

**5.333** Alternative option D would have similar effects to option A in relation to SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities, SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities, SA objective 4: Health and SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape, as overall levels of vehicle and cycle parking are assumed to be the same under this option. However, this policy option would not set requirements for vehicle charging and could mean that the required infrastructure is not in place for the phase out of petrol and diesel cars by 2030. This would also increase the number of polluting vehicles in Greater Cambridge in comparison to other policy options. Therefore, mixed minor positive and significant negative effects in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 13: Air quality.

## Policy I/FD: Freight and Delivery Consolidation

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy I/FD: Freight and Delivery Consolidation. This is the preferred approach as there is a need to address how goods are distributed locally.

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

B. Alternative option – No policy. This is not the preferred approach due to the need to address the issue of how goods are distributed locally.

**Table 5.78: Policy I/FD: Freight and Delivery Consolidation**

SA Objective	A	B
1. Housing	0	0
2. Access to services and facilities	0	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0	0
4. Health	+	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0	0
7. Historic environment	0	0
8. Efficient use of land	0	0
9. Minerals	0	0
10. Water	0	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0	0
12. Climate change mitigation	++	0
13. Air quality	++	0
14. Economy	0	0
15. Employment	0	0

A. Preferred policy

**5.334** Policy I/FD: Freight and Delivery Consolidation would reduce the number of freight and servicing vehicles in Greater Cambridge and subsequently reduce

the environmental impacts and total emissions from freight trips. This will be consolidated by improving provision of freight and servicing by more sustainable modes of transport such as rail. Therefore, significant positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 13: Air quality.

**5.335** A minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 4: Health because the policy would enable sustainable last-mile movements such as by cycle and electric vehicle. This would ensure that deliveries in Greater Cambridge improve residential amenity through a reduction in road noise and increased road safety, whilst maintaining substantial and efficient access to freight and delivery services.

## B. No policy

**5.336** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised it would not provide the positive outcomes that option A would bring in terms of improving amenity and reducing vehicle emissions.

## Policy I/SI: Safeguarding important infrastructure

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy I/SI: Safeguarding important infrastructure. This is the preferred option because there is a need to safeguard important infrastructure so that it works effectively or can be brought back into use in future.

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

B. Alternative option – No policy. This option was not assessed as it is not considered to be a reasonable alternative because it would risk jeopardising important infrastructure.

**Table 5.79: Policy I/Sl: Safeguarding important infrastructure**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	0
2. Access to services and facilities	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0
4. Health	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0?
6. Landscape and townscape	0
7. Historic environment	0
8. Efficient use of land	0
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0
12. Climate change mitigation	+?
13. Air quality	+?
14. Economy	+
15. Employment	0

## A. Preferred policy

**5.337** Policy I/Sl: Safeguarding important infrastructure would safeguard a number of key major infrastructure projects which would facilitate the needs of relevant businesses and organisations in Greater Cambridge, including the University. Therefore, a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 14: Economy.

**5.338** Railway sidings safeguarded as part of the Local Plan process could harm important wildlife and geological features if used in the future. Therefore, a negligible but uncertain effect is expected in relation to SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity.

**5.339** Similarly, infrastructure safeguarded as a result of this policy, namely rail freight facilities, could assist in mitigating the effects of climate change, and contributing to minimising air pollution by removing freight vehicles from the road and helping to minimise congestion. Nevertheless, this would be dependent on the possibility of rail freight facilities coming into use. Therefore, positive but uncertain effects are expected in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 13: Air quality.

## Policy I/AD: Aviation Development

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy I/AD: Aviation Development. This is the preferred policy because it responds to the need to ensure impacts of proposals, and air safety, are fully considered.
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This has not been assessed as it is not considered to be a reasonable alternative because there is a need to

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

provide policy guidance to ensure impacts of proposals, and air safety, are fully considered.

