



## **Cambridge Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan**

### **Development Strategy Update**

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

**November 2015**



## **Contents**

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Part 1: Evidence and consideration of reasonable options</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3. Part 2: Sustainability Appraisal</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>4. Part 3: Considerations and the Preferred Development Strategy</b>	<b>25</b>

## **Appendices**

1. Evidence Supporting the Submitted Local Plans	A1
2. Sustainability Appraisal (Up To Submission 2014)	A29
3. Objectively Assessed Need and Development Strategy – Proposed Modifications to the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan	A39
4. Policy E/2: Fulbourn Road East – Proposed Modifications to the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan	A44
5. Provisional New Allocation at Land South of Cambridge Biomedical Campus – Proposed Modifications to the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan	A47
6. Development Strategy – Proposed Modifications to the Cambridge Local Plan	A80

## **Executive Summary**

The purpose of this document is to respond to the issues raised in the letter from the Local Plan Inspectors to Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council on 20 May 2015. It draws on the original evidence prepared to support the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans that were submitted for examination in March 2014. The Councils have also prepared additional evidence to address the issues raised by the Inspectors. The original and additional evidence is drawn together in this document as part of carrying out an objective review of the appropriate development strategy for the Greater Cambridge area and considering whether the strategy in the submitted plans should be modified. The original and additional evidence is available to be considered together with this document.

The Structure of this Document is as follows:

- Part 1: Evidence and consideration of reasonable options
- Part 2: Sustainability Appraisal
- Part 3: Considerations and the Preferred Development Strategy

This document describes the key evidence documents related to the alternative development strategies, and provides a summary of key issues in relation to each stage of the development sequence. It summarises the role of sustainability appraisal in the plan making process, and key findings in relation to the development sequence. This includes a summary of the results of the Joint Sustainability Appraisal Addendum 2015 prepared in response to the Inspectors' Letter.

Drawing on the evidence base, it then considers the consequences and issues related to the strategic choices available to the Council, including the consideration of sustainable patterns of development (as required by NPPF paragraph 84 and 85) in the context of an area with a tightly drawn Green Belt around the historic city of Cambridge. It identifies the reasons for the preferred approach of the Councils in the submitted plans and having considered the issue afresh taking account of the additional work undertaken.

It concludes that the Councils have carried out or commissioned new studies to review the evidence on objectively assessed housing needs, Green Belt, transport, infrastructure and viability to ensure that the decision on the preferred strategy is based on a full understanding of the implications of the different strategy options. An addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal has also been carried out to ensure that the sustainability issues of the options available to the Councils are understood, in particular land on the edge of Cambridge and new settlements.

The Councils have been clear that they recognise the merits of land on the edge of Cambridge in accessibility terms and the transport evidence confirms that situation, although it makes clear that major new development on the edge of Cambridge on congested radial routes have their own transport issues and are not necessarily cheap to deliver. The independent Green Belt evidence supports the findings Councils' own evidence that release of land on the edge of Cambridge can be expected to compromise substantially the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt, with two exceptions and modifications are proposed to respond to these, one to reduce the size of an allocation in the submitted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and one provision one to allocate a new employment allocation as an extension to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus.

The evidence also looks at the potential to deliver sustainable new settlements as an alternative to sites on the edge of Cambridge and concludes that they can provide viable and deliverable developments that will be able to contribute to strategic off site infrastructure and



provide high quality public transport links to Cambridge that will attract significant levels of patronage and also provide wider benefits to existing communities. The City Deal is a significant opportunity to deliver sustainable transport to serve the wider area and with its focus on supporting the delivery of the development strategy is an important fund intended to assist with any funding shortfalls that might arise.

Having weighed all those factors, the Councils maintain their view that the development strategy in the submitted plans, with limited modifications, provides the right balance for this plan period that will provide a range of deliverable sites for the plan period and beyond and consider that sustainability will be secured.

## 1. Introduction

1.1 The purpose of this document is to respond to the issues raised in the letter from the Local Plan Inspectors to Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council on 20 May 2015. It draws on the original evidence prepared to support the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans that were submitted for examination in March 2014. The Councils have also prepared additional evidence to address the issues raised by the Inspectors. The original and additional evidence is drawn together in this document as part of carrying out an objective review of the appropriate development strategy for the Greater Cambridge area and considering whether the strategy in the submitted plans should be modified. The original and additional evidence is available to be considered together with this document.

1.2 The Structure of this Document is as follows:

Part 1: Evidence and consideration of reasonable options

*This section identifies the key evidence that informed the plan making process. This includes new evidence prepared in response to the Inspectors' letter. It then provides a summary of key issues in relation to each stage of the development sequence.*

Part 2: Sustainability Appraisal

*This section summarises the role of sustainability appraisal in the plan making process, and key findings in relation to the development sequence. This includes a summary of the results of the Joint Sustainability Appraisal Addendum 2015 prepared in response to the Inspectors' Letter. It then provides a summary of key issues in relation to each stage of the development sequence.*

Part 3: Considerations and the Preferred Development Strategy

*This section draws together the evidence base and the sustainability appraisal, considers the consequences and issues related to the strategic choices available to the Council, including the consideration of sustainable patterns of development (as required by NPPF paragraph 84 and 85) in the context of an area with a tightly drawn Green Belt around the historic city of Cambridge. It identifies the reasons for the preferred approach of the Councils in the submitted plans and having considered the issue afresh taking account of the additional work undertaken.*

1.3 The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans identify the growth needs of the area to 2031. They set the levels of employment and housing development that should be provided to most appropriately meet the needs of the area, and establish a strategy for meeting these in the most sustainable way. The Local Plans will replace the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and the South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy 2007<sup>1 2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> The adopted Area Action Plans for Northstowe (except as amended by Policy SS/7 of the submitted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan), North West Cambridge, Cambridge Southern Fringe, and Cambridge East (except as amended by Policy SS/3 of the submitted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan) remain part of the development plan for the plan period to 2031 or until such time as the developments are complete.

<sup>2</sup> The adopted Area Action Plans for North West Cambridge and Cambridge East (except as amended by Policy 12 of the submitted Cambridge Local Plan) remain part of the development plan for Cambridge for the plan period to 2031 or until such time as the developments are completed.

- 1.4 The Councils decided to prepare separate Local Plans for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. However, there has been joint working on the plans throughout, in conformity with the duty to cooperate and reflecting the close functional relationship between the tightly drawn city boundary and its rural surroundings. This included joint working arrangements at officer and Member level. The plans were also prepared in parallel with a new Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire by Cambridgeshire County Council. The benefits of this cooperative relationship has been recognised at a national level through the confirmation of the Greater Cambridge City Deal, which the local authorities, the University of Cambridge and the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership signed with the Government in 2014. The City Deal brings up to £500 million of grant funding to help deliver infrastructure to support growth in the area with its highly successful economy.
- 1.5 Early stages of plan making involved significant stakeholder participation, including two main stages of issues and options consultation in July 2012 and January 2013. Draft Plans were then subject to public consultation in July 2013. Both Local Plans were submitted to the Secretary of State in March 2014 for independent examination.
- 1.6 The Examinations commenced in 2014. The purpose of the examinations is to consider the soundness of the plans. Joint examination hearings on strategic issues were held between November 2014 and April 2015, including hearings on housing and employment needs, development strategy, Green Belt, transport, infrastructure and housing supply.
- 1.7 As part of the examination process, the Inspectors had previously indicated that they would write to the Councils if they had concerns about the submitted Local Plans. The Inspectors wrote to the Councils on 20 May 2015 raising several issues and inviting the Councils to undertake additional work to address those issues before the examinations progress further. The Councils agreed to undertake additional work and the examinations were formally suspended on 28 July 2015 until March 2016.
- 1.8 In particular, the Councils have been asked by the Inspectors to carry out more work on the assessment of the preferred development strategy contained within the submitted plan with reasonable alternatives to that development strategy. This includes ensuring that alternative options of building extra homes on the edge of Cambridge, and thereby removing further land from the Green Belt, have been considered as options for development at new settlements and villages, and that the comparative information is presented together in an accessible way. As part of the process of responding to the Inspectors' letter, the Councils have now carried out a number of additional studies, including working with consultants that prepared the original evidence supporting the submitted Local Plans.
- 1.9 The Local Plans plan for housing and jobs requirements for the period 2011 to 2031. The Cambridge Local Plan identifies the need for 22,100 jobs, and South Cambridgeshire 22,000 jobs. Following updated work on the need for homes requested by the Inspectors, which considered the latest information on Government household projections, market signals and affordability, a Modification is proposed to increase the South Cambridgeshire requirement in the submitted Local Plan from 19,000 to 19,500 homes, whilst the Cambridge requirement remains as the submitted Local Plan. This means housing requirements of 14,000 homes in Cambridge and 19,500 homes in South Cambridgeshire are proposed, a total of 33,500 homes.

- 1.10 Under the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Cooperation: Supporting the Spatial Approach 2011-2031 of May 2013<sup>3</sup>, agreed with all Councils in the Housing Market Area, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils committed to meeting in full their objectively assessed needs within their respective areas, as required by the NPPF. This remains the Councils' commitment.
- 1.11 In September 2014, the two Councils agreed a Memorandum of Understanding: Greater Cambridge Joint Housing Trajectory<sup>4</sup>, which deals specifically with the phasing of development across the two areas and agreed to a joint housing trajectory.
- 1.12 The Memorandum of Understanding is a response to the signing of the City Deal for Greater Cambridgeshire that recognises the strong inter-relationship between the two areas, and also the publication of the Planning Practice Guidance and its approach to housing land supply across areas. It is also considered to accord with the duty on neighbouring local authorities to cooperate in plan making. Modifications were submitted to the examination hearing on housing supply (Matter 8) to include the joint trajectory approach in the new Local Plans, and are included as part of this current consultation in view of their relationship with the development strategy. The Modifications are set out in the Housing Land Supply Update document (RD/MC/050).
- 1.13 A significant amount of the housing requirement in both areas will be met through existing commitments. The adopted plans provide a strategy for the period to 2016 and beyond and include a number of large sites that continue to be built out and will continue to meet a significant part of housing needs into the new plan period. Sites which have planning permission or that have been identified in existing plans, and anticipated windfall sites, account for over 27,400 dwellings. This includes significant new developments on the edge of Cambridge and the new town of Northstowe, which were identified through the previous round of plan making. Strategic choices remain regarding how the remainder of development needs are met.
- 1.14 Previous plans for the Cambridge area have adopted a development sequence, which prioritised development firstly within Cambridge, then on the edge of Cambridge (subject to consideration of the Green Belt), a new settlement close to Cambridge, and then at market towns (outside Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire) and better served villages. The development sequence for the Cambridge sub region was established Regional Planning Guidance (2000), and subsequently in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003). It was given effect in the two districts in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework 2007-2010. It was always recognised that the strategy would take time to come forward, being a major shift away from a dispersed development strategy to one that focused development closer to Cambridge through a review of the Cambridge Green Belt (so far as compatible with its purposes<sup>5</sup> and then through the new settlement stage in the sequence).
- 1.15 Through the plan making process, the Councils have considered whether this development sequence remains appropriate. This has been informed by evidence including a Sustainable Development Strategy Review (SDSR) undertaken by the Joint

---

<sup>3</sup> Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation: Supporting the Spatial Approach 2011-2031 (RD/Strat/100)

<sup>4</sup> Memorandum of Understanding between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council: Greater Cambridge Joint Housing Trajectory. September 2014 (RD/Strat/350)

<sup>5</sup> Regional Planning Guidance for the East of England (2000) Policy 26 - 'If sites could be released without significant detriment to Green Belt purposes, their suitability for development should be assessed against criteria including proximity to public transport, employment and services and environmental quality.'

Strategic Planning Unit, alongside Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments by both Councils, a joint review of the inner Green Belt boundary and transport modelling for the Greater Cambridge area. Those parallel and inter-related work streams were considered through the Councils' respective Sustainability Appraisals (SA), including a joint SA of the broad strategies and options available for growth.

- 1.16 The Inspectors point to the SDSR in their letter and the question for the local plan review that it suggests, being the extent to which additional development allocations contribute to the overarching objective to enable "genuinely sustainable development that balances economic, social and environmental needs". It points to the comment in the SDSR that locating development on the urban edge has significant advantages in sustainability terms and that key considerations in assessing the suitability of specific locations will be any potential conflict with Green Belt purposes and the deliverability of infrastructure improvements. It also identifies the consideration of new settlements finding that their sustainability is affected by their self-containment but that out-commuting to workplaces and other services and facilities is likely.

## **2. Part 1: Evidence and consideration of reasonable options**

- 2.1 This part of the document identifies the key evidence that informed the plan making process and consideration of reasonable options for the development strategy contained in the submitted Local Plans. It then identifies the updated evidence prepared in response to the Inspectors' letter of 20 May 2015 that is relevant to development strategy considerations. The key findings from all those evidence documents are set out in Appendix 1 (including links to where these documents can be viewed).
- 2.2 The evidence documents are summarised in Table 1 showing the key findings related to each stage in the development sequence alongside each other and highlighting what the key findings from the additional evidence do to update that understanding. The document then explains how that evidence was used to develop strategy options that were then subject to Sustainability Appraisal, as set out in Part 2.

### Evidence supporting the Submitted Local Plans:

- 2.3 The Councils prepared a wide range of evidence to support the plan making process. The following key documents and studies informed the development of the submitted Local Plans. It should be noted that this is not a comprehensive list of the evidence that informed the plans, and focuses on the evidence that informed development strategy decisions.

#### **Sustainable Development Strategy Review**

Prepared at the start of the plan making process for the Councils by the Joint Strategic Planning Unit, this document reviewed what sustainable development means in the context of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. It considers the previous development strategy and development sequence, and issues to consider when developing the new local plans.

#### **Cambridge Sub Region Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (2013)**

The SHMA was prepared by the Cambridgeshire Councils with St Edmundsbury and Forest Heath Councils and identified the objectively assessed need for homes and jobs across the Housing Market Area using an approach that integrated demographic trends and future jobs.

#### **Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation: Supporting the Spatial Approach 2011 to 2031 (May 2013)**

Produced by the local authorities to support the development of a coherent and comprehensive growth strategy across Cambridgeshire & Peterborough. It agreed a set of strategic principles that would guide plan making across the Cambridgeshire area. It included an agreement under the Duty to Cooperate between the Councils in the HMA and Peterborough Council to meeting the full objectively assessed needs and their spatial distribution. Under this agreement Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire agreed to meet their needs for homes as jobs as set out in the SHMA in full.

#### **Cambridge Sub Regional Transport Modelling Report for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans**

Plan making was supported by transport modelling undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council and its consultants, which compared the impacts of various growth scenarios before considering the impact of the development identified in the submitted Local Plans. The process was used to identify and test transport mitigation measures that could be implemented to address the identified transport impacts.

### **Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (2014)**

In order to help the Councils plan for sustainable growth, a Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire was prepared by Cambridgeshire County Council in parallel with the Local Plans. The plan was subject to consultation alongside the local plans during each stage of consultation. The adopted Transport Strategy identifies transport infrastructure needed in the Cambridge area, and an action plan for its delivery. It is reflected in the County Council's Local Transport Plan and Long Term Transport Strategy, which were updated following its completion.

### **Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)**

The SHLAA is a technical assessment of the potential suitability, availability and achievability of sites for housing development. Both Councils considered a wide range of potential sites in their respective SHLAAs. Sites identified as having development potential were considered through the plan making process as options for inclusion in the local plans. The most appropriate sites were included in the submitted Plans.

### **South Cambridgeshire Village Classification Report**

Prepared by South Cambridgeshire District Council, it considered the relative sustainability of villages in South Cambridgeshire and whether the classification (as Rural Centres, Minor Rural Centres, Group Villages and Infill Villages) remained appropriate. This was guided by consideration of the services, facilities, employment and public transport available.

### **Infrastructure Delivery Study**

The Councils worked closely with infrastructure providers and stakeholders throughout the plan process, in order to understand infrastructure needs of planned developments. The Study, prepared by consultants for both Councils, also considers the funding available to deliver the new infrastructure. The information was updated in 2013 to support the submission Local Plans.

### **Viability Studies**

The NPPF requires Councils to consider whether developments proposed are viable, taking account of the policy requirements included in their Local Plans. Viability studies were carried out by consultants in studies for each Council to support their respective SHLAAs, and to consider the overall viability of the Local Plans. They have also informed the development of Community Infrastructure Levy proposals for both Councils that have been submitted for examination.

### **Inner Green Belt Boundary Study**

Studies were undertaken to consider the contribution of areas of land surrounding Cambridge to the purposes of the Green Belt, and the potential impact of development in these areas. Earlier studies were also drawn on.

### **New Evidence in Response to the Inspectors' Letter**

- 2.4 In response to the Inspectors' Letter (May 2015), the Councils commissioned a suite of new evidence.

### **Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (2015)**

Building on the Cambridge Sub Region Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), this additional evidence prepared by consultants for the Councils has considered Planning Practice Guidance regarding any implications of the 2012-based DCLG household projections, market signals, and affordability, and whether any adjustment in the current identified housing requirement for Cambridge and South

Cambridgeshire is necessary. The study concludes that objectively assessed need for housing for South Cambridgeshire is slightly higher than previously identified.

#### **Inner Green Belt Study (2015)**

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

#### **Housing Land Supply Update (2015)**

Considers issues related to the delivery of housing to meet the local plan requirements, including updated delivery trajectory.

#### **Viability Update (2015)**

An update of the viability assessments prepared by consultants for the Councils to ensure that the inputs are up to date including changes to any key inputs (such as land and build costs). It considers the impacts of changes to government policy, for example the removal of the Code for Sustainable Homes. It specifically considers the particular costs associated with new settlements. This work has been undertaken in parallel with the Infrastructure Delivery Study.

#### **Infrastructure Delivery Study (2015)**

An update to the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Study prepared by consultants for the Councils, using up to date information on infrastructure delivery, costs, and sources of funding. Will take account of progress related to City Deal transport schemes, and the availability of City Deal funding, as well as providing more information related to the delivery of major development sites.

#### **Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Transport Report 2015**

A consolidated and enhanced Modelling Report / Local Plan Transport Assessment, prepared by Cambridgeshire County Council and their consultants for the Councils, pulling together existing evidence and new modelling work. New modelling has been carried out to compare development strategy options with significant edge of Cambridge development on like for like basis with new settlement or village focused development strategies. It also includes updated modelling of the Local Plan development trajectories to reflect proposed modifications.

#### City Deal Update

- 2.5 Subsequent to the submission of the Local Plans in 2014, The Greater Cambridge authorities, working with partners<sup>6</sup>, have secured funding through the Greater Cambridge City Deal, with the potential for up to £500m over a 15 year period towards transport infrastructure to support the delivery of growth. It provides a major opportunity for Greater Cambridge to maintain and grow its status as a prosperous economic area by helping to accelerate the growth in jobs and homes planned through the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans and to enhance the connectivity of key housing and employment sites.
- 2.6 Work to deliver infrastructure improvements through the City Deal has progressed significantly and is covered in the Infrastructure Delivery Study update, the Transport

---

<sup>6</sup> The Greater Cambridge City Deal partners are Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council, the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership, and the University of Cambridge.



Report 2015 and this document. The City Deal Board prioritised schemes for tranche 1 (the first £100m of funding) in January 2015.