**Table 5.80: Policy I/AD: Aviation Development**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	0
2. Access to services and facilities	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0
4. Health	+
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	+?
6. Landscape and townscape	+?
7. Historic environment	+?
8. Efficient use of land	+?
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	+?
12. Climate change mitigation	-
13. Air quality	-
14. Economy	+
15. Employment	0

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.340** Policy I/AD: Aviation Development would support development at Cambridge Airport subject to no significant adverse impacts on the

environment, which would provide opportunities for the growth of aviation businesses and the economy. Other aerodromes which play an important economic role in Greater Cambridge would also be safeguarded from inappropriate development. Therefore, a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 14: Economy.

**5.341** Minor negative but uncertain effects are expected in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 13: Air quality because the policy would support the potential for aviation-related business growth, which contributes to emissions of greenhouse gases and air pollution.

**5.342** This policy would ensure that there are no negative impacts on the environment at airfields other than Cambridge Airport and would also ensure no significant adverse impacts on the environment from development at Cambridge Airport in terms of residential amenity, human health and safety, landscape and adverse lighting, heritage assets, noise, public rights of way, nature conservation interests, flooding, and impact of potential to deliver renewable energy. Therefore, minor positive but uncertain effects are expected in relation to SA objective 4: Health, SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity, SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape, SA objective 7: Historic environment, SA objective 8: Efficient use of land, SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change. The effects are uncertain because the policy could result in some minor adverse impacts which are dependent on the scale and type of development proposed at Cambridge Airport.

## Policy I/EI: Energy Infrastructure Masterplanning

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy I/EI: Energy Infrastructure Masterplanning. This is the preferred option as it responds to the need to manage growing energy demands whilst facilitating the transition to net zero.

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

B. Alternative option – No policy. This is not the preferred approach as energy infrastructure availability has become an important issue in Greater Cambridge particularly with the growing emphasis on renewable energy. It is important this addressed in a planned way by major developments rather than on an ad-hoc basis.

**Table 5.81: Policy I/EI: Energy Infrastructure Masterplanning**

SA Objective	A	B
1. Housing	0	0
2. Access to services and facilities	0	0
3. Social inclusion and equalities	0	0
4. Health	0	0
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0	0
7. Historic environment	0	0
8. Efficient use of land	0	0
9. Minerals	0	0
10. Water	0	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0	0
12. Climate change mitigation	++	0
13. Air quality	++	0
14. Economy	0	0
15. Employment	0	0

## A. Preferred policy

**5.343** Policy I/EI: Energy Infrastructure Masterplanning requires strategic developments to consider the capacity of infrastructure to support development and the approach to energy provision in relation to net zero carbon development, by requiring energy masterplans to be produced. This would ensure that methods to decarbonise development, such as the electrification of transport, are realised and subsequently improve Greater Cambridge's response to climate change and air quality in these areas. Smart energy management and reduction of peak loads will help to minimise overall energy use. Therefore, significant positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 13: Air quality.

## B. No policy

**5.344** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised it would not provide the positive outcomes that option A would bring in terms of decarbonising the grid and improving air quality.

## Policy I/ID: Infrastructure and Delivery

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy I/ID: Infrastructure and Delivery. This is the preferred option as clarity is needed as to what infrastructure is required to support development, and when and how it should be secured.
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This option has not been assessed as it is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. This is because it would not provide sufficient clarity regarding the requirement of developers to

**Chapter 5** Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

mitigate the impacts of their developments, what infrastructure was needed and when, and how it would be secured.

**Table 5.82: Policy I/ID: Infrastructure and Delivery**

SA Objective	A
1. Housing	0
2. Access to services and facilities	++
3. Social inclusion and equalities	+?
4. Health	+
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0
7. Historic environment	0
8. Efficient use of land	0
9. Minerals	0
10. Water	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0
12. Climate change mitigation	+
13. Air quality	+
14. Economy	+
15. Employment	+

**A. Preferred policy**

**5.345** Policy I/ID: Infrastructure and Delivery ensures that infrastructure that is necessary for development is delivered by developers directly or via financial

contributions. This would help maintain the level of access to services and facilities despite increases in demand as a result of population. Therefore, a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 2: Access to services and facilities. This policy is expected to ensure that there will be sufficient health and social infrastructure, such as GP surgeries and schools and could also include community uses. Community uses and open space could help foster social inclusion and interaction, resulting in minor positive uncertain effects for SA objective 3: Social inclusion and equalities. New transport infrastructure such as walking and cycling routes and public transport provision would also likely be provided for by this policy, which would make these modes of transport more attractive to residents and workers in Greater Cambridge. Ensuring this infrastructure is delivered in line with identified need will minimise users' reliance on the car and engrain sustainable travel patterns when accessing services and facilities from the outset. Therefore, minor positive effects are also expected in relation to SA objective 4: Health, SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation, SA objective 13: Air quality, SA objective 14: Economy and SA objective 15: Employment.

## Policy I/DI: Digital infrastructure

### Policy options

- A. Preferred policy – Policy I/DI: Digital infrastructure. This is the preferred approach as it will ensure digital infrastructure is delivered to support development and support modern lifestyles.
- B. Alternative option – No policy. This is not the preferred approach due to the importance of provision for economic, social and climate change.
- C. Continuing the current policy approach by just requiring ducting rather than for actual connections. This is not the preferred approach as this is insufficient to ensure infrastructure is delivered to support development.

**Table 5.83: Policy I/DI: Digital infrastructure**

SA Objective	A	B	C
1. Housing	0	0	0
2. Access to services and facilities	++	0	+
3. Social inclusion and equalities	++	0	+
4. Health	++	0	+
5. Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0
6. Landscape and townscape	0	0	0
7. Historic environment	0	0	0
8. Efficient use of land	0	0	0
9. Minerals	0	0	0
10. Water	0	0	0
11. Adaptation to climate change	0	0	0
12. Climate change mitigation	+	0	+?
13. Air quality	+	0	+?
14. Economy	++	0	+
15. Employment	++	0	+

## A. Preferred policy

**5.346** Policy I/DI: Digital infrastructure would facilitate high quality broadband and smart infrastructure in new developments which would in turn support sustainable economic growth in Greater Cambridge. This would also support a diverse range of employment and businesses, including home-working and rural industries. Therefore, significant positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 14: Economy and SA objective 15: Employment opportunities. Improving digital infrastructure through development would also support the wellbeing and social inclusion of local residents who increasingly depend on good internet connectivity to access vital services such as online shopping, as well as in relation to health and education, which has been important in the Covid-19 pandemic. It also provides a means of connection to other people for those at risk of loneliness and isolation. This in turn would assist in reducing health inequalities and ensure vulnerable residents are not disadvantaged by their protected characteristics. Therefore, significant positive effects are also expected in relation to SA objective 2: services and facilities, SA objective 3: community cohesion and SA objective 4: Health and wellbeing. Minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 13: Air quality because improved digital connectivity which supports online access for residents and businesses would minimise the need for these users to travel by car, therefore minimising vehicle emissions.

## No policy

**5.347** This option would not result in any sustainability effects as it would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan. Nevertheless, it is recognised it would not provide the positive outcomes that option A would bring in terms of improving digital connectivity, enabling online access for diverse residents and businesses and contribute to minimising vehicle emissions.

## C. Continuing the current policy approach by just requiring ducting rather than for actual connections

**5.348** Alternative option C would facilitate ducting in new developments rather than requiring actual connections to be made. This would help to support sustainable economic growth in Greater Cambridge; however it would also represent a missed opportunity to make better connections for broadband, mobile phone and smart infrastructure which would be more efficient for residents and businesses. Therefore, minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 14: Economy and SA objective 15: Employment opportunities. Minor positive effects are also expected in relation to SA objective 2: services and facilities, SA objective 3: community cohesion and SA objective 4: Health and wellbeing because ducting would facilitate some improvement to internet connectivity for residents to access vital services, including providing a means of connection for more vulnerable residents, however the potential for this policy option to further reduce inequalities such as in regard to health and education for these residents would be missed. Only some improvement to internet connectivity would also mean that residents and business may be more reliant on using private cars for travel than for option A, Therefore, minor positive uncertain effects are recorded in relation to SA objective 12: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 13: Air quality.

## Recommendations

**5.349** This section sets out recommendations for the policies when fully worked at the next stage of plan making, in order to minimise negative sustainability effects and maximise positive sustainability effects. The recommendations are as follows:

- Vision – it is recommended that the vision includes reference to adaptation to the impacts of climate change, as well as mitigation.
- Policy S/NEC: North East Cambridge could explicitly identify opportunities at the site to address flood risk, such as through the inclusion of SuDS.