- 2.7 On the A428 corridor (Cambourne, Bourn Airfield) additional studies have been undertaken as part of City Deal work on options to deliver public transport / cycling improvements. These identify route options and estimated costs. Public consultation on these options is taking place in October / November 2015. For the A10 north corridor (Waterbeach New Town), a transport study is commencing on transport infrastructure, phasing and delivery. This is anticipated to be completed in Spring 2016. Given that proposals for both corridors are developing and further information as to delivery of schemes within those corridors is likely to be available before, or approximately at the point that, the examinations are to recommence, it is inevitable that further work to address and respond this information will be required to be undertaken. The results of this further work will be reported to the Inspectors at the examination.

Table 1: Key findings from Evidence related to stages of the Development Sequence

	<b>Evidence and earlier stages of plan making</b>	<b>Urban area</b>	<b>Edge of Cambridge</b>	<b>New Settlements</b>	<b>Villages</b>
Sustainable Development Strategy	<p>For Submission Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Joint Statement on Strategic Planning in Cambridgeshire 2010 (RD/Strat/030)</li> <li>2. Sustainable Development Strategy Review 2012 (RD/Strat/040)</li> <li>3. Cambridgeshire &amp; Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation: Supporting the Spatial Approach 2011 to 2031, May 2013 (RD/Strat/100)</li> <li>4. Cambridge Local Plan Issues and Options Report 2012 (RD/LP/240)</li> <li>5. South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Issues and Options Report (RD/LP/030)</li> <li>6. Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options 2, joint part 1 (RD/LP/150)</li> <li>7. South Cambridgeshire Village Classification Report (RD/Strat/240)</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Top of the development sequence.</li> <li>• Most sustainable location for new development because of ready access to employment, services and transport choices. Development levels which are compatible with local character should be maximised.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Second stage of the development sequence.</li> <li>• The adopted Local Plans for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire released land from the Green Belt for major urban extensions subject to Green Belt purposes.</li> <li>• Good progress of the implementation of the urban extensions with the exception of part of Cambridge East, but slowed due to the effects of recession in 2008. These continue to deliver and with rapid progress since 2011 will significantly contribute to supply over the 2011 to 2031 plan period.</li> <li>• Recognise the significant advantages in terms of accessibility to jobs and services in Cambridge by sustainable modes and key considerations of any potential conflict with Green Belt purposes and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Third stage of the development sequence</li> <li>• Adopted Plans for South Cambridgeshire allocated Northstowe new town.</li> <li>• Implementation of Northstowe slowed in part due to recession but phases 1 and 2 now have planning permission, development has started on site and the A14 Development Consent Order is at the examination stage.</li> <li>• Recognise new settlements should be sustainable by providing homes, jobs and essential services within a single planned development, although recognise whilst elements of self containment may be achieved, there will also be out commuting to main employment centres.</li> <li>• New settlements can make significant contribution to housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lowest level on development sequence</li> <li>• Villages categorised into Rural Centre, Minor Rural Centres, Group Villages and Infill Villages (supported by Village Classification Report).</li> <li>• Rural Centres and Minor Rural centres identified as better served villages. Group and Infill villages not considered suitable options for allocations (unless coming through neighbourhood proposals).</li> <li>• Potential to provide flexibility and help ensure a continuous supply of housing land over the plan period, including if there is any delay in progress on any of the major sites.</li> <li>• Many villages have infrastructure issues, making significant growth challenging. More difficult to deliver major transport improvements through</li> </ul>

	Evidence and earlier stages of plan making	Urban area	Edge of Cambridge	New Settlements	Villages
			<p>deliverability of infrastructure improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreement under the duty to co-operate by the Cambridgeshire Authorities to carefully balance development taking account purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt, sustainability of existing settlements and opportunities to create new settlements.</li> </ul>	<p>supply. Challenges to delivery and funding of infrastructure, including lead in time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New settlements can be located close to Cambridge and with good quality public transport available or capable of being provided.</li> <li>Agreement under the duty to co-operate by the Cambridgeshire Authorities to carefully balance development taking account purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt, sustainability of existing settlements and opportunities to create new settlements.</li> </ul>	<p>to dispersed village growth.</p>
Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment	<p>For Submission Plan:</p> <p>8. Cambridge Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2012 (RD/Strat/130) and 2013 Update (RD/Strat/140)</p> <p>9. South Cambridgeshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (August 2013)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban area as an important source of capacity.</li> <li>Following a detailed site search and consideration of a long list of around 900 potential sites through the Cambridge SHLAA , 59 sites were</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The two Councils tested sites on the edge of Cambridge jointly.</li> <li>Issues and Options Reports in July 2012 divided the area on the fringes of Cambridge into 10 Broad Locations<sup>7</sup>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>14 sites which would either deliver new standalone settlements, or expand existing new settlements were tested.</li> <li>Options at Waterbeach and Bourn Airfield, and the Strategic Reserve at Northstowe.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Around 260 sites were subject to SHLAA assessment.</li> <li>The majority were identified as having no development potential.</li> <li>Those considered to have some or limited development potential,</li> </ul>

<sup>7</sup> South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options 2012 (Issue 12); Cambridge Issues and Options Report 2012 (Options 10 to 19)

	Evidence and earlier stages of plan making	Urban area	Edge of Cambridge	New Settlements	Villages
	(RD/Strat/120) 10. Joint Technical Background Document Part 1 (RD/LP/170).	considered through the plan making process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In January 2013, the Councils Jointly consulted on an Issues and Options 2 Part 1 report<sup>8</sup>. This was accompanied by a Technical Background Document providing an assessment of 41 sites on the edge of Cambridge<sup>9</sup>.</li> <li>Six sites identified as options for inclusion in the Local Plans, and subject to consultation as options in the Issues and Options Report. The remainder were rejected, due either to their significance in relation to Green Belt purposes, or other planning constraints</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites at Six Mile Bottom, Hanley Grange, Heathfield, Duxford, north of Cambourne, north east of Northstowe, and Barrington Quarry were identified as sites with no development potential.</li> </ul>	at better served villages were subject to consultation through the Issues and Options process.
	Additional work: 11. Housing <i>Land Supply</i> 2015		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New site opportunities identified and tested at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land north of Cherry Hinton (carrying forward more of the current housing allocation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<sup>8</sup> Issues and Options 2 Part 1 Joint Consultation on Development Strategy and Site Options on the edge of Cambridge  
<https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/issues-options-2-jan-feb-2013>

<sup>9</sup> Cambridge Local Plan Towards 2031, South Cambridgeshire Local Plan – Issues and Options 2: Part 1 – Joint Consultation on Development Strategy & Site Options on the Edge of Cambridge – Technical Background Document Part 1 <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/background-documents>

	Evidence and earlier stages of plan making	Urban area	Edge of Cambridge	New Settlements	Villages
			<p>in the Cambridge East Area Action Plan in view of progress by the promoters and better understanding of constraints in the area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land south of Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Addenbrooke's) (responding to the new Green Belt study findings with provisional site for employment subject to further investigation of surface water flooding)</li> <li>Land south of Bell School site (responding to the new Green Belt study findings, tested for housing but rejected due to flooding issues)</li> </ul>		
Transport	<p>For Submission Plan:</p> <p>12. Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC) (RD/T/120)</p> <p>13. Transport Modelling</p>	<p>Modelling Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New households in or near Cambridge use cars less than those in villages: typically there are 6% more extra car</li> </ul>	<p>Modelling Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New households in or near Cambridge use cars less than those in villages: typically there are 6% more extra car</li> </ul>	<p>Modelling Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New settlements strategy enable over 5% higher mode share by public transport compared with</li> </ul>	<p>Modelling Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Village focused strategy would generate a higher proportion of trips by car, and a lower proportion of trips by</li> </ul>

	Evidence and earlier stages of plan making	Urban area	Edge of Cambridge	New Settlements	Villages
	Summary Report 2013 (RD/Strat/160))	trips per household further from Cambridge.  TSCSC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes improvements to the existing network within Cambridge and in particular the capacity for movement by non-car modes.</li> <li>Road space will be reallocated to buses, cyclists and pedestrians in many areas of the city.</li> <li>Orbital bus movements will also be prioritised.</li> </ul>	trips per household further from Cambridge  TSCSC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes improvements to the existing network within Cambridge and in particular the capacity for movement by non-car modes.</li> <li>Road space will be reallocated to buses, cyclists and pedestrians in many areas of the city.</li> <li>Orbital bus movements will also be prioritised.</li> <li>Enhancement of Park &amp; Ride network</li> <li>Potential orbital road improvements</li> </ul>	additional corresponding trips associated with a village focused strategy.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant shift in modes that will be enabled by the package of identified transport measures.</li> </ul> TSCSC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies Enhancement to transport corridors will deliver a network of High Quality Passenger Transport (HQPT), delivering higher frequency services with faster and more reliable journey times.</li> <li>New infrastructure will enable buses to access Cambridge whilst avoiding delays in car traffic.</li> <li>Enhanced network of park and ride services, and segregated cycleways.</li> </ul>	public transport compared to strategy options focused around new settlements.  TSCSC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The passenger transport corridors will provide the overarching focus for the rural areas for both the cycling and walking network.</li> <li>Opportunities for smaller rural interchanges will be looked for.</li> </ul>
	Additional work: 14. Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Transport Report 2015	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modelling of Strategic options which focused additional development on the edge of Cambridge had lower</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Higher car mode shares in comparison with Cambridge and the edge of Cambridge.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dispersed village development option is less preferable than new settlements or edge of Cambridge in terms of</li> </ul>

	Evidence and earlier stages of plan making	Urban area	Edge of Cambridge	New Settlements	Villages
	Note: See City Deal below under infrastructure		car mode shares and higher proportions of trips by active modes of travel to Cambridge. Potentially due to a combination of the location of growth on the periphery of the city being well served by public transport, and distances being within cycling range.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport measures tested on growth corridors increase the proportion of trips made by non car modes, including shift towards Park &amp; Ride.</li> </ul>	car mode share of new trips generated.
Green Belt	For Submission Plan: 15. Inner Green Belt Boundary Appraisal May 2012 (RD/Strat/200) 16. Inner Green Belt Boundary Study November 2012 (RD/Strat/210) 17. Inner Green Belt Boundary Study 2002 Cambridge City Council (RD/Strat/170) 18. Cambridge Green Belt Study 2002 by Landscape Design Associates for South Cambridgeshire District Council (RD/Strat/170)	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Release of larger sites would cause significant harm to Green Belt purposes.</li> <li>Six small sites could be removed from the Green Belt on edge of Cambridge to provide land for homes and jobs without significant harm to Green Belt purposes.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A
	Additional work: 19. Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study LDA 2015	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unlikely that any significant development could be accommodated without substantial harm</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A

	Evidence and earlier stages of plan making	Urban area	Edge of Cambridge	New Settlements	Villages
			<p>to the Green Belt purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only exceptions are limited areas near Worts' Causeway, Fulbourn Road, and Darwin Green, which have been identified in the Submitted Local Plans.</li> <li>Limited additional development south of Addenbrooke's could be undertaken without significant long-term harm to Green Belt purposes.</li> </ul>		
Infrastructure and Delivery	<p>For Submission Plan:</p> <p>20. Infrastructure Delivery Study 2012 (RD/T/010)</p> <p>21. Infrastructure Delivery Study Update 2013 (RD/T/020)</p> <p>22. Cambridge Local Plan / CIL Viability Assessment (RD/T/200)</p> <p>23. South Cambridgeshire Viability Report (RD/T/220)</p>	<p>Cambridge Viability Study :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For CIL in respect of residential development, potential for charging £100 to £150/sq. m. (£125/sq. m. proposed in submission CIL charging schedule)</li> </ul> <p>Infrastructure Delivery Study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 2013 report considered the infrastructure requirements related to the developments identified in the Submitted Local Plans.</li> </ul>	<p>South Cambridgeshire Viability Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Typically highest values were around the Cambridge fringe (especially around the south and west of the City), to the south / south-west of the City and in some southernmost areas of South Cambs.</li> <li>A higher rate of CIL (£125 sq.m) for residential development could be considered,</li> </ul>	<p>South Cambridgeshire Viability Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potentially viable development but with consideration of the optimum works and planning obligations packages achievable in response to the actual delivery circumstances.</li> <li>a nil (£0/sq. m) charging rate approach may be necessary for larger scale development assuming that significant s.106 obligations are</li> </ul>	<p>South Cambridgeshire Viability Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Values varied across the district. Overall rate of not more than £100/sq. m, applicable District-wide. Sites likely to be viable at this rate when required to deliver 40% affordable housing, subject to site specific costs such as remediation costs.</li> </ul> <p>Infrastructure Delivery Study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies costs associated with</li> </ul>



	Evidence and earlier stages of plan making	Urban area	Edge of Cambridge	New Settlements	Villages
			<p>similar to that being proposed in Cambridge alongside 40% affordable housing.</p> <p>Infrastructure Delivery Study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 2013 report considered the infrastructure requirements related to the developments identified in the Submitted Local Plans.</li> </ul>	<p>going to be required. Depending on the Value Level achieved, lower affordable housing levels may be needed.</p> <p>Infrastructure Delivery Study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 2013 report considered the infrastructure requirements related to the developments identified in the Submitted Local Plans.</li> </ul>	<p>individual developments. The 2013 report considered the infrastructure requirements related to the developments identified in the Submitted Local Plans.</p>
	<p>Following Submission: 24. City Deal (RD/Strat/300) &amp; City Deal Board / Assembly Reports</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The backbone of the proposed strategy is a transport network to link areas of population and employment within the City Deal area.</li> <li>New orbital bus routes around Cambridge and new high quality public transport links into Cambridge on key corridors, connecting with major employment centres.</li> <li>Infrastructure priorities for phase 1 includes City centre capacity improvements / cross-city cycle improvements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The housing requirement is being addressed through strategic developments including the southern and north-west fringes of Cambridge,</li> <li>The City Deal Greater Cambridge will undertake a package of measures to support housing delivery.</li> <li>Infrastructure priorities for phase 1 includes Milton and Histon road bus priority, and Chisholm trail cycle route.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The housing requirement is being addressed through strategic developments including at Cambourne and another new village at Bourn Airfield, and through the new towns of Northstowe and Waterbeach. Northstowe will comprise around 10,000 homes once fully built, with the first phase comprising 1,500 homes and new employment areas.</li> <li>The City Deal Greater Cambridge will undertake a package of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commitment to help deliver affordable housing exception sites, to support sustainable rural communities</li> </ul>

	Evidence and earlier stages of plan making	Urban area	Edge of Cambridge	New Settlements	Villages
				<p>measures to support housing delivery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure priorities for phase 1 includes transport improvements on the A428 corridor.</li> </ul>	
	Additional Work: 25. Viability Update 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Net effect of the cumulative impact of changes in market conditions, development costs and national and local policies is positive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Due to increasing sales values, results indicate potential for increased funding for S106 / strategic infrastructure, including when 40% affordable housing policy requirement is applied compared to the 2013 study.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Due to increasing sales values, results indicate potential for increased funding for S106 / strategic infrastructure, including when 40% affordable housing policy requirement is applied compared to the 2013 study.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small developments in villages remain viable when policy changes resulting from Written ministerial statements are considered.</li> </ul>
	26. Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 2015 report considered the infrastructure requirements related to the developments identified in the Submitted Local Plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 2015 report considered the infrastructure requirements related to the developments identified in the Submitted Local Plans, and in addition a larger development at North of Cherry Hinton.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 2015 report considered the infrastructure requirements related to the developments identified in the Submitted Local Plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 2015 report considered the infrastructure requirements related to the developments identified in the Submitted Local Plans.</li> </ul>

- 2.8 The evidence prepared prior to submission of the Local Plans guided the identification of issues for consideration through the plan making process, and options regarding sites and policies that could be included in the plans to address them.
- 2.9 The Cambridge Issues and Options Report 2012 considered options for the level of housing and jobs that are required. It considered options for continued development within the urban area as well as exploring whether there should be further development on the edge of Cambridge in the Green Belt. The South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options Report 2012 also considered housing and jobs requirements. It sought views on how the development strategy should be taken forward, including whether development should be focused on the edge of Cambridge, new settlements, villages, or a combination of these. It considered whether there were exceptional circumstances for a Green Belt review. Both reports sought views on broad locations of development around the edge of the city in the Green Belt.
- 2.10 Through a joint Issues and Options 2: Part 1 consultation in 2013, sites were identified and tested on the edge of Cambridge, and options were subject to consultation where assessment showed that they would not cause significant harm to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. The Councils expressed the view that it was not appropriate at that time to consider large scale Green Belt releases whilst working together to maximise delivery of housing in and on the edge of Cambridge that maintains Green Belt purposes. However, at the same time the Councils also sought views on the appropriate balance between protecting land on the edge of Cambridge that is of high significance to Green Belt purposes, and delivering development away from Cambridge in new settlements and at better served villages.
- 2.11 The Councils also sought views on site options in the urban area, new settlements and villages in their 2012 Issues and Options Reports, and in their respective Part 2 documents of their 2013 Issues and Options 2 reports.
- 2.12 Options considered were subject to sustainability appraisal, which has been undertaken in parallel with the plan making process, including options for the development strategy. Part 2 of this report provides further information.
- 2.13 The additional evidence has been considered by the Councils, both where it supports earlier evidence and where it indicates something different. This includes the identification through the recent Inner Green Belt study of additional site options on the edge of Cambridge to be tested. This has fed onto an Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal that reconsiders the options for the development strategy in light of new evidence. This is also covered in Part 2 of this report.

### **3. Part 2: Sustainability Appraisal**

- 3.1 Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a process to ensure that potential sustainability effects of plans are addressed through assessing sustainability impacts of objectives, actions, policies and their alternatives during plan preparation. The SA process is an iterative process throughout plan making. It helped inform the options that were subject to consultation at the two rounds of issues and options and also the decisions on the preferred strategy that was included in the respective Local Plans. It has continued to inform the plan making process through the additional work to respond to the Inspectors' letter.
- 3.2 The submitted Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans are each accompanied by Sustainability Appraisal Reports that test the Local Plan policies and sites against reasonable alternatives, and consider the impacts on a set of Sustainability Objectives. This highlights the impacts of strategy options, and the pros and cons of different approaches.
- 3.3 An Addendum to the SA has been prepared as part of the additional work to respond to the Inspectors' letter, which asked the Councils to address a number of concerns, in particular:
- Consistency with the Review of the Sustainable Development Strategy (2012), and the challenges in relation to delivery of sustainable new settlements
  - The weight given to Green Belt relative to other considerations
  - Comparison of reasonable alternatives at the same level as the preferred option, in particular options requiring a review of the Green Belt.
- 3.4 The NPPF sets specific requirements when undertaking a Green Belt Review. Paragraph 84 requires councils to take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. Paragraph 85 requires Councils to ensure consistency of Green Belt boundaries with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development. The Inspectors indicated that they would expect to see this addressed in the Councils' SAs.
- 3.5 The Councils considered the sustainability of development in a number of evidence base documents, as highlighted in Part 1 of this report. The SA has drawn on these.
- 3.6 The SA also informs the Councils' consideration of NPPF paragraph 85. This is explored further in Section 3 of this document.
- 3.7 A summary of the key findings from both SAs, in particular drawing on the joint appraisals of the development sequence from the Joint 2013 assessment and the SA Addendum 2015 are set out in Appendix 2 and summarised in Table 2 below showing the findings for each stage in the development sequence alongside each other.

Table 2: Summary of Sustainability Appraisal findings related to the Development Sequence

Evidence and earlier stages of plan making	Urban area	Edge of Cambridge	New Settlements	Villages
Joint Sustainability Appraisal May 2013: Reviewing the Development Strategy for the Cambridge area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities to re-use previously developed land, reducing the need to develop greenfield / agricultural land.</li> <li>• Cambridge provides the highest concentration of jobs, and high order services and facilities in the Cambridge area, placing residential development in the urban area would enable the closest access to these.</li> <li>• Central area of the city is identified as an AQMA, and therefore further development could include placing further population in this area.</li> <li>• Best opportunity to support non-car modes of transport, and the compact nature of the city makes it particularly suitable for cycling in addition to walking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An edge of Cambridge focus would involve loss of significant amounts of high grade agricultural land.</li> <li>• Significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt from largescale new development.</li> <li>• Next closest to the urban area of the city, supporting access opportunities by alternative modes, although some areas around the city currently have more limited access to high quality public transport.</li> <li>• Larger developments could include their own local centres, and be accessed by new public transport routes.</li> <li>• Could bring dwellings closer to the M11 or A14, areas of relatively poor air quality.</li> <li>• Development near to busy routes would still add to congestion at peak times.</li> <li>• Could support delivery of significant green infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could utilise previously developed land opportunities, but likely to still utilise significant areas of greenfield land.</li> <li>• New town and local centres to ensure that residents have convenient access to local services and facilities by walking, cycling and public transport.</li> <li>• Focus investment in public transport and cycling infrastructure, delivering high quality services to provide a significantly higher modal share of travel by non-car modes than village based growth options.</li> <li>• The greater distance from Cambridge would mean higher levels of car use (although significantly better than dispersed villages based strategies).</li> <li>• Focused pressure on specific routes could have local air quality implications.</li> <li>• Mix of uses with employment delivering jobs locally and their own services. Could provide a degree of self-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to services, facilities and transport varies by village, but comparatively offer reduced opportunities and greater need to travel.</li> <li>• Less opportunities to deliver sustainable transport than a Cambridge focused or new settlement option, as spreading development around villages would be likely to deliver incremental improvements.</li> <li>• Traffic impacts would be spread more around the district, but there would be a higher modal share for car use.</li> <li>• Cycling opportunities lower than other strategy approaches, would often rely on rural roads rather than dedicated routes.</li> <li>• Most sustainable villages are in Green Belt.</li> <li>• A village based option would require incremental improvement to village infrastructure. Could put pressure on existing village services and facilities, such as schools, doctors and</li> </ul>

Evidence and earlier stages of plan making	Urban area	Edge of Cambridge	New Settlements	Villages
			<p>containment, by providing opportunities to live and work in the same place, however, the greatest concentration of jobs will remain in and close to Cambridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale and mixed use nature offer specific opportunities for renewable energy.</li> <li>Located outside the green belt they would have a lesser impact on townscape, and the setting of Cambridge. Sites tested were all outside the Green Belt.</li> <li>Opportunity to deliver significant green infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<p>utilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less opportunities to deliver green infrastructure.</li> </ul>
Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Appraisal Addendum 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many sustainability benefits including protecting the distinctive setting of Cambridge through safeguarding the Green Belt and the associated biodiversity of the Green Belt.</li> <li>Focusing all development on Cambridge will not meet the identified housing need and this would then lead to greater levels of travel (and effects on air quality) as people from outside the area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development would have substantial harm to the Green Belt purposes.</li> <li>Best performing option with regard to modal share outside Cambridge.</li> <li>High property values mean potentially higher levels of funding being available for facilities and infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could incorporate significant public transport routes to Cambridge, and new town and local centres as appropriate, to ensure that residents have convenient access to local services and facilities by walking, cycling and public transport.</li> <li>Higher levels of car use than an edge of Cambridge focus but site specific transport measures would reduce the impact of growth, increasing the proportion of trips made</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not as positive as for edge of Cambridge and new settlements for access to services and facilities.</li> <li>Development that is compatible with the character of even the more sustainable villages is unlikely to deliver very high levels of housing development overall.</li> <li>Generally higher modal share for car use. Less opportunity for focused</li> </ul>

Evidence and earlier stages of plan making	Urban area	Edge of Cambridge	New Settlements	Villages
	access new jobs.		<p>by non-car modes, including shift towards Park &amp; Ride.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mix of uses with both employment delivering jobs locally and services and facilities of higher order than with village focused development, although this option will still provide homes a greater distance from Cambridge than the edge of Cambridge.</li> <li>• Higher infrastructure costs, but lower property values than edge of Cambridge.</li> <li>• Although new settlements could have significant impacts on landscape character they will help to protect Green Belt and the setting of Cambridge.</li> </ul>	<p>transport investment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most sustainable villages are inset into the Green Belt close to Cambridge and could have a negative effect on the Green Belt (but not as significant an effect as large scale Green Belt releases).</li> </ul>

#### **4. Part 3: Considerations and the Preferred Development Strategy**

- 4.1 This section looks at the way the preferred strategy in the submitted Local Plans evolved through the plan making process. It also considers the additional evidence and SA Addendum prepared in response to the Inspectors' letter and considers afresh the appropriate development strategy for the Greater Cambridge area and proposed modifications that flow from that work.
- 4.2 Looking first at the submitted Local Plans, the document explains how the Councils took account of the need to deliver sustainable patterns of development, including the merits of different levels of development at different stages of the development sequence. This included consideration of the consequences of reviewing or not altering the Green Belt boundary on the edge of Cambridge and of different levels of development at this second stage of the sequence. The tables in Parts 1 and 2 directly compare the findings of the original evidence for the option of development on the edge of Cambridge on land in the Green Belt alongside the option of development at new settlements.
- 4.3 It should be noted that both Councils prepared audit trail documents to accompany the submission Local Plans, signposting and documenting the identification of issues, key evidence related to the issue, the options that were considered, the results of consultation, and the reasons for the preferred approach<sup>1</sup>. These documents provide a considerable level of detail on the evolution of the plans.
- 4.4 In addition, the development and refinement of the spatial strategy and the consideration of options was documented in the Topic Paper – Joint Working and Development Strategy<sup>2</sup>.
- 4.5 The respective Sustainability Appraisals also documented the identification of the development strategy, the alternatives considered through the plan making process, and the reasons for rejection of alternative approaches. This is contained in the Joint Sustainability Appraisal of the Development Strategy for the Cambridge Area<sup>3</sup> that is also published separately<sup>4</sup>. It is not intended to repeat the content of those documents in detail here, but to highlight key parts of the Councils' considerations that are pertinent to identification of the development strategy and the issues raised in the Inspectors' letter.
- 4.6 This section of the report also includes consideration of the results of the new evidence prepared in response to the Inspectors' letter. The evidence largely confirms the original evidence with some additional information and a few differences that are identified in Part 1. The options for the development strategy were reconsidered through an SA Addendum taking account of the additional evidence and is summarised in Part 2. An assessment all the available evidence and SA findings against national planning policy and guidance has been undertaken in preparing Part 3 of the document to determine whether the development strategy included in the submitted Local Plans is a sound approach or whether modifications should be made.

---

<sup>1</sup> South Cambridgeshire Draft Final Sustainability Report (RD/Sub/SC/060) Annex A - Audit tables, pages A20-A21 and Chapter 2 Spatial Strategy, Cambridge Statement of Consultation and Audit Trails, pages 66-96 (RD/Sub/C/080)

<sup>2</sup> Topic Paper – Joint Working and Development Strategy (RD/Top/010).

<sup>3</sup> South Cambridgeshire Draft Final Sustainability Report, Part 3 Appendix 1 (RD/Sub/SC/060) and Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan Volume 1: Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State, part 4 (RD/Sub/C/030).

<sup>4</sup> Development Strategy for the Cambridge Area: Joint Sustainability Appraisal (RD/LP/180)



- 4.7 A key part of the assessment of all the available evidence has been a review of the Cambridge Green Belt in the context of NPPF paragraph 84 and 85 and the aim to achieve sustainable patterns of development. This has included a direct comparison between large scale development on the edge of Cambridge, recognising the effect it would have on Green Belt purposes and the benefits it would have in transport terms, with the alternative of creating new settlements connected to Cambridge by sustainable transport links having regard to their deliverability.
- 4.8 Following this assessment, a conclusion is reached on the preferred strategy for the Local Plans and the Councils have proposed a number of modifications to the submitted Local Plans. These have been subject to assessment and Sustainability Appraisal.

#### Objectively Assessed Housing Needs

- 4.9 In response to the issues raised by the Inspectors, the Councils commissioned further independent assessment. This work, relating to Objectively Assessed Need for Housing<sup>5</sup>, sits alongside the Cambridge Sub Region Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)<sup>6</sup> that supported the submitted Local Plans. The new study has considered the following issues raised by the Inspectors:
- Whether the 2012-based CLG household projections published in February 2015 suggest a different level of need;
  - Whether an assessment of market signals justifies an uplift to these CLG demographic projections;
  - Whether they should be increased in order to provide more affordable housing.
- 4.10 The study addresses a recognised limitation of the Cambridge CLG household projections and proposes an appropriate demographic starting point of 10,069 new dwellings. It confirms the CLG projection of 17,579 new dwellings as appropriate for South Cambridgeshire. Against these figures, which national guidance states provide the starting point for considering housing need, the study concludes there should be an uplift of 30% for Cambridge and 10% for South Cambridgeshire to take account of market signals in each area, giving figures of 13,090 homes for Cambridge and 19,337 homes for South Cambridgeshire.
- 4.11 The study refers to there already being in place through the SHMA an analysis of the housing required to support future employment growth. Therefore there are two alternative housing need figures: the new projection, based on past demographic trends and market signals, and the SHMA projections, which take account of future employment. For South Cambridgeshire the SHMA figure is fractionally below the new need assessment of 19,337 dwellings. The new figure took account of past demographic trends and market signals but not future jobs. The SHMA figure suggests that, if housing is built in line with our assessment, it will provide very slightly more workers than are required to support expected job growth. Hence there is no justification for a 'jobs uplift' to the new assessment. Conversely, for Cambridge City the SHMA figure is above the new assessed need of 13,090 dwellings. This suggests that, if housing is built in line with the new assessment, the city will provide slightly fewer workers than are required to support the expected job growth. Hence the new

---

<sup>5</sup> Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination – Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Further Evidence 2015 (RD/MC/40)

<sup>6</sup> Cambridge Sub Region Housing Market Assessment 2013 (RD/Strat/090)

assessment should be adjusted upwards, to provide 14,000 dwellings as shown in the SHMA.

- 4.12 On this basis, the study concludes that objectively assessed housing needs in the study area are:
- 19,337 dwellings for South Cambridgeshire
  - 14,000 dwelling for Cambridge City.
- 4.13 These housing numbers are consistent with past demographic trends as adjusted for market signals in each local authority area (as advised by the PPG), and also provide enough labour to support expected job growth as part of an HMA-wide strategy.
- 4.14 This endorses the current requirement of 14,000 homes for Cambridge and indicates that the current figure for South Cambridgeshire of 19,000 homes should be increased to 19,500 (rounded). Consideration of affordable housing need did not result in any further recommendations. A modification to Policy S/5 is proposed with consequential changes to the supporting text (see Appendix 3).

#### The Development Sequence

- 4.15 The Councils have considered whether the development sequence established through the previous round of plan making remains an appropriate starting point for the new Local Plans.
- 4.16 The Sustainable Development Strategy Review (SDSR) undertaken by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Planning Unit<sup>7</sup> considered the issues resulting from development at each stage of the sequence. It concluded that the sequence remains a robust starting point for considering the spatial strategy for the area. It should be noted that it acknowledged that any potential conflict with Green Belt purposes would be a key consideration in assessing the suitability of specific locations. The results of the Sustainability Appraisals also confirmed that the development sequence offered a suitable starting point to guide the future development strategy.
- 4.17 The development sequence is defined in the submission Local Plans<sup>8</sup> as:
1. Within the built up area of Cambridge;
  2. On the edge of Cambridge;
  3. At new settlements;
  4. In the rural area at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.
- 4.11 As highlighted earlier, a significant amount of the development required is already committed either having planning permission or allocations carried forward from existing plans. This includes significant new developments on the edge of Cambridge such as North West Cambridge, Darwin Green, Trumpington Meadows, Clay Farm and the Wing development north of Newmarket Road. Northstowe will also make a significant contribution during the plan period. An allowance is also included for future windfalls, which is development on land that is not specifically allocated for housing.

---

<sup>7</sup> Review of the sustainable development strategy - Cambridgeshire Joint Strategic Unit (RD/Strat/040)

<sup>8</sup> Cambridge Local Plan 2014 (RD/Sub/C/010) Paragraph 2.26; South Cambridgeshire Submission Local Plan (RD/Sub/SC/010) Policy S/6

The current commitments retain the Cambridge focus of the strategy originated in the Structure Plan, with around 60% in or on the edge of the city. These developments remain a key part of the new development strategy.

**Table 1: Housing Completions and commitments by stage in the development sequence**

<b>CAMBRIDGE AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE</b>	<b>Completions and Committed Dwellings (November 2015)</b>	<b>Percentage (%) of existing total supply</b>
<b>Cambridge Urban Area</b>	5,358	20
<b>Cambridge Fringe Sites</b>	11,370	41
<b>New Settlements</b>	3,445	13
<b>Rural Area</b>	7,284	27
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>27,457</b>	

- 4.12 The Local Plans must consider how to add to this baseline, and where to focus the additional development required. The Inspectors' letter comments that the SDSR says that the question for the local plan reviews is the extent to which additional development allocations contribute to the overarching objective of genuinely sustainable development that balances economic, social and environmental needs. The Inspectors comment that a strategy whereby the majority of new allocations are at the third stage in the sequence, in other words new settlements, does not appear to support the contention that the plans accord with the SDSR.
- 4.13 The Councils agree that a question for the Local Plans is where to focus the additional development required to meet their objectively assessed needs, and this is addressed in the following parts of this document. However, the Councils maintain their view that the commitments and new allocations in the plans must be considered holistically. It is the agreed view of the Councils and their neighbours reached under the Duty to Cooperate that "Sustainable and deliverable locations and allocations in existing plans are likely to make up a significant proportion of the identified need for future land for homes and jobs. This is particularly the case where authorities have adopted core strategies or plans which have relatively long end dates. These existing allocations are founded on the principles of the existing overarching strategy and include development within and as major extensions to urban areas, and the planned new town of Northstowe."<sup>9</sup> The relationship of both the additional allocations to the development sequence and the development strategy as a whole is considered later in this part of the document.

#### The Development Strategy – Consideration of the Green Belt

- 4.14 The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts<sup>10</sup>. The Green Belt surrounding Cambridge has been in place since the 1950s. Green Belt policy has maintained the setting and special character of Cambridge; avoided coalescence with the ring of villages closest to the city; protected the countryside from development and prevented urban sprawl. The result is that Cambridge remains a compact city, surrounded by attractive countryside and a ring of attractive villages to which there is

<sup>9</sup> Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation, Page 14(RD/Strat/100)

<sup>10</sup> National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 79.

easy access by foot and bicycle. The city centre is unusually close to open countryside, particularly to the west and south-west.

4.15 National purposes of the Green Belt are established in the NPPF. However, purposes specific to the Cambridge Green Belt have been identified as:

1. To preserve the unique character of Cambridge as a compact, dynamic city with a thriving historic centre;
2. To maintain and enhance the quality of its setting; and
3. To prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the city.

4.16 Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances through the preparation of a Local Plan. The NPPF and the NPPG do not require the release of Green Belt sites to meet needs but at paragraphs 84 and 85 do require that account is taken of promoting sustainable patterns of development and of the consequences for sustainable development if development is channelled to locations outside the Green Belt. This is addressed in the following sections.

4.17 The Councils have considered whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify a review of the Green Belt boundary through this Local Plan review (reflecting paragraph 83 of the NPPF). The development sequence is clear that land on the edge of Cambridge is the second most sustainable location for development in the Greater Cambridge area after development in the existing urban area, and additional development in these areas would require a Green Belt review.

4.18 During the plan making process, the Councils did not rule out Green Belt development, and it was considered and tested as a potential development option. The Councils sought to gain a clear understanding of the impact additional releases on the edge of Cambridge would have on Green Belt purposes, through an Inner Green Belt Review.

4.19 The Councils sought views through the Issues and Options consultations on the principle of development in the Green Belt, development in Broad Locations around the city. They then tested site options, reviewing 41 potential development sites. Six sites were identified as options in the Issues and Options 2 Joint consultation, with the remainder proposed for rejection. At this stage, significant harm to the Green Belt was identified as a reason for rejection. However, in that consultation the Councils specifically asked the question on where the appropriate balance lies between protecting land on the edge of Cambridge that is of high significance to Green Belt purposes, and delivering development away from Cambridge, in new settlements and better served villages.

4.20 In response to the Inspectors' Letter, the Councils have prepared new evidence, including an independent review of the inner Green Belt boundary and the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum 2015. These consider afresh the merits of development on the edge of Cambridge, including sites that assessments show would cause significant harm to Green Belt purposes<sup>11</sup>. These are considered on a like for like basis with development options elsewhere in the development sequence, including new settlements<sup>12</sup>. Therefore the consequences of development outside the Green Belt have been compared with the consequences of further development in the Green Belt. This ensures and demonstrates that the Councils have complied with paragraph

---

<sup>11</sup> Joint Sustainability Appraisal Addendum Section 6 and Annex A

<sup>12</sup> Joint Sustainability Appraisal Addendum Section 5 Review of Development Sequence, Chapter 7 Strategic Development Alternatives, Chapter 8 Green Belt in the SA

84 and 85 of the NPPF in considering the implications of Green Belt on sustainable patterns of development and reach sound conclusions.

#### Considerations informing the decision on the Preferred Strategy

- 4.21 The Councils have developed a comprehensive suite of evidence, both the original evidence and the new evidence in response to the Inspectors' letter, which has been informed by Sustainability Appraisal, to compare and understand the strategic options available to meet future development needs. The following section of this report details the consideration of the options structured around each stage of the development sequence.

#### *Cambridge Urban Area*

- 4.22 The Sustainable Development Strategy Review and the Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plans have highlighted that the urban area of Cambridge remains at the top of the development sequence. The SDSR highlights it as, '*The most sustainable location for new development because of the ready access to existing employment, services and transport choices, development levels that are compatible with local character should be maximised*'<sup>13</sup>. The SA highlighted opportunities to re-use previously developed land, access to the highest concentrations of jobs and facilities, and opportunities for sustainable transport.
- 4.23 Reflecting the position at the top of the search sequence, Cambridge City Council endeavoured to explore all reasonable opportunities, and considered the development potential of 900 sites. Filtering of sites identified those which were available, suitable and achievable. Sites considered to be unsuitable, those at flood risk or that would harm heritage assets for example, were rejected.
- 4.24 Viability evidence identified that developments were viable along with the package of policy measures envisaged by the submission Cambridge Local Plan. The Infrastructure Delivery Study considered the infrastructure needs of the city. Whilst many of the new sites do not require specific large scale infrastructure, it is intended that contributions to wider improvements to address the cumulative impacts will be secured through Community Infrastructure Levies (CIL) for each area and both Councils have submitted a CIL for examination alongside their Local Plans.
- 4.25 Sites with development potential were tested through the Sustainability Appraisal. This considered the individual sites, and cumulative impacts on the four functional areas of the city<sup>14</sup>.
- 4.26 In carrying out the assessments, the Councils have fully considered the consequences of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary.
- 4.27 The preferred strategy maximises development within the urban area, subject to protecting and enhancing the environment of the city. Allocations and commitments from the current Local Plan and forecast windfalls already provide 5,358 dwellings (as shown in Table 1), and potential has been identified to accommodate a further 1,470 new dwellings through new allocations, giving a total of 6,828 dwellings at the top of the development sequence (as shown in Table 2). Fringe sites released through the current plans count in the second stage of the sequence until they are built, when they

---

<sup>13</sup> Sustainable Development Strategy Review 2012 (RD/Strat/040) Para 4.5

<sup>14</sup> North, East, South and West/Central.

will form part of the urban area. The Councils are not proposing any Modifications to the policies for the urban area as a result of the additional work.