## Chapter 5 Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

- Policy S/AMC: Areas of Major Change and Policy S/OA: Opportunity areas in Cambridge – it is recommended that these policies include stronger Green Infrastructure aspirations in relation to public realm improvements.
- Policy S/GC: Genome Campus – The policy could be improved by including commitments to delivering sustainable transport links at this location.
- Policy BG/BG: Biodiversity and geodiversity – It is recommended that this policy includes reference to the mitigation hierarchy, in that adverse effects on biodiversity and geodiversity should be avoided if possible, if not then reduced, then any residual effects mitigated, with compensation only being used as a last resort.
- Policy BG/GI: Green infrastructure – it is recommended that this policy is renamed to ‘green and blue infrastructure’ in order to be clear that blue infrastructure is also included. The policy could more clearly identify which initiatives support the Wicken Fen Vision Area.
- Policy BG/TC: Improving tree canopy cover and the tree population – It is recommended that this policy refers to the need to ensure new planting is resilient to climate change. For example, when referring to ‘locally appropriate species’, it is recommended ‘taking into account climate change’ is added.
- Policy BG/PO: Protection of open spaces - This policy could potentially be combined with BG/EO: Enhancing open. It is recommended that the policy could require all new developments to include some form of open space, be it public or private open space. The policy could also set out in what circumstances the total or partial loss of designated open spaces would (or would not) be permitted, in addition to a requirement for all open spaces to be inclusive and easily accessible to all. Lastly, sustainable drainage systems could be incorporated into open spaces to help in sustainable water management and mitigating flood risk.
- Policy BG/EO: Enhancing open spaces - This policy could potentially be combined with BG/PO: Protection of open spaces. The policy could set out in what circumstances the total or partial loss of designated open spaces would (or would not) be permitted. Reference could also be added to sustainable drainage systems and their incorporation into open spaces.

## Chapter 5 Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

The policy could also include wording on protecting the safety of users of the open spaces, particularly at night. Lastly, the policy currently states that provision will be onsite where appropriate. If not, financial contributions will be sought to improve off-site facilities. The policy should clarify what is meant by off-site facilities and whether this refers to improvements to existing open spaces and facilities in general.

- Policy WS/HD: Creating healthy new development - This policy could potentially be divided into several policy options, as it is currently lacking in detail. Many of the topics mentioned are covered within other policies, therefore it is recommended that the policy cross-references other relevant policies.
- Policy WS/HS: Pollution, health and safety – This policy could provide more detail by specifying receptors to environmental pollution as a result of new and existing development. These may include local residents, visitors, wildlife and habitats.
- Policy H/AH: Affordable housing – It is recommended that this policy requires affordable housing to not be distinguishable in appearance from market housing. This will help promote social inclusion and equalities.
- Policy H/ES: Exception sites for affordable housing - It is recommended that this policy provides further detail on the meaning of appropriate locations for exception sites, such as the proximity to services and facilities that would enable good access.
- Policy H/SH: Specialist housing and homes for older people - This policy could provide clarification in relation to what is considered an ‘accessible’ location, such as one that is in close proximity to services and facilities.
- Policy H/RC: Residential Caravan sites - This policy could recommend that residential caravan sites and mobile home parks with static dwellings over a certain size provide an element of affordable housing and communal, outdoor amenity space, or a minimum plot size to enable provision of some private, outdoor amenity space.
- Policy I/ST: Sustainable transport and connectivity – It is recommended that, either here or in a separate policy, the Local Plan sets out design requirements or guidance for provision of cycle infrastructure that is

## Chapter 5 Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

attractive and safe, including being separated from both pedestrians and road traffic and ensuring cyclists are not hampered by parked cars.

- Policy I/ID: Infrastructure delivery – It is recommended that this policy is clear about the infrastructure covered by the policy. This should include physical, social and green and blue infrastructure.