#### *Better Served villages*

- 4.28 Villages are at the opposite end of the development sequence. Whilst there are variations between individual villages, they generally offer poorer access to services, facilities and transport compared to development options higher up the development sequence, even the larger, better served villages. The SA highlighted issues of incremental development offering fewer opportunities for transport infrastructure improvements, and potential pressure on village infrastructure.
- 4.29 The dispersal of development across villages, particularly the less well served villages, has been discredited through previous plan reviews, and demonstrated not to provide a sustainable development strategy for the Cambridge area. A dispersed strategy would not enable the focused delivery of new infrastructure or improvements in transport infrastructure to support travel by sustainable modes. Education provision would be a significant constraint on development in many villages, with schools unable to be expanded to accommodate additional pupils.
- 4.30 Many South Cambridgeshire villages are small, offering few services and facilities, and often lacking amenities such as a primary school. Development in these locations would mean travel for accessing even basic services, and public transport opportunities are typically limited.
- 4.31 The approach to village sites has taken into account the village hierarchy, developed following a review of the sustainability of settlements (South Cambridgeshire Village Classification Report 2012), and included in the Spatial Strategy chapter of the Local Plan. This identifies Rural Centres as the most sustainable villages in South Cambridgeshire, with the highest level of access to a combination of services, facilities, employment and public transport, providing services to a small rural hinterland. Minor Rural Centres are the next in the hierarchy, offering a lower level of services and facilities, but still more than smaller villages. The number of Minor Rural Centres is proposed to be increased in the draft plan, by including a number of other villages which have a higher level of services and facilities than most villages in the district and perform similarly to other Minor Rural Centres. These were described as Better Served Group Villages during the Issues and Options consultations. At the bottom of the hierarchy, Group Villages have a primary school but only limited other services, and Infill Villages do not have a primary school and are generally the smallest villages in the District.
- 4.32 Paragraph 85 of the NPPF requires Local Plans to consider the consequences of directing growth towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt. Whilst there are no towns, there are a range of villages inset within the Cambridge Green Belt. Four of the five Rural Centres are within or on the edge of the Green Belt. The same applies to four Minor Rural Centres, and a number of Group and Infill Villages. The South Cambridgeshire SHLAA identified some opportunities for development at these villages, either through releases of land from the Green Belt where assessment showed it could be developed without harm to Green Belt purposes or such as reusing previously developed sites. A number of other sites were rejected, for example due to flood risk, or infrastructure constraints such as education. These were consulted on at the Issues and Options consultations along with other site options in villages outside the Green Belt.

- 4.33 Policies in the submitted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan include 12 sites as allocations at larger villages and through Parish Council proposals for a total of 936 dwellings, including four sites currently in the Green Belt (as shown in Table 2). There are limited additional allocations in the rural area outside villages making best use of previously development land, giving a total of 1,084 homes on allocations in the rural area. The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan continues to support windfall development within villages, at a scale appropriate to the sustainability of the settlement, should land become available during the plan period. The supply from this source has been identified as a windfall allowance in the housing trajectory at a rate of 200 per annum, consistent with evidence on historic supply<sup>15</sup>, which are included in the rural area figure in Table 1. A number of sites identified earlier in the SHLAA and the Issues and Options documents have already gained planning permission.
- 4.34 Development of small sites at villages have the advantage that they can be brought forward relatively quickly, as they need less upfront infrastructure compared to major sites. An element of village development is therefore a potentially important element of the plan. However, these opportunities were limited compared to the overall scale of development needed in the district and a village focused strategy to accommodate the new growth has not been taken forward, as it would not deliver a sustainable pattern of development. Total supply in the rural area over the plan period is 8,220 dwellings<sup>16</sup>. No modifications are proposed in respect of village development in response to the Inspectors' letter.

#### Edge of Cambridge versus New Settlements

- 4.35 The distribution of growth between these two strategic options in the middle of the development sequence is a key choice for the Local Plans. The edge of Cambridge is higher in the sequence and has advantage in terms of accessibility. The Councils have always recognised this advantage. However, it needs to be set against Green Belt considerations and the new Green Belt study confirms that major release of land would cause significant Green Belt harm. New settlements offer an alternative means of delivering significant growth without requiring development in the Green Belt but require significant infrastructure provision to connect them to higher order services and jobs. However, the evidence is that they can be delivered in a sustainable manner by providing that required infrastructure. This is confirmed by the SA Addendum. This is now explored in more detail.
- 4.36 Large areas of land were released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge through the last round of plan making, where it was identified that these would not cause significant harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. This includes sites in the Southern Fringe, North West, and East of the city. The exception was land for the University in North West Cambridge where the international significance of the University and lack of other suitable and available land was considered such that land of high importance to the Green Belt being released. These are already accounted for in the existing commitments. Accommodating further growth would require further land to be removed from the Green Belt.
- 4.37 National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 84 and 85 say that the implications of Green Belt for sustainable patterns of development should be considered when reviewing the Green Belt through the Local Plan process. Paragraph 52 says that the

---

<sup>15</sup> Examination Statement by Statement by Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council Matter 8: Housing Land Supply and Delivery: paragraphs 108 to 101

<sup>16</sup> Note that whilst the fourth stage in the development sequence is larger villages, the figures for the rural area in Tables 1 and 2 include all rural housing development for completeness.

supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or extensions to existing villages and towns that follow the principles of Garden Cities. It is therefore relevant to consider these two stages in the development sequence alongside each other, a point made by the Inspectors in their letter of 20 May 2015.

- 4.38 The new town of Northstowe, identified through the last round of plan making, will make a significant contribution towards development needs in the period to 2031. The first two phases, comprising 5000 homes and the town centre, now have planning permission. Funding for the A14 improvements needed to allow development beyond the first 1500 dwellings is now secured, and the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Scheme is currently subject of a Development Consent Order examination. The scheme is anticipated to be completed by 2020. Construction of infrastructure on the new town site has commenced, and the first homes are anticipated in 2016/17. The new settlement of Cambourne came through an earlier round of plan making and much of the settlement is complete. The Councils therefore have significant experience of dealing with and delivering new settlements.
- 4.39 Through the SHLAA and SA process supporting the submitted Local Plans the Councils considered a number of potential further new settlement options. Sites north of Waterbeach and Bourn Airfield were identified as reasonable options and subject to consultation through the issues and options process. In addition, a significant expansion to the west of the previously established new settlement of Cambourne was identified as an option. For the purposes of this section of the report, the term 'new settlements' is used to refer to all three sites.
- 4.40 The joint Inner Green Belt Boundary Review 2012 identified that large scale development on the edge of Cambridge would cause significant harm to Green Belt purposes. The few areas where additional development could be accommodated without significant harm were identified as allocations in the Submitted Local Plans (after having been confirmed as available, suitable and deliverable through the SHLAA and SA process, and subject to consultation). As detailed earlier, other sites around the fringe of city were tested, but rejected at the Issues and Options stage, although a question was asked about the right balance between Green Belt and new settlement locations.
- 4.41 In response to the Inspectors' Letter, a new independent review has been carried out. The Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study 2015 followed a different methodology to undertake a comprehensive strategic assessment of the significance of land around the edge of Cambridge to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. It also concluded that beyond those locations already identified in the submission Local Plans, in most locations around the edge of the city it is unlikely that any development could be accommodated without substantial harm to Green Belt purposes. The only exceptions were an area of land South of Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Bell School site where the study concludes that an area of land could be released without significant harm to Green Belt purposes, and the land allocated in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan south of Fulbourn Road as an employment extension to Peterhouse Technology Park where the study concludes that a smaller site would be more appropriate in terms of Green Belt impact. This is addressed later.
- 4.42 The SA identifies the importance of balancing the accessibility aspects of sustainable development and the environmental and social benefits it brings. It identifies the significant harm that further Green Belt release would have on the aspects of sustainability that the Green Belt designation is intended to protect. It would result in irreversible adverse impacts on the special character and setting of Cambridge as a



compact, historic city and risk the economic success of the Cambridge area, which is in part built on its attractiveness as a place to live and work<sup>17</sup>.

4.43 As Table 2 earlier in this report highlights, the Submitted Sustainability Appraisals and the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum have provided a comparison of the impacts of development on the edge of Cambridge compared with development of new settlements.

- Edge of Cambridge – the SA identifies benefits of this stage in the sequence in terms of proximity to the concentration of services, facilities and employment that the city provides. It has also highlighted negative environmental impacts, on landscape and townscape and to the Green Belt.
- New settlements – the SA identifies that at a greater distance from Cambridge there would be higher levels of car use, but they provide opportunities for investment in public transport. New town and local centres would ensure that residents have convenient access to local services and facilities by walking, cycling and public transport. Located outside the Green Belt, they would have a lesser impact on townscape, and the setting of Cambridge. Sites tested were all outside the Green Belt.

4.44 Through the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum 2015, sites on the edge of Cambridge have been compared on a like for like basis with sites elsewhere in the development sequence including new settlements. Some key comparisons are:

Transport:

- Edge of Cambridge - criteria testing transport issues show positive impacts due to short distances to the city, low public transport journey times, and in many cases proximity to high frequency public transport.
- New settlements – transport criteria highlight opportunities to serve sites by high quality public transport, but journey times and cycling distances are higher when compared to edge of Cambridge options.

Access to Jobs:

- Edge of Cambridge - offers proximity to major employment sites within the city.
- New settlements have potential to include new employment development but there would be longer journeys to jobs in and around Cambridge.

Services and Facilities:

- Edge of Cambridge - dependent on the scale of an edge of Cambridge site, it would include new local or district centres. Would require significant infrastructure provision such as education and utilities.
- New settlements - would include new town and local centres which would mean residents have convenient access to local services and facilities by walking, cycling and public transport. Would require significant infrastructure provision such as education and utilities. However, they would be further from Cambridge, which remain the key centre of services and employment in the areas.

Greenfield/Brownfield Land:

- Edge of Cambridge sites - are almost entirely agricultural land.
- New settlements - offer opportunities to re-use areas of previously developed land, although would still require large areas of agricultural land to be developed.

---

<sup>17</sup> South Cambridgeshire Draft Final Sustainability Report (RD/Sub/SC/060) Part 3 Appendix 1 paragraph 104

Green Belt/Landscape/Townscape Impacts:

- Edge of Cambridge - major developments would have significant negative impact on Green Belt, landscape and townscape.
- New settlements - outside the Green Belt.

The Councils recognise that maximising transport sustainability is an important issue, but it must be considered alongside other sustainability considerations<sup>18</sup>. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Transport Report 2015 highlights benefits in terms of the share of sustainable modes of transport for edge of Cambridge development in comparison with development options further from the city. Edge of Cambridge sites car mode share ranges from 13% to 32% for trips to Cambridge, but overall 41-49% to all destinations. New settlements car mode share of 58-70% to Cambridge, but 57-60% to all destinations<sup>19</sup>. The proximity particularly supports higher levels of cycling.

- 4.45 New settlements tested would not deliver the mode share of trips by sustainable modes anticipated from edge of Cambridge sites. However, with the provision of the sustainable transport measures proposed in the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire<sup>20</sup> (TSCSC), including park & ride and cycling, this would deliver a significant increase in the proportion of trips made by non-car modes from new settlements, including 27% public transport to Cambridge in the case of Bourn Airfield which includes 12% park & ride<sup>21</sup>. However, their distance from Cambridge means that cycling mode shares to the city are considerably lower than sites on the edge of Cambridge.
- 4.46 Given the overall scale of development and background traffic growth in the plan period, in overall terms differences between the strategic choices including edge of Cambridge or new settlements for the Local Plans were much less marked, with scenarios tested varying only by 1 to 2 %<sup>22</sup>.
- 4.47 New settlements provide an opportunity to focus growth on key radial routes into Cambridge and bring with them significant improvements to deliver high quality public transport and cycling access into Cambridge, connecting with key destinations. This has the potential to deliver significant improvements to existing settlements along these corridors, both within and beyond the Greater Cambridge area. It is often the case that these corridors currently experience significant congestion problems which would be addressed by the transport improvements delivered through a development strategy that includes new settlements.
- 4.48 The Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, which was prepared in parallel with the Local Plans, identifies infrastructure that would be needed to support the new settlements, along with a wider package of improvements for the area to address other known and forecast issues in the Cambridge area. This reflects the approach required in two tier areas by NPPF paragraph 180. The TSCSC proposes to create new High Quality Public Transport (HQPT) routes, in particular on the A10 corridor serving Waterbeach new town (in addition to the existing rail line) and on the A428 corridor serving Bourn Airfield and Cambourne West. These will provide a service frequency for journeys to Cambridge of at least every 15 minutes. The HQPT

---

<sup>18</sup> NPPF Paragraphs 30 and 34.

<sup>19</sup> Transport Report 2015 paragraphs 5.63 - 5.64, Figure 5-11, 5-12, 5.13 Mode Share of AM trips from major development areas

<sup>20</sup> Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy (RD/T/120) Strategy and Action Plan

<sup>21</sup> Transport Report 2015 paragraph 5.64.

<sup>22</sup> Transport Report 2015 paragraph 5.51 and Figures 5-5 and 5-6.

corridor proposals will reduce bus journey times to Cambridge by implementing measures that enables buses to bypass queuing traffic. It includes measures to develop highly accessible pedestrian and cycling infrastructure. In addition, Cambridge itself will see focussed interventions of walking, cycling and public transport – including more emphasis on orbital movements that link up key employment sites<sup>23</sup>.

- 4.49 The Local Plans identify transport infrastructure needed to deliver the developments allocated, consistent with the TSCSC. Major development proposals in the Local Plans are not the sole purpose of many of the improvements. It is intended that the developments will make an appropriate contribution towards the funding of the schemes identified in the relevant Local Plan policies, via section 106 or CIL.
- 4.50 The City Deal for Greater Cambridge<sup>24</sup> will make a significant contribution to funding, and provide added certainty regarding commitment to delivery. Public transport improvements between the A428 and Queen's Road Cambridge and additional park & ride have been prioritised for Tranche 1 of the City Deal funding. The A428 corridor has been subject to a phase 1 study<sup>25</sup>, identifying options for this element, and for bus improvements between Cambourne, Bourn Airfield and the edge of Cambridge and public consultation on options for these measures was undertaken in October/November 2015. These measures are programmed for delivery by 2020.
- 4.51 The Inspectors' letter raised a question over the feasibility and deliverability of the sustainable transport measures to serve the new settlements using the A428 corridor as an example. The current consultation moves the project forward and is supported by a technical report. The Councils propose to undertake further assessment of feasibility and deliverability to supplement the technical report, taking account of the results of consultation and views of stakeholders. A similar exercise will be carried out for the A10 corridor, prepared in parallel with the A10 corridor study and drawing on its findings. These will be reported back to the Local Plan examinations in due course.
- 4.52 The Inspectors also raise a question about the phasing of development and the need for any mitigation measures for development in the first five years covered by the plans. This mainly applies to the A428 corridor in respect of development at Cambourne West. This issue is being considered in the context of a current planning application for a larger scale of development at this site. The County Council recognises that there will be pressure to deliver development in the corridor prior to implementation of the full City Deal proposals. The County Council has advised that it will therefore work with developers to identify what interim measures could be provided by this development to support early housing delivery. These interim measures will need to complement the wider corridor proposals, must not be abortive work, and are likely to include improved provision for cyclists, potentially seeking to address pinch points that impact upon bus journey times, and possibly localised highway works. Depending on what detailed assessment of these interim measures shows, and the rate at which development actually happens, there may be a need to accept some very short deterioration in travel conditions pending delivery of the larger scale corridor works. This will all be addressed in determining the planning application and the Inspectors will be advised of the outcome.
- 4.53 Significant development on the edge of Cambridge would not necessarily be a cheap option in terms of transport infrastructure. They would be placing potentially very large

---

<sup>23</sup> Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (RD/T/120) Strategy and Action Plan

<sup>24</sup> Greater Cambridge City Deal (RD/Strat/300)

<sup>25</sup> Madingley Road / A428 Cambourne to Cambridge Corridor Study Interim Report

[http://epetition.cambridgeshire.public-i.tv/assets/A428\\_Interim\\_Report\\_1\\_June\\_2015\\_for\\_Publication.pdf](http://epetition.cambridgeshire.public-i.tv/assets/A428_Interim_Report_1_June_2015_for_Publication.pdf)

developments, generating large numbers of vehicle movements, at a specific point in the city's transport network, and there are existing congestion issues on all the radials into Cambridge. Transport modelling considered the infrastructure needed for the major sites being promoted through the Local Plans, and identified that significant new road infrastructure would be required in most cases, often more than being suggested by the promoters. Comparisons can be made with permitted development on the southern fringe, where significant transport improvements were needed to enable development now under construction. This included the new Addenbrooke's Access Road at a cost of £25.5m and the construction of the southern section of the Guided Bus which cost £40m. As a comparison with the new settlement strategic transport costs, the County Council estimates that a strategic link road to the south east of Cambridge from Fulbourn Road to Addenbrookes Road to serve strategic level development in this area would be likely to cost in the order of £45-60million including junction improvements.

- 4.54 Large scale strategic developments require new infrastructure in order to make them sustainable. This includes infrastructure needed for new communities, such as education, libraries, sports facilities and open space. Reflecting NPPF paragraph 38, they have potential to secure a mix of uses in order to provide opportunities to undertake day-to-day activities including work on site. Very large urban extensions would also have these costs, as they would also be unable to rely on existing infrastructure capacity in most cases.
  
- 4.55 Viability evidence has confirmed that sites on the edge of Cambridge offer higher sales values than options further from the city. This offers benefits in terms of potential to secure higher funding through Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) / Section 106. Cambridge is proposing to secure a higher rate of CIL than South Cambridgeshire, and this higher rate has the potential to be applied to edge of Cambridge sites. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements which can utilise existing infrastructure if it is available. However, the Infrastructure Study and Viability Report indicate that the new settlement proposals will be viable with a significant proportion of affordable housing and there is scope for these sites to contribute towards the cost of strategic transport corridor improvements relevant to their planned growth. City Deal funding and other potential sources are intended for and will be available to make up any shortfall that might be identified at the planning application stage, although the City Deal partners have made clear that developments will be expected to make full and appropriate contributions to the infrastructure they require.
  
- 4.56 In terms of access to jobs, the largest employment opportunity in the area will remain Cambridge, although there are a number of large employment areas anticipated to grow in South Cambridgeshire. A number of the major development proposals submitted to the Local Plan process on the edge of Cambridge include employment elements, particularly south of Addenbrooke's Road which includes a proposal for a new science park. New settlements also have the potential to deliver new employment opportunities, although they would also have a role in housing people employed in Cambridge.
  
- 4.57 The longer lead-in time to bring forward new settlements is an important consideration. Experience at Northstowe has informed the understanding of lead in times, and the Councils have considered the housing trajectories to ensure that annual delivery rates are robust and realistic. It is likely that any new settlement identified in this plan period will continue to develop beyond 2031, and help meet longer term development needs.

4.58 As detailed earlier, the Councils consulted on the strategic choices during the plan making process. The results are reported in the Councils' Statements of Consultation<sup>26</sup>. In 2012, both Councils sought comments in their respective Issues and Options consultations on how the sustainable development strategy should be taken forward for the area. This included whether there should be a further review of the Cambridge Green Belt, and where the focus of development should be. The South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options consultation 2012 sought views on the development sequence and where development should be focused (Question 9)<sup>27</sup>. The most supported option was to focus development on new settlements, receiving around ten times as many supporting representations as either a Cambridge focus or a sustainable villages focus<sup>28</sup>. This was followed up in the Joint Issues and Options consultation in 2013<sup>29</sup>. Again the most favoured options were for new settlements in preference to Green Belt development.

#### Identifying the Preferred Development Strategy

- 4.59 As highlighted in this report, working collaboratively<sup>30</sup> the Councils have considered a range of issues to determine their preferred approach to the development strategy. In light of the Inspectors' letter, they have prepared and reviewed a range of new evidence. In doing so they have compared development options requiring land to be removed from the Green Belt on a like for like basis with options outside the Green Belt.
- 4.60 The letter from Nick Boles MP to Sir Michael Pitt dated 3 March 2014 notes that it has always been the case that a local authority could adjust a Green Belt boundary through a review of the Local Plan. The letter goes on to state that it must always be transparently clear that it is the local authority itself which has chosen this path.
- 4.61 The Councils acknowledge the advantages of edge of Cambridge sites in terms of sustainable accessibility to jobs and services in the urban area. The Councils have also taken account of the constraint imposed by the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt and the level of harm that large developments within the currently designated Green Belt would have. However, this factor itself has been balanced against the need to promote sustainable patterns of development and the consequences of channelling development to locations outside the Green Belt. Consideration of sustainability must take account of the full range of economic, social and environmental issues. NPPF paragraph 152 requires Local Planning Authorities to seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and net gains across all three. Significant adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued.
- 4.62 In the context of all evidence now available, the Councils have considered the merits of edge of Cambridge sites and the locational advantages they offer, against the significant harm that would be caused by substantial development on the edge of Cambridge to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. The Councils' assessment in

<sup>26</sup> South Cambridgeshire Statement of Consultation (RD/Sub/SC/090) and Cambridge City Council Statement of Consultation and Audit Trails (RD/Sub/C/080)

<sup>27</sup> South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options 1 (RD/LP/030) - Question 9 Chapter 4 Page 37

<sup>28</sup> Consultation results are summarised in the South Cambridgeshire Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal (RD/Sub/SC/060) Annex A – Audit Trail Chapter 2 Page A100

<sup>29</sup> Cambridge Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Issues and Options 2 Joint Part 1 2013 consultation (RD/LP/150) Chapter 8 Question 1 Page 50

<sup>30</sup> Reflecting NPPF paragraph 179

2012 of the importance of land on the edge of Cambridge to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt has been endorsed by the new independent assessment (with two main differences at land South of Cambridge Biomedical Campus and land South of Fulbourn Road). Additional new settlements offer sufficient benefits in terms of critical mass, services and facilities and opportunities to deliver high quality transport improvements. The new evidence confirms that they can provide viable developments and are capable of delivering the infrastructure required to make them sustainable developments. If there proves to be a funding shortfall at the planning application stage, there are a number of significant funding sources available to make up that shortfall, in particular the City Deal. The transport improvements that are required to make the new settlements sustainable will also have a wider benefit for existing communities.

- 4.63 The Councils consider that the need for jobs and homes could in principle provide a justification for review of the green belt boundary. However whether in fact such a release is appropriate involves balancing other consideration including impact of release in the purpose of the Cambridge green belt, the accessibility advantages of locating development on the edge of the urban area and reasonable alternative. The result of this balancing exercise has led the Councils to conclude that only small scale Green Belt releases at locations where harm to the purposes of the Green Belt designation would not be significant is appropriate.
- 4.64 The development strategy supported by the LTP / TSCSC offers significant benefits in terms of delivering sustainable travel both for planned and existing communities. The City Deal for Greater Cambridge, securing up to £500 million with the aim of enabling continued growth in the successful Cambridge area by investing in infrastructure, housing and skills, provides a significant funding boost, and added certainty regarding commitment to delivery.
- 4.65 In summary the preferred approach to the development strategy reflects the Submitted Local Plans:
- Development within Cambridge where there is capacity
  - Additional development on the edge of Cambridge where this would not cause significant harm to Green Belt purposes at:
    - Worts' Causeway
    - Darwin Green (small additional area to existing site)
    - Fulbourn Road (employment allocations)
  - New Settlements at North of Waterbeach and at Bourn Airfield
  - Extension of Cambourne at Cambourne West
  - Limited Village allocations at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.
- 4.66 Modifications are proposed in response to the Green Belt Review 2015:
- Amendment to the land south of Fulbourn Road employment allocation (see below and Appendix 4).
  - Additional employment development opportunity south of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus – a provisional modification pending further investigations (see below and Appendix 5)
- 4.67 In addition, further redevelopment capacity has been at Cambridge East North of Cherry Hinton. This is addressed in the separate document on Housing Land Supply<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Housing Land Supply Update (RD/MC/50)

4.68 The Council consider that the Preferred Strategy:

- maximises development within the urban area of Cambridge focusing on previously developed land
- includes the existing major developments on the edge of Cambridge identified in the adopted plans through previous Green Belt releases
- releases limited land for development on the edge of Cambridge weighing in each case the sustainability merits of such locations with the significance of harm to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt
- focuses growth at new settlements on two key strategic growth corridors, supported by transport improvements to achieve sustainable high quality public transport and other infrastructure such as education, with potential to support longer term sustainable growth outside the Green Belt;
- continues to limit the amount of new development in villages whilst providing for new development focused at the more sustainable villages to provide some flexibility to meet local needs
- supports the recycling of land at villages and schemes to meet local needs, with the scale of schemes guided by the rural settlement hierarchy<sup>32</sup>.

4.69 The spatial strategy is considered to be the most appropriate when considered against the reasonable alternatives. When the total development planned to 2031 is considered, the emphasis on Cambridge-focused development contained in the Structure Plan 2003 remains. This represents a sustainable development strategy for the wider Cambridge area that meets objectively assessed housing needs in a way that supports the successful economy and provides pattern of development that will give genuine opportunities for residents of new developments to live in a sustainable way. Many will benefit from new settlements that provide a wide range of services and facilities and, with significant new public transport measures on the two corridors involved akin to the successful Guided Busway, the opportunity to move around the area by sustainable modes of transport.

4.70 The location of development new to the Local Plans within the plan period are distributed within the development sequence as follows:

**Table 2: New housing allocations and total housing provision by stage in the development sequence**

<b>CAMBRIDGE AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE</b>	<b>New Allocations<sup>33</sup></b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>	<b>Total Development 2011 to 2031</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
<b>Cambridge Urban Area*</b>	1,470	18	6,828	19
<b>Cambridge Fringe Sites</b>	1,300	16	12,670	35
<b>New Settlements and Cambourne West</b>	4,610	55	8,055	23
<b>Rural Area*</b>	936	11	8,220	23
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8,316</b>	100	<b>35,773</b>	100

<sup>27</sup> South Cambridgeshire Submission Local Plan (RD/Sub/SC/010) Policies S/8 to S/11

<sup>33</sup> Note: This is new allocations and additional land at Cambridge East :north of Cherry Hinton

\*Includes anticipated windfalls

- 4.71 On the edge of Cambridge, sites at Worts' Causeway and Darwin Green can deliver additional development for housing and would have limited impacts on Green Belt purposes which are capable of mitigation. In addition, a review of the land north of Cherry Hinton previously removed from the Green Belt by the Cambridge East Area Action Plans indicates capacity for an additional 740 homes beyond that indicated in the submitted Local Plans.
- 4.72 The development of land south of Fulbourn Road for employment would have limited impacts on Green Belt purposes which are capable of mitigation. Particular exceptional circumstances also exist relating to the expansion needs of ARM, a major local business. This site now has planning permission. The release of land at Fulbourn Road East would have limited impacts on Green Belt purposes which are capable of mitigation and provides the opportunity for additional employment development on the edge of Cambridge adjacent to the successful Peterhouse Technology Park. The Green Belt Review 2015 agreed that land can be released from the Green Belt here without significant harm to Green Belt purposes but concludes that this only applies as far as the roundabout with Yarrow Road. South Cambridgeshire District Council therefore proposes to reduce the size of the proposed allocation to remove the area east of the Yarrow Road roundabout (see Modification in Appendix 4).
- 4.73 The Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study 2015 also identifies potential for an area of land immediately south of and adjoining the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Bell School site to be developed with limited impact to Green Belt purposes. This falls within two distinct areas. These areas have been re-examined through the Sustainability Appraisal process.
- The land south of the Bell School housing site, that is currently under construction, has been assessed for its potential for housing. A significant part of the land south of the Bell School site is located within Flood Zone 3. The sequential test means that this land is not suitable for allocation for residential development.
  - The land immediately south of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus is subject to surface water flooding with a category of Low risk. Further investigation will be required to examine whether there is development potential on this site. The Biomedical Campus has been planned to provide long term development capacity, but has been developed more quickly than anticipated, particularly with the relocation of Astra Zeneca to the site. The additional land offers an opportunity to provide for future growth needs in a sustainable way flowing specifically from the Green Belt review 2015, if further investigations show that the surface water flooding issues can be satisfactorily addressed. A Provisional Modification is therefore proposed for consultation, and a decision whether to propose a modification to the Inspector will be dependent on the outcome of further investigations of the surface water flooding issue including discussions with the landowner (see Modification in Appendix 5, which should be read alongside the site assessment and sustainability appraisal assessment which are also included in Appendix 5). These investigations are on going.
- 4.74 New settlements north of Waterbeach and at Bourn Airfield remain appropriate inclusions in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, along with the Cambourne West development. The preference to allocate all three strategic sites has been influenced by the long lead in times for new settlements which will therefore come forward later in the plan period and continue developing beyond 2031.



- 4.75 As part of the phasing strategy for new settlements, the District Council has proposed that the first housing completions at Bourn Airfield New Village should not be delivered before 2022, and no more than 1,700 dwellings by 2031. For Waterbeach new town, it states that no more than 1,400 dwellings will be completed by 2031. The promoters have indicated that development could start on site considerably earlier than had been anticipated by the District Council at the time the plan was submitted. In order to provide a flexible strategy that can respond to any changing circumstances, modifications are proposed which would remove these restrictions, and whilst delivery is brought forward in the trajectory it takes a cautious approach and the start date remains later than the promoters indicate. Modifications are proposed in the separate document Housing Land Supply<sup>34</sup>
- 4.76 The small number of village allocations identified in the Submission South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, focused on Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, remain an appropriate element of the strategy. These will help deliver development in the early years on the plan period and some provide additional housing in the southern part of the district close to jobs in a number of business parks.
- 4.77 A number of modifications are proposed to the supporting text of both Local Plans to refer to the additional work (see Appendices 3 and 6).

### Conclusion

- 4.78 The Councils have carried out or commissioned new studies to review the evidence on objectively assessed housing needs, Green Belt, transport, infrastructure and viability to ensure that the decision on the preferred strategy is based on a full understanding of the implications of the different strategy options. An addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal has also been carried out to ensure that the sustainability issues of the options available to the Councils are understood, in particular land on the edge of Cambridge and new settlements.
- 4.79 The Councils have been clear that they recognise the merits of land on the edge of Cambridge in accessibility terms and the transport evidence confirms that situation, although it makes clear that major new development on the edge of Cambridge on congested radial routes have their own transport issues and are not necessarily cheap to deliver. The independent Green Belt evidence supports the findings Councils' own evidence that release of land on the edge of Cambridge can be expected to compromise substantially the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt, with two exceptions and modifications are proposed to respond to these, one to reduce the size of an allocation in the submitted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and one provision one to allocate a new employment allocation as an extension to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus.
- 4.80 The evidence also looks at the potential to deliver sustainable new settlements as an alternative to sites on the edge of Cambridge and concludes that they can provide viable and deliverable developments that will be able to contribute to strategic off site infrastructure and provide high quality public transport links to Cambridge that will attract significant levels of patronage and also provide wider benefits to existing communities. The City Deal is a significant opportunity to deliver sustainable transport to serve the wider area and with its focus on supporting the delivery of the development strategy is an important fund intended to assist with any funding shortfalls that might arise.

---

<sup>34</sup> Housing Land Supply Update (RD/MC/50)

- 4.81 Having weighed all those factors, the Councils maintain their view that the development strategy in the submitted plans, with limited modifications, provides the right balance for this plan period that will provide a range of deliverable sites for the plan period and beyond and consider that sustainability will be secured.

## **Appendix 1: Evidence Supporting the Submitted Local Plans**

### **SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY**

- Joint Statement on Strategic Planning in Cambridgeshire 2010 (RD/Strat/030)
- Sustainable Development Strategy Review 2012 (RD/Strat/040)
- Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation: Supporting the Spatial Approach 2011 to 2031, May 2013 (RD/Strat/100)

### **TRANSPORT**

- CSRM Modelling Summary Report July 2013 (RD/Strat/160)
- Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (RD/T/120)
- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Transport Report 2015

### **STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT**

- Cambridge Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (RD/Strat/130) and 2013 Update (RD/Strat/140)
- South Cambridgeshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (August 2013) (RD/Strat/120)
- Joint Technical Background Document Part 1 (RD/LP/170).
- Technical Background Document Part 2 and Part 2 Supplement (RD/LP/260 and RD/LP/310)

### **INFRASTRUCTURE**

- Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Study (August 2012)(RD/T/010) & Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Study Update (August 2013) (RD/T/020)
- Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015

### **VIABILITY**

- Cambridge City Council Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and Potential Site Allocations High Level Viability Assessment (RD/Strat/150);
- Cambridge City Council Supplementary Report Small Sites – Affordable Housing Viability (RD/H/320);
- Cambridge City Council Student Accommodation – Affordable Housing Financial Contributions Viability (RD/H/340);
- Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment, Cambridge City Council (RD/T/200).
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission & Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule Consultation Viability Study 2013 (RD/T/220);
- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Viability Update 2015

### **ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORTS**

- Cambridge Local Plan Issues and Options Report 2012 (RD/LP/240)
- South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options 2012 (RD/LP/030)
- Cambridge & South Cambridgeshire Joint Issues and Options Part 1 2013 (RD/LP/150)
- Cambridge Issues and Options 2 2013 Part 2 (RD/LP/270)

- South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options 2 2013 Part 2 (RD/LP/050)
- South Cambridgeshire Village Classification Report (RD/Strat/240)

#### **GREEN BELT**

- Inner Green Belt Boundary Study 2002 Cambridge City Council (RD/Strat/170) & Cambridge Green Belt Study 2002 by Landscape Design Associates for South Cambridgeshire District Council (RD/Strat/180) & Green Belt study by Landscape Design Associates (2003) in relation to land West of Trumpington Road.
- Inner Green Belt Appraisal Cambridge City Council May 2012 (RD/Strat/200)
- Inner Green Belt Study Review December 2012 (RD/Strat/210)
- Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study, LDA 2015

#### **GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL**

- Greater Cambridge City Deal (RD/Strat/300 & Board and Assembly Reports)

## **SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY**

### **Joint Statement on Strategic Planning in Cambridgeshire 2010 (RD/Strat/030)**

- A1.1 Statement produced in 2010 by the Cambridgeshire authorities setting out their position regarding the development strategy for the County in light of the Government's announcement of the revocation of Regional Spatial Strategies and aspiration for a locally based planning system.
- A1.2 The Cambridgeshire authorities remain committed to the strategy for planning in the County, including the provision of housing, as originally established by the Structure Plan and as reflected by the policies and site proposals in the Cambridge Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire District Council's Development Plan Documents and developing strategies for market towns. The key objective of the strategy is to locate homes in and close to Cambridge, following a comprehensive review of the Cambridge Green Belt, and to other main centres of employment, while avoiding dispersed development which increases unsustainable travel and makes access to services and community facilities difficult.

### **Sustainable Development Strategy Review 2012 (RD/Strat/040)**

- A1.3 The purpose of this Sustainable Development Strategy document was to review what sustainable development means in the context of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and to ensure that the sustainability of different broad spatial options for locating new developments are assessed. This document does not consider specific development sites or locations. Furthermore, it does not address overall housing and jobs numbers or the distribution of these.
- A1.4 It was prepared by the Cambridgeshire Joint Strategy Unit on behalf of the Councils. It complements the Sustainability Appraisals undertaken for the individual local plans.
- A1.5 It states that, 'the main aim of the existing development strategy in adopted plans is to enable genuinely sustainable development that balances economic, social and environmental needs. The question for the (local plan) reviews is the extent to which additional development allocations contribute to this overarching objective.
- A1.6 Overall, the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Sustainable Development Strategy Review document concludes that the development strategy in the Cambridge Local Plan and the South Cambridgeshire Development Plan Documents remains the most sustainable for the two areas, subject to striking the right balance between meeting the needs and demands for new homes and jobs, with environmental, infrastructure and quality of life factors.
- A1.7 There is an argument for treating two districts as one unit for housing land supply purposes. It has the advantage of enabling phasing of development across two areas to ensure most sustainable sites come forward, recognising that different scales of development are delivered over varied timescales. It also ensures most sustainable locations in and around Cambridge phased for earlier plan periods with larger, sustainable sites in South Cambridgeshire, phased for later years. It would obviate

need for smaller sites in South Cambridgeshire (easier to deliver but less sustainable) which might otherwise be allocated only to ensure a five year housing land supply demonstrated.

- A1.8 Section 4 of the document outlines the existing approach to the location of development and considers how each of the options performs against the sustainability considerations set out in Section 3 of the document.

#### Summary by Stage in the Development Sequence:

##### Urban Area

- A1.9 The most sustainable location for new development because of the ready access to existing employment, services and transport choices, development levels that are compatible with local character should be maximised<sup>1</sup>.

##### Edge of Cambridge

- A1.10 Locating development on the urban edge has significant advantages in sustainability terms. New housing would be close to existing major employment locations and main services and facilities; as well as providing the opportunity to create new employment premises, which can benefit from a large labour pool within the city and its surrounds. Urban concentration generally allows for shorter journeys and enables use of existing well-established public transport, cycling and walking routes. Occupants of new development would benefit from access to the services, facilities and opportunities that provide for a good quality of life. Greater value means that the necessary infrastructure and facilities are more likely to be provided. Large-scale planned development like a major urban extension is likely to have a long lead-in time, in terms of planning, land assembly and preparation. Key considerations in assessing the suitability of specific locations will be any potential conflict with Green Belt purposes and the deliverability of infrastructure improvements<sup>2</sup>.