**5.350** Many of the site assessment policies recognise similar negative effects, particularly with regards to the environmental objectives. As such, general mitigation recommendations are set out for site allocation policies below (it is noted that some of the site allocation proposed policy approaches already include mitigation measures but others do not):

- Where negative effects are identified for SA objective 5: Biodiversity and geodiversity, policies could commit to conserving and enhancing designated and priority habitats and species on or near the site. In addition, site allocation policies could promote biodiversity enhancements appropriate to the location, or cross-reference Policy BG/BG: Biodiversity and geodiversity and Policy BG/GI: Green infrastructure.
- Where negative effects are identified for SA objective 6: Landscape and townscape, policies could commit to conserving and enhancing the landscape and townscape setting of the site, and ensuring design is complementary to the local area. Policies could also cross-reference Policies GP/PP: People, place and responsive design, and GP/LC: Protection and enhancement of landscape character.
- Where negative effects are identified for SA objective 7: Historic environment, policies could commit to conserving and enhancing heritage assets on and near the site and their settings, making references to the specific assets this relates to. Where development could damage archaeological assets, archaeological investigations should take place prior to development, with assets retained in-situ if possible, otherwise fully recorded and preserved for education and research. Policies could also cross-reference Policy GP/HA: Conservation and enhancement of heritage assets.
- Where negative effects are identified for SA objective 9: Minerals, the Councils could consult with the Minerals Planning Authority and consider

## Chapter 5 Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Local Plan First Proposals and Reasonable Alternatives

the potential for prior working of minerals at the site and require this, where practical/viable to do so.

- Where negative effects are identified for SA objective 11: Adaptation to climate change, particularly in relation to potential for development to be at risk of flooding, policies could require site-level flood risk assessments and appropriate flood management on site, including SuDS that also provide green infrastructure. Policies could also cross-refer to Policy CC/FM: Flooding and sustainable water management.

## Chapter 6

# Conclusions and Next Steps

## Conclusions

**6.1** The preferred policy approaches for the Local Plan have been subject to appraisal against the SA objectives, which were developed at the Scoping stage of the SA process and refined in previous stages of SA. A range of reasonable alternative options has also been assessed, including alternatives to the preferred policy approaches, Strategic Spatial Options and site options.

**6.2** Overall, the proposed direction of the Local Plan performs well in sustainability terms. There is a strong focus on providing an appropriate amount of development and in particular a variety of housing types and tenures, to meet the needs of a broad range of people. Whilst this level of growth will inevitably increase vehicular traffic, the spatial strategy and policies have a strong emphasis on minimising carbon emissions, particularly through minimising the need to travel, using land efficiently and making the most of existing and planned sustainable transport links. This does however, lead to potential risks for the historic townscape of Cambridge, but this can likely be mitigated by considerate layout and design of development. Overall, the proposed policy directions presented in the First Proposals document set a direction for a plan that will contribute to the strong economy of Cambridge city and the economic and academic role of the area in the wider sub-region, whilst creating pleasant, healthy and accessible places for people to live.

**6.3** Chapter 5 sets out a number of recommendations for the Councils to consider when preparing the next iteration of the Local Plan.

## Next Steps

**6.4** This SA Report and the accompanying Non-Technical Summary will be available for consultation alongside the First Proposals document. Formal consultation on the documents will take place following approval at Committee in November/December 2021. Comments received will inform the next iteration of SA and the Local Plan.

**6.5** The Councils will then prepare a draft Local Plan, including detailed policies, which will be subject to SA and subject to another round of consultation.

LUC

September 2021

# References

- 1 NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unity (2017) Rapid Health Impact Assessment Tool. [online] Available at <https://www.healthyurbandevelopment.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/HUDU-Rapid-HIA-Tool-3rd-edition-April-2017.pdf>
- 2 Greater Cambridge Shared Planning (2020) Greater Cambridge Local Plan, Strategic Spatial Options for Testing – Methodology, Appendix 4. Available at: <https://www.greatercambridgeplanning.org/media/1432/gclp-strategic-spatial-options-for-testing-methodology-nov2020.pdf>
- 3 The Trip Budget is calculated to ensure there are no additional vehicle trips on Milton Road at peak times (from 2017 levels) and subsequently not result in queuing on the A14 at Milton Interchange (Junction 33).

**Contents**