##### New Settlements

- A1.11 Depending on their overall scale, new settlements should be sustainable due to their self-containment, particularly by providing homes, jobs and essential services within a single planned development. The location for a new settlement can be chosen with regard to proximity to the main urban area and to good quality public transport. This should help offset the length of journeys and will enable some to be made by non-car modes. Out-commuting to workplaces and other facilities and services is likely.
- A1.12 Planning a reasonably-sized new settlement enables self-containment and economies of scale for infrastructure. However, providing all the necessary infrastructure (for example new secondary schools) may present viability challenges. New settlements can build-in quality in the built environment and public realm through a comprehensive planned approach. It is less straightforward, however, to create a sense of place and community cohesion. There are potentially long

---

<sup>1</sup> Sustainable Development Strategy Review 2012 (RD/Strat/040) Para 4.5

<sup>2</sup> Summarised from paragraphs 4.6 to 4.10 Sustainable Development Strategy Review 2012 (RD/Strat/040)

preparation, planning and overall lead-in times before development starts. Furthermore, large-scale settlements can have long build-out times before they are completed<sup>3</sup>.

### Villages

A1.13 Villages within South Cambridgeshire are already categorised for planning purposes according to their scale, provision of services and accessibility. More sustainable villages are less likely than other stages in the sequence to provide large-scale employment opportunities, but they have the advantage of being located relatively close to Cambridge with good public transport access. There are limited opportunities to generate new or enhanced public transport provision, although existing provision of services and opportunities for cycling are plus points. Similarly, the scale of development typically coming forward is unlikely to place significant demands for large-scale infrastructure provision. Compared to larger planned developments, delivery of development in villages can occur relatively quickly. However, development that is compatible with the character of even the more sustainable villages is unlikely to deliver very high levels of housing development overall<sup>4</sup>.

### **Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation: Supporting the Spatial Approach 2011 to 2031, May 2013 (RD/Strat/100)**

A1.14 The Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation was produced by the local authorities to support the development of a coherent and comprehensive growth strategy across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. The Memorandum aims to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development in Cambridgeshire & Peterborough, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

A1.15 In undertaking the review or roll forward of their plans, the local authorities are clear that fundamentally they will continue to be guided by the strategic principles which underpinned the original growth strategy, first set out in the 2003 Structure Plan. Locating homes in and close to urban areas and to other main centres of employment is critical to ensure appropriate, sustainable development. It is essential, therefore, that the future development needs of the wider area are considered and agreed through a strategic plan-led approach, which takes account of identified local and national priorities.

A1.16 Sustainable and deliverable locations and allocations in existing plans are likely to make up a significant proportion of the identified need for future land for homes and jobs.

A1.17 In undertaking the review or roll forward of their plans, the local authorities are clear that fundamentally they will continue to be guided by the strategic principles which underpinned the original growth strategy, first set out in the 2003 Structure Plan. Locating homes in and close to urban areas and to other main centres of employment is critical to ensure appropriate, sustainable development.

---

<sup>3</sup> Summarised from paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 Sustainable Development Strategy Review 2012 (RD/Strat/040)

<sup>4</sup> Summarised from paragraphs 4.21 to 4.24 Sustainable Development Strategy Review 2012 (RD/Strat/040)

- A1.18 Sustainable and deliverable locations and allocations in existing plans are likely to make up a significant proportion of the identified need for future land for homes and jobs. This is particularly the case where authorities have adopted core strategies or plans which have relatively long end dates. These existing allocations are founded on the principles of the existing overarching strategy and include development within and as major extensions to urban areas, and the planned new town of Northstowe.
- A1.19 Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire have a strong geographic relationship. Interdependencies between the two administrative areas are well-established through the location of key employment sites and patterns of travel to work. Urban capacity within Cambridge will be an important source of future development opportunities. This includes expanded employment opportunities around the proposed new Science Park rail station to the north of the city. The authorities will need to consider carefully the balance of development across their areas, taking account of the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt, the sustainability of existing settlements and the opportunities to create new settlements.

## **TRANSPORT**

### **CSRM Modelling Summary Report July 2013 (RD/Strat/160)**

- A1.20 In 2012, transport modelling work was commissioned to inform the emerging Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans, and the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. This modelling work was undertaken in three phases, reflecting the transition from broad options at the start of the plan making process, to the testing of preferred options. Modelling runs were used to test and consider transport mitigation measures, to help inform measures eventually included in the draft local plans and the transport strategy, to maximise benefits and ensure a sustainable strategy.
- Phase 1 (Autumn 2012): Seven different scenarios were tested based on the sites in the Issues and Options consultation, including the current committed level of development (planning permissions and sites allocated in current local plans). These scenarios sequentially increased the total development, allowing the impact of varying levels of future housing at different stages of the development sequence to be tested.
  - Phase 2 (Spring 2013): Detailed tests were carried out on short-listed strategic options: village focused development in South Cambridgeshire, development at Bourn Airfield and a new town at Waterbeach. These tests allowed the different development focuses to be compared, including the potential for mitigation of transport impacts. Each option was tested first without additional transport measures (the Do Minimum), and then with sites specific transport measures and other strategic transport improvements in place (the Do Something). By this point, the decision had been taken that major new development on the edge of Cambridge should be a rejected option, so further modelling of this option was not carried out.



- Phase 3 (Spring 2013): Preferred Local Plan Strategies: In the final phase, the Proposed Submission Local Plan scenarios for South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge were tested together with an enhanced package of transport mitigations. (see Modelling Report Section 2.4). Transport mitigation measures used in the transport modelling reflect those developed for the emerging Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, designed by Cambridgeshire County Council to address significant known transport issues, and anticipate measures which would be needed to support future growth.

A1.21 The conclusions summarised in the executive summary are:

- The Local Plan strategies should pursue focused rather than dispersed development;
- Development locations should maximise sustainable travel alternatives to the car, particularly by providing high quality public transport. New Settlement locations are best suited to delivering the necessary infrastructure to encourage travel by non-car modes;
- Such public transport routes need to be able to bypass queues and congestion to offer reliable and swift journey times both to the identified growth areas to improve options for residents in existing villages and settlements as well as for the new developments.
- The Transport Strategy will help to make the city and key destinations more accessible;
- The Preferred Local Plan strategies and transport measures should reduce the amount of car growth to and from the city; and
- With a growth in travel demand generally stricter controls on car access and parking in Cambridge will need to play an increasing role in managing car travel demand.

A1.22 This work has therefore demonstrated that the proposed Local Plan and Transport Strategy should have a beneficial effect overall. The development strategy chosen by providing further housing will assist in minimising in-commuting, which is a major driver of future traffic growth. The focus on new settlements will provide opportunities to further minimise traffic growth through use of sustainable travel modes and internalisation of trips.

#### Summary by Stage in the Development Sequence:

##### Urban Area

A1.23 As might be expected, new households in or near Cambridge use cars less than those in villages: typically there are 6% more extra car trips per household further from Cambridge<sup>5</sup>.

##### Edge of Cambridge

---

<sup>5</sup> CSRM Modelling Summary Report July 2013 (RD/Strat/160) Section 2.1

- A1.24 Transport modelling, using the Cambridge Sub-Regional Model (CSRM), an integrated multi-modal land use and transportation model, was carried out in three phases. The first phase considered seven different scenarios, with different levels of development focused at different stages in the development sequence, adding combinations of sites onto the baseline transport situation. This included two levels of development of sites on the edge of Cambridge.
- A1.25 As might be expected, new households in or near Cambridge use cars less than those in villages: typically there are 6% more extra car trips per household further from Cambridge<sup>6</sup>.

#### New Settlements

- A1.26 Comparison of strategic options showed that a village focused strategy would generate a higher proportion of trips by car, and a lower proportion of trips by public transport compared to strategy options focused around new settlements. The Transport Modelling Report identifies a significant shift in modes that will be enabled by the package of identified transport measures, particularly identifying that additional trips with new settlements strategy enable over 5% higher mode share by public transport compared with additional corresponding trips associated with a village focused strategy<sup>7</sup>.
- A1.27 Whilst the concentrated impacts of the car trips on specific corridors creates more congestion on those routes than a rural dispersed strategy this can be more easily addressed through delivery of new settlements.
- A1.28 Modelling Report identified and tested specific mitigation measures related to new settlement options.
- A1.29 Having Bourn Airfield and Cambourne West on the same corridor helps to support the public transport improvements that would help mitigate the transport impacts and congestion on Madingley Road between the A428 and the M11 junction and onward into the city<sup>8</sup>.

#### Villages

- A1.30 Due to the amount of existing committed development, and the impact of suppressed demand, overall differences between strategy options relatively small, but new households in villages create extra car trips compared to new households in or near Cambridge.
- A1.31 Comparison of strategic options (phase 2 of the modelling) showed that a village focused strategy would generate a higher proportion of trips by car, and a lower proportion of trips by public transport compared to strategy options focused around

---

<sup>6</sup> CSRM Modelling Summary Report July 2013 (RD/Strat/160) Section 2.1

<sup>7</sup> CSRM Modelling Summary Report July 2013 (RD/Strat/160) Section 2.3

<sup>8</sup> CSRM Modelling Summary Report July 2013 (RD/Strat/160) Section 2.3

new settlements<sup>9</sup>. It would be more challenging to deliver new infrastructure to a dispersed village based strategy.

## **Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (RD/T/120)**

A1.32 The Local Plans were prepared in close cooperation with Cambridgeshire County Council. The LTP is a statutory plan addressing transport matters, produced by the Local Highways Authority. Following the adoption of the third Local Transport Plan (LTP3) in 2011<sup>10</sup> by the County Council, and in order to help the Councils plan for sustainable growth, it was decided to prepare a Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC) in parallel with the Local Plans, which would form a daughter document to an updated Local Transport Plan which would reflect and support the implementation of its proposals. A joint group comprising Members of the three Councils, the Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group, was established as part of the duty to cooperate to guide the integrated process ahead of formal decisions by the individual Councils on their respective plans.

A1.33 Following consultation alongside the Local Plans<sup>11</sup>, the TSCSC was adopted in March 2014<sup>12</sup>. LTP3 was also refreshed and updated, in line with requirements to keep it up to date with National policy context as well as new and emerging transport and planning strategies. The refreshed LTP3 was adopted by the County Council in November 2014<sup>13</sup>, along with the Long Term Transport Strategy<sup>14</sup>, which reflect the strategy and schemes in the TSCSC. The Local Plans identify transport infrastructure needed to deliver the developments allocated, consistent with the TSCSC. The TSCSC includes an action plan identifying funding sources and identifying when infrastructure is anticipated to be delivered.

A1.34 The TSCSC identifies a series of transport improvements and measures that would be required to support delivery of the strategic developments identified in the submitted Local Plans and address existing transport issues. Enhancement to transport corridors will deliver a network of High Quality Passenger Transport (HQPT), delivering higher frequency services with faster and more reliable journey times. New infrastructure will enable buses to access Cambridge whilst avoiding delays in car traffic. There will be an enhanced network of park and ride services<sup>15</sup>, and segregated cycleways.

A1.35 The TSCSC also proposes improvements to the existing network within Cambridge and in particular the capacity for movement by non-car modes. Road space will be reallocated to buses, cyclists and pedestrians in many areas of the city. Orbital bus movements will also be prioritised. There will be enhancements to the cycling

---

<sup>9</sup> CSRM Modelling Summary Report July 2013 (RD/Strat/160) Section 2.3

<sup>10</sup> Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 3 - 2011-2026 (March 2011) (RD/T/090)

<sup>11</sup> Issues for a New Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (July 2012) (RD/T/100); Draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (July 2013) (RD/T/110)

<sup>12</sup> Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire & Action Plan (TSCSC) (adopted March 2014) (RD/T/120)

<sup>13</sup> Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2031 (LTP3 Refresh) Adopted November 2014 (RD/T/093)

<sup>14</sup> Cambridgeshire Long Term Transport Strategy (LTTS) Adopted November 2014 (RD/T/095)

<sup>15</sup> Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire & Action Plan (TSCSC) (adopted March 2014) (RD/T/120) figure 4.1 page 4-3

network including the Chisholm Trail. These improvements will help people move around Cambridge improving journeys for people accessing key centres, services and employment areas, including through delivery and improvement of interchange facilities, where people change their mode of travel or take a different service.

- A1.36 The South Cambridgeshire Submission Local Plan includes policies for strategic sites that require specific transport measures to address the impact of proposals and deliver sustainable transport solutions in line with the TSCSC.

### **Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Transport Report 2015**

- A1.37 This Report builds on the Modelling Report 2013 and the transport modelling undertaken prior to submission of the Local Plans.
- A1.38 After the suspension of the Local Plan Examination in 2015, it was decided that the Phase 2 tests should be re-run and expanded to cover additional options for development focusing on major developments in areas on the edge of Cambridge (currently in the Green Belt). Accordingly, Phase 2 was re-run with the original 3 options tested in 2013 (village focused development in South Cambridgeshire, development at Bourn Airfield and a new town at Waterbeach), and four additional options for green belt development. The four radial Green Belt options tested were: a west radial comprising development on Barton Road, a combined south and north-east radial for developments adjacent to Hauxton Road and Trumpington Road and Horningsea Road in the north east of the City, a south east radial for development off Babraham Road, and a combined radial scenario covering all of these together.
- A1.39 The Phase 2 tests allowed the different development focuses to be compared, including the potential for mitigation of transport impacts. As before, the results demonstrated that amongst the original options, the dispersed village development option is less preferable than new settlements in terms of car mode share of new trips generated. This reflects the improved access to public transport and greater internalisation that can be achieved in larger developments. The concentrated impacts of car trips on specific corridors can be more easily addressed through focused mitigation measures.
- A1.40 The edge of Cambridge options tested all have a high active mode share and lower car mode shares for trips from the sites themselves, as might be expected due to the proximity to the City and the provision of sustainable infrastructure. This indicates the expected advantages of development on the edge of the City. However, when considering overall car mode share and traffic growth for the Districts from the total level of development considered, the net benefit from these options is less apparent. All options tested indicate overall traffic growth of a similar order, and very significant growth in delay and congestion across the two districts. The transport measures proposed and tested in each case are successful in reducing traffic levels and congestion, but in all options levels of delay will rise by 80% in South Cambridgeshire, and double in Cambridge.

A1.41 Phase 3: In the final phase, the Proposed Submission Local Plan scenarios for South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge (the Preferred Strategy) were tested together with an enhanced package of transport mitigations. These transport mitigation measures were developed in cooperation with Cambridgeshire County Council.

A1.42 A re-run of phase 3 has been undertaken to reflect modifications proposed to the Local Plans. The results are reported in this modelling report. The Transport Strategy measures proposed have a beneficial impact on travel behaviour in the two districts. These measures directly cause non-car trips into Cambridge to grow at double the rate they would otherwise be expected to (26% compared with 13%). The growth in car trips into Cambridge is reduced by 11% in the AM peak. The measures have the added impact of reducing the total trips into Cambridge making the City more accessible overall. This clearly shows that the Transport Strategy improves trips by public transport, cycling and walking.

A1.43 The Report concludes that:

- The Local Plan Strategies should pursue focused rather than dispersed development;
- Development locations should maximise sustainable travel alternatives to the car, particularly by providing high quality public transport;
- Such public transport routes need to be able to bypass queues and congestion to offer reliable and swift journey times both to the identified growth areas to improve options for residents in existing villages and settlements as well as for the new developments; and
- The Transport Strategy will help to make the city and key destinations more accessible and should reduce the amount of car growth to and from the city.

#### Edge of Cambridge

A1.44 Modelling of strategic options which focused additional development on the edge of Cambridge had lower car mode shares and higher proportions of trips by active modes of travel to Cambridge. Potentially due to a combination of the location of growth on the periphery of the city being well served by public transport, and distances being within cycling range.

#### New Settlements

A1.45 Higher car mode shares in comparison with Cambridge and the edge of Cambridge. Transport measures tested on growth corridors increase the proportion of trips made by non car modes, including shift towards Park & Ride.

#### Villages

A1.46 Dispersed village development option is less preferable than new settlements or edge of Cambridge in terms of car mode share of new trips generated.

## **STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT**

## **Cambridge Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (RD/Strat/130) and 2013 Update (RD/Strat/140)**

A1.47 The SHLAA is a technical assessment of the potential suitability, availability and achievability of sites for housing development. Just under 900 sites were considered for their development potential within the urban area of Cambridge. In preparing Cambridge's SHLAA in compliance with the requirements of the NPPF, public consultation was undertaken in 2008 and 2009 concerning assessment criteria, density assumptions and methodology. Two calls for sites were undertaken and the draft SHLAA was the subject of public consultation in September - November 2011. This resulted in a preferred list of sites being formulated which were considered to be deliverable and developable. Following the calls for sites and consultation, the SHLAA was first published in May 2012, alongside Issues and Options consultation. When published, the SHLAA 2012 included reference to the deliverability and developability of existing allocations in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006. The SHLAA 2013 updated the SHLAA 2012. This updated version of the SHLAA took into account changes to sites that had occurred in the interim period as part of developing the Local Plan. The SHLAA 2013 was endorsed as part of the evidence base for developing a new Plan for Cambridge at the Council's Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee in May 2013.

## **South Cambridgeshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (August 2013) (RD/Strat/120)**

A1.48 The SHLAA is a technical assessment of the potential suitability, availability and achievability of sites for housing development.

A1.49 For South Cambridgeshire, the SHLAA was first published in July 2012 and a supplement was published in December 2012. Further updates were published in June 2013, and then August 2013. The latter replaced the previous documents.

A1.50 Both were informed by a 'call for sites', and representations received through the issues and options process. Each site was subject to testing according to a methodology, informed by stakeholders via a Housing Market Partnership. Criteria considered strategic and local planning constraints, as well as an assessment of whether the site was available and deliverable. The testing included consideration the infrastructure required to serve a site, and whether the site was economically viable.

## **Joint Technical Background Document Part 1 (RD/LP/170).**

A1.51 For the edge of Cambridge, sites were assessed using a joint proforma, informed by both the SHLAA and the SA criteria. This was included within the Interim Sustainability Appraisal which accompanied the Joint Issues and Options 2 Part 1.

A1.52 The Joint Green Belt Site Assessment Pro Forma template can be found at Appendix 1<sup>16</sup>, which includes an explanation of the criteria, in particular:

---

<sup>16</sup> Repeated in South Cambridgeshire Draft Final Sustainability Report (RD/Sub/SC/060) Annex BI

- For each criterion an explanation was provided as to which of the Cambridge SA topics and South Cambridgeshire SA objectives it relates to<sup>17</sup>.
- Level 1 included Green Belt assessments informed by the Green Belt Review 2012 with impacts on Green Belt purposes and matters important to the special character and setting of Cambridge set out.
- Level 2 included criteria relevant to sustainable patterns of development such as sustainable transport and accessibility to existing centres and services. The sustainable transport criteria included two sub-sets:
  - from the Cambridge SA where the measures used reflected the urban nature of Cambridge and as such edge of Cambridge, as the lowest in the development sequence, scored relatively poorly compared with the rest of Cambridge
  - from the South Cambridgeshire SA where the measures used reflected the mainly rural nature of South Cambridgeshire and as such edge of Cambridge, at the top of the development sequence, scored well compared with the rest of the district
- The proformas included a conclusion for both levels 1 and 2 and an overall conclusion. All the conclusions are together at the end of each proforma and not at the end of each level.

A1.53 These assessments were included in the Joint Technical Background Document Part 1 (RD/LP/170).

#### Summary by Stage in the Development Sequence:

##### Urban Area

A1.54 Following a detailed site search and consideration of a long list of over 900 potential sites through the Cambridge SHLAA, 59 sites were considered through the plan making process.

##### Edge of Cambridge

A1.55 The two Councils tested sites on the edge of Cambridge jointly. The Issues and Options Reports in July 2012 divided the area on the fringes of Cambridge into 10 Broad Locations<sup>18</sup>. In January 2013, the Councils Jointly consulted on an Issues and Options 2 Part 1 report<sup>19</sup>. This was accompanied by a Technical Background Document providing an assessment of 41 sites on the edge of Cambridge<sup>20</sup>.

<sup>17</sup> Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council Interim Sustainability Appraisal to accompany Local Plan Issues & Options 2 Report (Part 1) – Appendix 1 page 15 to 34

<sup>18</sup> South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options 2012 (Issue 12); Cambridge Issues and Options Report 2012 (Options 10 to 19)

<sup>19</sup> Issues and Options 2 Part 1 Joint Consultation on Development Strategy and Site Options on the edge of Cambridge <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/issues-options-2-jan-feb-2013>

<sup>20</sup> Cambridge Local Plan Towards 2031, South Cambridgeshire Local Plan – Issues and Options 2: Part 1 – Joint Consultation on Development Strategy & Site Options on the Edge of Cambridge – Technical Background Document Part 1 <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/background-documents>

A1.56 A joint site testing proforma was developed for the purpose of testing edge of Cambridge sites. Six sites were considered to be potential options for inclusion in the Local Plans, and subject to consultation as options in the Issues and Options Report. The remainder were rejected as options for development, due either to their significance to green Belt purposes, or other planning constraints<sup>21</sup>.

#### New Settlements

A1.57 A total of 14 sites which would either deliver new standalone settlements, or expand existing new settlements were tested. Five options at three locations were subsequently identified for consultation through the Issues and Options 2012. This included options at Waterbeach and Bourn Airfield, and the Strategic Reserve at Northstowe. Sites at Six Mile Bottom, Hanley Grange, Heathfield, Duxford, north of Cambourne, north east of Northstowe, and Barrington Quarry were identified as sites with no development potential.

#### Villages

A1.58 Around 260 sites were subject to SHLAA assessment. The majority were identified as having no development potential. Those considered to have some or limited development potential, at better served villages were subject to consultation through the issues and options process.

### **Technical Background Document Part 2 and Part 2 Supplement (RD/LP/260 and RD/LP/310)**

A1.59 These documents were produced by Cambridge City Council in relation to Issues and Option 2 Part 2 and following that consultation to support the Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission consultation. The Part 2 Supplement provided an update on a limited number of sites.

A1.60 The Technical Background Document Part 2 sets out the methodology for the assessment of the potential sites to be allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan. It also contains the full assessments of all 34 sites within the Cambridge boundary that are considered to be suitable for allocation for either residential, mixed use, employment, university/college and residential mooring development.

A1.61 To properly evaluate the suitability and deliverability of sites a rigorous and transparent method of assessment was required. This includes full evidence and justification. A pro forma was developed to assess each site.

A1.62 A long list of sites was drawn up and was initially reduced, by removing those sites which had already been consulted upon in the Issues and Options 1 consultation in June/July 2012, sites less than 0.5 hectares (apart from a small number of residential

---

<sup>21</sup> Summary of Reasons for rejection can be found in: Issues and Options 2 Part 1 Joint Consultation on Development Strategy and Site Options on the edge of Cambridge – Appendix 4  
<https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/issues-options-2-jan-feb-2013>



sites which due to their location could be developed at a high density), and those picked up through annual monitoring where planning permission had been granted.

- A1.63 All of these sites were then assessed by Cambridge City Council using the City Sites pro forma. Sites that scored 'amber' or 'green' as the overall conclusion across the Level 1 and Level 2 criteria are considered by the Council to be 'reasonable' options for allocation. All of these sites have been subjected to sustainability appraisal.

## **INFRASTRUCTURE**

### **Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Study (August 2012)(RD/T/010) & Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Study Update (August 2013) (RD/T/020)**

- A1.64 Key infrastructure components for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire have been set out in the Councils' Infrastructure Delivery Study (IDS) and its 2013 update that accompany and support the Local Plans.
- A1.65 Both Councils have worked closely with key infrastructure providers and stakeholders throughout the plan process, in order to obtain information on a wide range of infrastructure needs. The IDS not only considers what additional infrastructure is needed in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, but also establishes what other funding sources are available. These sources include core Government funding, anticipated planning obligations and anticipated necessary highways improvement schemes funded by organisations other than the Councils.
- A1.66 It identifies costs associated with individual developments at each stage of the development sequence.
- A1.67 The IDS considered infrastructure delivery over the plan period, with more detailed costing in the first 5 - 10 years where available. The IDS has examined the indicative phasing of planned development across Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and infrastructure requirements have been placed within time bands dependent on when they are likely to be required by new development. The IDS provides a spatial breakdown of infrastructure requirements including information for category, cost, delivery, phasing, funding, responsibility and location. Where it has been necessary, the IDS has resolved what infrastructure is 'critical', 'necessary' and what is 'desirable'. The IDS is a 'live' document and will periodically be updated to reflect changes in the evidence base, legislation and funding streams.

### **Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015**

- A1.68 The study was commissioned to assess the infrastructure requirements, costs and known funding relating to planned growth, particularly the strategic sites and identify any phasing issues that might affect the proposed growth and advise on the future delivery of infrastructure needed to support the planned growth. This study has been developed in parallel with the updated viability assessment.

- A1.69 Whilst all the growth and infrastructure needs of the area during the plan period were considered, the study focused on the delivery of the new sites identified in the submitted local plans, including infrastructure required, when it was needed, and how it could be funded.
- A1.70 The IDS and Viability Study, together conclude that the strategic sites are all capable of being delivered with the infrastructure they require, with a reasonable expectation that the level of any shortfall in funding for off site infrastructure will be met through other funding sources, in particular City Deal which is already prioritising delivery of key schemes on the two radials where improvements are necessary to bring forward strategic sites.

## **VIABILITY**

**Cambridge City Council Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and Potential Site Allocations High Level Viability Assessment (RD/Strat/150);  
Cambridge City Council Supplementary Report Small Sites – Affordable Housing Viability (RD/H/320);  
Cambridge City Council Student Accommodation – Affordable Housing Financial Contributions Viability (RD/H/340);  
Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment, Cambridge City Council (RD/T/200).  
South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission & Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule Consultation Viability Study 2013 (RD/T/220);**

- A1.71 Cambridge City Council considered the viability of a range of policies in the Local Plan, including affordable housing and the environmental construction standards. These ensured that policies in the plan could be delivered whilst maintaining the viability of development. Viability consultants Dixon Searle LLP were commissioned to undertake viability modelling work on planned development proposals across Cambridge, as well as examining the viability of the SHLAA and emerging Local Plan policies RD/T/200, RD/Strat/150, RD/H/340 and RD/H/320).
- A1.72 For South Cambridgeshire, a Viability Study (2013) was commissioned that assessed the viability of development in the area, taking account of a range of development values and costs including the cumulative impact of policies. The study concluded that there is potential to create viable residential schemes associated with the Council's strategy.
- A1.73 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations require that consideration is given to 'the potential effects (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability of development across its area'. Both councils have considered the level of CIL it is viable to charge within their respective areas, and have proposed charging schedules as a result.

Summary by Stage in the Development Sequence:

Urban Area

A1.74 In Cambridge, the CIL Viability Study identifies that the highest values were in Market and Newnham. The study suggested whilst it was possible to set three different charging rates, it was recommended that Cambridge adopt a CIL charging rate of £125/sqm for residential development alongside 40% affordable housing.

#### Edge of Cambridge

A1.75 In South Cambridgeshire, The Viability Study 2013 identifies that typically highest values were around the Cambridge fringe (especially around the south and west of the City), to the south / south-west of the city and in some southernmost areas of the District<sup>22</sup>. Cambridge Edge scenarios demonstrated at a strategic level. A higher rate of CIL (£125 sqm) for residential development could be considered, similar to that being proposed in Cambridge alongside 40% affordable housing.

#### New Settlements

A1.76 The South Cambridgeshire Viability Report notes that at the stage of this report, based on the available information it is not possible to undertake detailed review of the largest new towns and villages. These are proposed for delivery from 2023 / 2026 to well beyond the emerging plan period and are going to need ongoing and detailed review and monitoring of their capacity to deliver growth and associated infrastructure over such a long time span through varying market cycles etc.

A1.77 The study tested Bourn, Cambourne and Waterbeach scenarios, and considered that Scenarios were potentially viable development but with consideration of the optimum works and planning obligations packages achievable in response to the actual delivery circumstances. In terms of CIL, however, this all points to a nil (£0/sq. m) charging rate approach being necessary for larger scale development assuming that significant s.106 obligations are going to be required. Depending on the Value Level achieved, lower affordable housing levels may be needed<sup>23</sup>.

#### Villages

A1.78 The South Cambridgeshire Viability Study identified that values varied across the district<sup>24</sup>. Overall rate of not more than £100/sq. m, applicable District-wide. Sites likely to be viable at this rate when required to deliver 40% affordable housing, subject to site specific costs such as remediation costs<sup>25</sup>.

### **Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Viability Update 2015**

---

<sup>22</sup> South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission & Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule Consultation Viability Study 2013 (RD/T/220) 3.2.4

<sup>23</sup> South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission & Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule Consultation Viability Study 2013 (RD/T/220) 3.3.2

<sup>24</sup> South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission & Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule Consultation Viability Study 2013 (RD/T/220) 3.2.4

<sup>25</sup> South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission & Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule Consultation Viability Study 2013 (RD/T/220) 3.3.4 to 3.3.17

A1.79 In 2015 the Councils commissioned an update of the viability assessments to ensure that the inputs and findings are consistent with other Local Plan evidence and studies. It responded to changing policy requirements resulting from Written Ministerial Statements, which could impact on cost assumptions. It also provided a further assessment of strategic development sites.

#### Summary by Stage in the Development Sequence:

##### Urban Area

A1.80 Net effect of the cumulative impact of changes in market conditions, development costs and national and local policies is positive. This also indicates that if the previously recommended affordable housing policies and CIL rates are maintained, viability is certainly no worse and in fact suggests that there is scope for any currently applicable upward pressure on land values and / or build or other costs to be absorbed whilst maintaining viability, in a strategic overview sense. The results fed into the Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015, where there implications for available infrastructure funding were considered.

##### Edge of Cambridge

A1.81 Results are summarised on page 36 of the report. Due to increasing sales values, results indicate potential for increased funding for S106 / strategic infrastructure, including when 40% affordable housing policy requirement is applied compared to the 2013 study.

##### New Settlements

A1.82 Results are summarised on page 36 of the report. Due to increasing sales values, results indicate potential for increased funding for S106 / strategic infrastructure, including when 40% affordable housing policy requirement is applied compared to the 2013 study.

## **ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORTS**

### **Cambridge Local Plan Issues and Options Report 2012 (RD/LP/240)**

A1.83 The Cambridge Issues and Options Report 2012 focussed on the City Council's area by assessing options for continued development within the urban area as well as exploring whether there should be further development on the edge of Cambridge in the Green Belt.

A1.84 It outlined the existing development strategy, including the releases of land from Green Belt for urban extensions to redress balance houses / jobs in / close to Cambridge, growth of University & Addenbrookes and address congestion on radials.

A1.85 The Issues and Options Report sought views on a number of growth options, and their implications for development in Cambridge:

- Option 2 – 12,700 new homes to 2031 – ‘urban growth’. 10,612 commitments and 2,060 sites through SHLAA within urban area and existing extensions. Sustainable, infrastructure deliverable, sustainable travel, balanced with amenity issues. But does not meet needs – housing or economy, increased in-commuting & associated congestion.
- Option 3 – Up to 14,000 new homes to 2031– ‘ the current development strategy’ - as option 2 plus 1,300 new homes provided on land released from Green Belt. Meets housing & economic needs. Sustainable. Infrastructure deliverable. Insufficient affordable housing. Loss Green Belt. Infrastructure & transport pressures.
- Option 4 – Up to 21,000 new homes to 2031 – ‘enhanced levels of urban and Green Belt growth’ - As option 2 plus up to 8,300 new homes on land released from Green Belt. Impacts as above, but greater impact on Green Belt and uncertainty of delivery in plan period.
- Option 5 - Up to 25,000 new homes to 2031 ‘significantly increased levels of urban and Green Belt growth’ - As option 2 plus up to 12,300 new homes on land released from Green Belt.

A1.86 Comments were sought by the Council as to whether the current development strategy remained the soundest basis for development in Cambridge for the period to 2031. The Report looked at options for continued development within the urban area as well as exploring whether there should be further development on the edge in the Green Belt. This included:

- Whether there should be more development than is already committed in the 2006 Local Plan on the edge of Cambridge?
- Should more land be released from the Green Belt?
- If so, where should this be? Ten broad locations<sup>[1]</sup> (Options 10 – 19) around Cambridge were included in the consultation document.

A1.87 This production of options for broad locations was informed by an Inner Green Belt Appraisal. It stated that existing releases from the Green Belt were sound, but adjacent land has added value to Green Belt purposes and setting of City.

A1.88 A coordinated approach between Cambridge & South Cambridgeshire would be taken to ensure sustainable strategy for wider Cambridge area.

### **South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options 2012 (RD/LP/030)**

A1.89 The South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options 2012 consultation included a question on how the sustainable development strategy should be taken forward. This included:

---

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

- Whether there should be more development than is already committed in the 2006 Local Plan on the edge of Cambridge?
- Should more land be released from the Green Belt?
- If so, where should this be? Ten broad locations around Cambridge were included in the consultation document.
- Whether there were any other approaches that should be considered at this stage?

A1.90 There was also strong acknowledgement of the good progress that is being made towards implementing the current strategy, with development progressing on fringe sites on the edge of Cambridge.

A1.91 The South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options 2012 consultation included a question on how the sustainable development strategy should be taken forward.

A1.92 It explained that any development strategy for South Cambridgeshire needs to recognise the links with Cambridge, particularly in terms of providing employment to support the successful economy of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, and housing to provide opportunities for the workforce, both existing and new, to live close to where they work.

A1.93 It highlighted that existing plans propose a development sequence focusing first on Cambridge, then extensions to Cambridge on land now released from the Green Belt, followed by the new town of Northstowe with its links to Cambridge via the Guided Busway. They then look to the market towns elsewhere in the County and only finally to villages that have good services, facilities, employment and public transport. As part of the last round of plan-making, the Green Belt around Cambridge was reviewed and land released to provide new communities on the edge of the City. These included land in South Cambridgeshire at Trumpington Meadows, sites both sides of Huntingdon Road in North West Cambridge, Cambridge East, and potential for additional housing at Orchard Park.

A1.94 As with the current strategy, the updated Local Plan is likely to need to be a combination of sites at different stages in the sequence in order to meet housing targets and in particular some village housing developments to provide a 5 year supply, given the long lead in time for new major developments which would realistically only start to deliver later in the plan period.

A1.95 The options for the development strategy consulted on that lie within South Cambridgeshire were to:

- Focus on providing more development on the edge of Cambridge, in part to replace development previously planned on Cambridge airport which is no longer available in the plan period, through a further review of the Green Belt.
- Focus on providing more development through one or more new settlements, of sufficient size to provide sustainable development, including provision of a secondary school, and with good public transport links to Cambridge.

- Focus on providing development at the more sustainable villages that have the best levels of services and facilities and accessibility by public transport and cycle to Cambridge or, to a lesser extent, a market town.
- A combination of the above.

A1.96 As for Cambridge, strategy options considered included whether there should be further development of land on the edge of Cambridge, through a review of the Green Belt, and whether there was 'exceptional circumstances' to justify release of land. The same ten broad Green Belt locations were identified for consultation around the edge of Cambridge.

A1.97 Excluding the edge of Cambridge over 300 sites were tested through the Sustainability appraisal and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. This resulted in 52 housing site options being presented for consultation, ranging from new settlements to sites at better served villages.

### **Cambridge & South Cambridgeshire Joint Issues and Options Part 1 2013 (RD/LP/150)**

A1.98 Through the joint Issues and Options Part 1 consultation in 2013, the Councils sought views on the appropriate balance between protecting land on the edge of Cambridge that is of high significance to Green Belt purposes, and delivering development away from Cambridge in new settlements and at better served villages.

A1.99 It outlined the existing development strategy in adopted plans, which was consistent with the agreed development strategy for the Cambridge area set out in the 2003 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan. The Plans released significant land from the Cambridge Green Belt and allocated a number of urban extensions to the city in the south, north west, north east and east of the city. Significant progress had been made in bringing these sites forward. The Airport element of Cambridge East was no longer going to deliver development until at least 2031.

A1.100 The document highlighted the considerable challenges for the Cambridge area, in the context of:

- A strong and growing economy;
- The need for new homes to support the jobs and the aim to provide as many of those new homes as close to the new jobs as possible to minimise commuting and the harmful effects for the environment, climate change and quality of life that it brings; and
- A tightly drawn Green Belt to protect the special characteristics of historic Cambridge that help make it attractive to business and residents.

A1.101 The Document highlighted the findings of the Sustainable Development Strategy Review document, with its key themes of:

- The need to have regard to the scale of development that is planned at different locations, not least to ensure that development allocations do not undermine the delivery of the existing sustainable development strategy and lead to a return to unsustainable patterns of development;

- Its ability to deliver the necessary infrastructure to create sustainable communities; and
- Overall delivery implications and timescales.

A1.102 It acknowledged that the NPPF requires plans to consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary. As a result a review of the Green Belt would be undertaken.

A1.103 The Issues and options report sought views on the appropriate balance lies between protecting land on the edge of Cambridge that is of high significance to Green Belt purposes and delivering development away from Cambridge in new settlements and at better served villages.

A1.104 On balance, Councils concluded not appropriate at this time to consider large Green Belt releases that cause significant harm. It highlighted that a future strategy could mean that a much higher proportion of new housing will have to be delivered at the lower stages in the sequence with the negative impacts this will have on sustainable development. However, the alternative would be to consider allocating further large sites on the edge of Cambridge where the evidence is clear that there would be very significant harm to the purposes of the Green Belt, although they would have the benefit of being more sustainable in other respects.

A1.105 A long list of sites at the fringe of Cambridge was developed within these broad locations, resulting in an initial list of 41 sites. Sites were tested using a joint proforma, building on the SHLAA and SA process of both Councils. Results are included within the 'Technical Background Document - Part 1' which accompanied the consultation. In order to draw information together in an accessible form, and reach an overall conclusion on the merits of the sites assessed, key elements from the proformas were combined in a series of summaries by broad location which enable the most and least sustainable sites to be identified. These can be found in Appendix 2 & 3 of the Issues and Options 2 (2013) Part 1 document.

A1.106 Following the assessment, 6 sites in the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge were identified as being sites with development potential, albeit with some constraints or adverse impacts. These include two housing sites, two employment sites, one site which could be developed for either housing or employment and one which could be potentially developed for housing, employment or a community stadium. Five of these sites are located to the south of Cambridge and one is to the north of Cambridge. Four of the sites are within the Cambridge City Council boundary and two fall within South Cambridgeshire. These were subject to public consultation in the joint Issues and Options 2: Part 1 consultation in January 2013. The other sites assessed were rejected as options for development, due to either their significance to Green Belt purposes and/or for other reasons including planning constraints such as archaeological merit.

## **Cambridge Issues and Options 2 2013 Part 2 (RD/LP/270)**



A1.107 Following an extensive search and rigorous assessment of additional housing sites within the built-up area, sites were put forward which could deliver an additional 2,060 homes. These sites were subject to public consultation in January 2013, including initial sustainability appraisal by Cambridge City Council.

#### **South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options 2 2013 Part 2 (RD/LP/050)**

A1.108 In response to Issues and Options 2012 consultation, 58 new sites were submitted to the Council for consideration. The 30 sites in identified 'Better Served Group Villages' (now Minor Rural Centres) and above were assessed and 10 additional site options were identified for consultation in the through the Issues and Options 2013 Part 2 consultation.

#### **South Cambridgeshire Village Classification Report (RD/Strat/240)**

A1.109 Within the existing Core Strategy Development Plan Document most of the housing growth to 2016 was planned at urban extensions to Cambridge, and the new town of Northstowe. A relatively small amount of development was allocated at villages, focusing on Rural Centres, the better served and most sustainable villages in the district. As well as identifying Rural Centres, the existing Core Strategy categorises the remaining villages according to their relative sustainability, services they provide, and their role in the district, into Minor Rural Centres, Group Villages, and Infill Villages, and includes policies regarding the scale of development proposals that would be suitable in principle within village boundaries to meet local needs, and to enable the sustainable recycling of land.

A1.110 The new Local Plan will need to identify new development sites to meet the growth needs up to 2031. It will need to consider the scale of development that is required, and how that should be distributed across the district, including what is appropriate at different settlements, towards a sustainable development strategy. If allocations are needed in the rural area of the district, the settlement hierarchy would be a consideration, as it would be an indication of the most suitable locations for growth. The Local Plan review provides an opportunity to review the settlement hierarchy, including whether the village categories remain sound, and where individual villages should sit within the hierarchy. It also provides an opportunity to review the scale of development that would be appropriate if windfall developments, sites not allocated in the plan, are proposed.

A1.111 This paper provides a review of the village hierarchy, reviewing the previously used methodology and the impact of any changes in village circumstances. The existing settlement hierarchy is then re-assessed, and options for revisions to the hierarchy identified.

A1.112 The Report recommended a number of changes to the settlement hierarchy, which were considered through the South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options 2012 consultation.

A1.113 The Submitted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan includes some changes to the previously adopted hierarchy, most significant of which was to increase the number of Minor Rural Centres.

## **GREEN BELT**

### **Inner Green Belt Boundary Study 2002 Cambridge City Council (RD/Strat/170) & Cambridge Green Belt Study 2002 by Landscape Design Associates for South Cambridgeshire District Council (RD/Strat/180) & Green Belt study by Landscape Design Associates (2003) in relation to land West of Trumpington Road.**

A1.114 The study for South Cambridgeshire District Council took a detailed look at the Green Belt around the east of Cambridge and a wider, more strategic look at the Green Belt elsewhere around the city, whilst the Inner Green Belt Boundary Study prepared by Cambridge City Council was carried out to specifically assist with identifying sites that could be released from the Green Belt for development close to Cambridge without harm to the purposes of the Green Belt including the setting of the city.

A1.115 The West of Trumpington Road study concluded that there was no case for a Green Belt release within the land West of Trumpington Road, in that the land provides a rural setting of arable farmland and water meadows close to the historic core, which is not found elsewhere around Cambridge. A smaller area of land including school playing fields and the golf course was assessed for development within this broad location and it was concluded that these were attractive features in their own right which contribute positively to the quality of the landscape setting of Cambridge, and the quality of life for people within the city.

A1.116 These studies were used to inform the Structure Plan 2003, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework.

### **Inner Green Belt Appraisal Cambridge City Council May 2012 (RD/Strat/200)**

A1.117 A forerunner to the 2012 Study, Cambridge City Council also carried out a broad-brush Appraisal<sup>26</sup> in May 2012 which evaluated the current inner Green Belt Boundary in the light of the recent land releases in the adopted plans and their development. The information gathered for the Appraisal was very useful for providing much of the base data for the December 2012 Study.

### **Inner Green Belt Study Review December 2012 (RD/Strat/210)**

A1.118 The Inner Green Belt Study Review 2012 builds on the studies that were undertaken in 2002 and 2003 as well as the broad updated appraisal of the Inner Green Belt boundary that the City Council undertook in March 2012 to sit alongside its Issues and Options consultation (Summer 2012).

A1.119 The study was undertaken against the backdrop of the most recent land releases and how those releases have affected the revised inner Green Belt boundary. The

---

<sup>26</sup> Cambridge City Council: Inner Green Belt Appraisal, May 2012 (RD/Strat/200).

appraisal specifically reconsidered zones of land immediately adjacent to the city in terms of the principles and function of the Green Belt. It did not identify specific areas with potential for further release.

A1.120 The Study concluded that six small sites could be removed from the Green Belt to provide land for homes and jobs without significant harm to Green Belt purposes. The Study also concluded that release of larger sites would cause significant harm to Green Belt purposes.

#### **Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study, LDA 2015 (RD/MC/030)**

A1.121 This study was commissioned jointly by Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council in response to the comments raised in the Inspectors' Preliminary Conclusions (letter dated 20 May 2015). The study provides an assessment of the Inner Green Belt Boundary around Cambridge, to provide a robust, transparent and clear understanding of how the land in the Cambridge Green Belt performs against the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt.

A1.122 The five purposes of Green Belt set out in the National Planning Policy Framework are:

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
- To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
- To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

A1.123 Specifically the Cambridge Green Belt purposes have been identified as:

- Preserve the unique character of Cambridge as a compact, dynamic city with a thriving historic centre
- Maintain and enhance the quality of its setting
- Prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the city.

A1.124 The study explores the various qualities that can be attributed to the Cambridge Green Belt, and provides a methodology to assess how land in the Inner Cambridge Green Belt performs against Green Belt purposes.

A1.125 Exploring the existing situation it highlights:

- Extensive areas of Distinctive townscape and landscape including the historic core, the Grange Road and West Cambridge area, and the Cam corridor including the approaches from Grantchester and Fen Ditton.
- Supportive landscape around most of the west, south and east edges of the city, where the relationship of the city to the adjacent rural landscape is an important aspect of its setting.
- Areas of Supportive townscape including the Science Park and areas of Victorian/Edwardian housing.

- Areas of Connective townscape/landscape may still be important but, depending on individual circumstances, may have potential to accommodate change.

A1.126 The study goes on to identify 16 qualities of the Cambridge Green Belt relevant to the Green Belt purposes. The study breaks the area around Cambridge down into 19 sectors and sub areas, and explores how the areas contribute to each of these.

A1.127 In summary, the study identifies that it is unlikely that any development within the sectors could be accommodated without substantial harm to the Green Belt purposes. The only exceptions are limited areas near Worts Causeway, Fulbourn Road, and Darwin Green, which have been identified in the Submitted Local Plans. However, boundary of any land released in South Cambridgeshire on Fulbourn Road should extend no further than the existing southern edge of Peterhouse Technology Park and no further east than the Yarrow Road roundabout. In addition, the study identifies that limited development south of Addenbrooke's could be undertaken without significant long-term harm to Green Belt purposes.

## **GREATER CAMBRIDGE CITY DEAL**

### **Greater Cambridge City Deal (RD/Strat/300 & Board and Assembly Reports)**

A1.128 The Localism Act 2011 introduced the Core Cities Amendment. This allows local councils to make the case for being given new powers to promote economic growth and set their own distinct policies.

A1.129 City Deals are agreements between government and a city that give the city control to:

- take charge and responsibility of decisions that affect their area
- do what they think is best to help businesses grow
- create economic growth
- decide how public money should be spent

A1.130 The first wave of City Deals are with the 8 largest cities outside of London, known as the Core Cities. City Deals - Wave 2 involves 20 cities - the next 14 largest cities outside of London and their wider areas and the 6 cities with the highest population growth during 2001 to 2010. The Greater Cambridge City Deal<sup>27</sup> is within the Wave 2 group.

A1.131 These cities will negotiate deals with government – deals that give each city new powers in exchange for greater responsibility to stimulate and support economic growth in their area. Each city had to put forward a proposal by January 2013 that showed how they hope to do this.<sup>28</sup>

### Purpose of the City Deal

<sup>27</sup> Greater Cambridge City Deal RD/Strat/300

<sup>28</sup> Information taken from the Gov.uk website policy section, *Giving more power back to cities through City Deals*.

A1.132 The success of the Greater Cambridge area is centered on the knowledge-based, high-tech economy. In order to continue this success story, the Greater Cambridge area has to grow physically whilst maintaining ease of movement between key economic hubs such as new economic centres of gravity like the Addenbrookes Bio-Medical campus to the south and the University of Cambridge's sites to the west and north-west.

A1.133 Investment in appropriate transport infrastructure and services is, therefore, critical to ensuring that that Cambridge and its environs can continue to function as a successful, vibrant and sustainable place.

A1.134 The City Deal proposition is that Greater Cambridge will create an investment fund drawing together national and local funding streams to invest in infrastructure that will drive economic growth in the area. Government will support this through an innovative Gain Share mechanism where Greater Cambridge is rewarded for prioritising, and investing in, projects that deliver the greatest economic impact over 15-20 years, commencing in 2015-16.

A1.135 Local partners in the City Deal with government are: Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council, Cambridgeshire County Council, the University of Cambridge, and the Greater Cambridge, Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership.

#### The Investment Fund and Outcomes

A1.136 Over the period 2015/6 to 2019/20, Government will provide Greater Cambridge with £100m, consisting of five annual payments of £20m. This will provide Greater Cambridge with a high level of certainty to commence investment in an ambitious programme of transport infrastructure.

A1.137 Dependent on the economic impact of the local investments, Greater Cambridge will be able to access up to an additional £400m over the next 10-15 years. This investment will sit alongside the over £500m that Greater Cambridge has pledged to invest to enable the supporting infrastructure needed to unlock the benefits of growth in the Greater Cambridge area. This pooling of central and local resources will lead to a total investment of £1bn over the City Deal period.

A1.138 The Deal Document was signed on behalf of Government and all local partners on 19 June 2014.

#### Infrastructure to be funded through Tranche 1 (2015/16 – 2019/20)

A1.139 The Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board met on 28 January 2015 agreed a prioritised infrastructure investment programme, made up of the following schemes:

- Milton Road bus priority
- Maddingley Road bus priority
- Histon Road bus priority

- A428 to M11 segregated bus route / A428 corridor Park and Ride
- City centre capacity improvements / cross-city cycle improvements (to include Hills Road in the scope)
- A1307 corridor to include bus priority / A1307 additional Park and Ride
- Chisholm Trail cycle links / Chisholm Trail bridge
- Year 1 to 5 pipeline development
- Year 6 to 10 programme development
- Programme management and early scheme development

## Appendix 2: Sustainability Appraisal

- A2.1 From the outset of both Local Plans' preparation, and throughout the subsequent processes, a series of iterative appraisals has been published and consulted upon to accompany the Issue and Options Documents, the Proposed Submission and the Submission Local Plans.
- A2.2 The process began with a Scoping stage, to identify the issues that need to be considered through the appraisals. Each authority's SA objectives were established early in the process and set out in the Councils' respective Scoping Reports<sup>29</sup>, alongside baseline information, plans, programmes and policies and their objectives and local sustainability issues.
- A2.3 At each appraisal stage, the likely effects of the reasonable alternatives available were identified, described and evaluated and possible mitigation measures to minimise adverse effects identified were proposed<sup>30</sup>. The SA findings informed the choice of preferred options and helped to refine policies taken forward in the Plans.
- A2.4 The Sustainability Appraisal reports consider options and approach to the scale of development being planning in terms of housing and jobs, options regarding the strategic approach to development, a wide range of site options that could potentially contribute to meeting development needs, and policy options which could be applied to development proposals.
- A2.5 Whilst a range of policy and site options were considered, this summary focuses on the consideration of strategy options. For further information the full reports are available separately:
- South Cambridgeshire Draft Final Sustainability Report (RD/Sub/SC/060)
  - Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan (RD/Sub/C/030) Volume 1: Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State Section

### Sustainability Appraisal of Strategy Options

- A2.6 In 2012, both councils sought comments in their respective Issues and Options consultations<sup>31</sup> on how the sustainable development strategy should be taken forward for the area. This included whether there should be a further review of the Cambridge Green Belt, and where the focus of development should be. The joint Issues and Options 2 consultation in 2013<sup>32</sup> also sought views on the development strategy.

---

<sup>29</sup> Scoping Reports were incorporated into the Final SA Reports: South Cambridgeshire SA (RD/Sub/SC/060) – Part 2; Cambridge SA. (RD/Sub/C/030) Volume 1 Part 3

<sup>30</sup> South Cambridgeshire SA (RD/Sub/SC/060): Part 3 Section 3 The Identification and Assessment of Alternatives; Cambridge SA (RD/Sub/C/030): Part 4.5.

<sup>31</sup> South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Issues and Options 2012 (RD/LP/030) – Chapter 4 Spatial Strategy; Cambridge Local Plan Towards 2031 Issues and Options Report (RD/LP/240) – Section 3 Spatial Strategy.

<sup>32</sup> Cambridge Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Issues and Options 2 Joint Part 1 2013 consultation (RD/LP/150) Question 1 page 90

## Cambridge Interim Sustainability Appraisal 2012

A2.7 This appraisal considered the following options for levels of housing growth to 2031:

- Option 2 – 12,700 new homes to 2031 – ‘urban growth’.
- Option 3 – Up to 14,000 new homes to 2031 – ‘the current development strategy’
- Option 4 – Up to 21,000 new homes to 2031 – ‘enhanced levels of urban and Green Belt growth’
- Option 5 - Up to 25,000 new homes to 2031 ‘significantly increased levels of urban and Green Belt growth’

A2.8 In summary the assessment concludes: *The decision as to the right scale of housing development for Cambridge is critical given the significant shortfall in the number of affordable houses, high house prices, the pockets of deprivation within Cambridge and the relatively high number of people who live outside and commute into Cambridge often by private car. However, Cambridge is constrained in terms of the scale of development that is feasible without significantly impacting on the setting of Cambridge, compromising the Green Belt, exacerbating flood risk and adversely impacting on biodiversity. Options 03 and 04 attempt to balance these conflicting priorities and therefore perform slightly better in terms of sustainability compared to either the maximum or minimum level of development. However, it will be important, at a project level, to ensure that the negative impacts associated with development including the transport, biodiversity and green infrastructure and the landscape and townscape in particular are addressed. It will be important to ensure appropriate levels of hard and social infrastructure are brought forward to support development and not adversely affect existing communities.*

### South Cambridgeshire Initial Sustainability Appraisal 2012

A2.9 Reflecting the Issues and Options 2012, the initial sustainability appraisal considered options for the development strategy consulted on that lie within South Cambridgeshire were to:

- Focus on providing more development on the edge of Cambridge, in part to replace development previously planned on Cambridge airport which is no longer available in the plan period, through a further review of the Green Belt.
- Focus on providing more development through one or more new settlements, of sufficient size to provide sustainable development, including provision of a secondary school, and with good public transport links to Cambridge.
- Focus on providing development at the more sustainable villages that have the best levels of services and facilities and accessibility by public transport and cycle to Cambridge or, to a lesser extent, a market town.
- A combination of the above.

A2.10 The appraisal identified the following:

#### Edge of Cambridge



- A2.11 An edge of Cambridge (option i) would involve Green Belt development. As Green Belt is designated to protected landscape and townscape character, a significant negative impact on the objective has been identified, although the scale and nature of the impact would vary. In terms of sustainable transport this option has the best potential to support journeys by sustainable modes, by providing homes closest to the largest concentration of jobs (Cambridge). It also has a positive impact on the access to services and facilities objective.

### New Settlements

- A2.12 The new settlement (option ii) has potential to address transport, as the quantity of development could enable significant transport investment. If designed as a sustainable settlement, it could also be developed with a mix of uses with both employment delivering jobs locally and its own services and facilities of higher order than with village focused development, although it will still provide homes a greater distance from Cambridge than the Cambridge focused option. Impact on landscape would again depend on the site, but the scale of a new settlement means it is likely to have a significant negative impact on the landscape objective.

### Villages

- A2.13 The sustainable village focus (option iii) would focus development on the rural settlements where there is the best access to services and facilities and best public transport, rather than smaller villages where they would be less available. However, the distances to Cambridge would be greater than the Cambridge focused option. There are likely to be less opportunities to deliver sustainable transport than the new settlement option. Impact on the landscape could be less, as it may result in smaller sites and greater distribution of development, but village expansions could still impact on village character. The most sustainable villages are located in the Green Belt close to Cambridge. This could therefore mean a review of the Green Belt, or development in the next band of settlements, which have a lower level of services and facilities.
- A2.14 An option considering less sustainable villages (group and infill villages) was considered (option v). This would have significant adverse impacts on access to services and facilities, employment, and sustainable transport. This option has therefore been rejected.
- A2.15 Option 11 considered whether more land, beyond that already released and committed, on the edge of Cambridge and potentially at larger villages, should be released from the Green Belt. The appraisal concluded that the impacts of a Green Belt review are similar to those described in the development strategy options above. Development, depending on the scale and location, has potential for significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape. There could also be impact on biodiversity objectives. However, given the best access to services and facilities will be on the edge of Cambridge, or in rural centres located in the green belt, this has the most potential to address sustainable travel objectives.

Reviewing the Development Strategy for the Cambridge area: Joint Sustainability Appraisal May 2013 (part of both Councils draft Final Sustainability Reports)

A2.16 Drawing on the Issues and Options Consultations, Evidence Base, and Sustainability Appraisals, the Councils prepare a document which set out their approach to its review of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Cambridge Area. This was incorporated into the respective sustainability appraisals undertaken by the two Councils<sup>33</sup>.

A2.17 This included the following:

- The Current Development Strategy for Cambridgeshire – Considered how the existing strategy for development in the Cambridge area was developed.
- Continuing a Sustainable Development Strategy – Considerations regarding how the strategy could be moved forward to 2031.
- Considering Options for a new Development Strategy – How strategy options were considered through the Issues and Options process.
- Existing Housing Supply – Details the existing supply of sites with planning permission or existing allocations, and how they relate to the development hierarchy.
- Identifying New Site Options – How site options for testing were identified, how they were tested through the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process, and how reasonable alternative allocations were distinguished from rejected options.
- Identification of the proposed development strategy.

A2.18 Building on the Sustainability Appraisals supporting each of the Issues and Options consultations, it included a high level assessment of the sustainability implications of focusing on different stages of the development sequence (Cambridge Urban Area, Edge of Cambridge, New Settlements, more Sustainable villages, and although not part of the development sequence for comparison the less sustainable villages).

Cambridge

A2.19 Development in Cambridge offers opportunities to re-use previously developed land, making use of the existing urban area, reducing the need to develop greenfield / agricultural land. Cambridge provides the highest concentration of jobs, and high order services and facilities in the Cambridge area, placing residential development in the urban area would enable the closest access to these. With regard to air quality, the central area of the city is identified as an AQMA, and therefore further development could include placing further population in this area. However, development in the urban area has best opportunity to support non-car modes of transport, and the compact nature of the city makes it particularly suitable for cycling in addition to walking.

Edge of Cambridge

---

<sup>33</sup> Reviewing the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Cambridge Area – See South Cambridgeshire Draft Final Sustainability Report (RD/Sub/SC/060) Part 3 Appendix 1: and Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan (RD/Sub/C/030) Volume 1: Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State Section 4.2, pages 151 - 189

- A2.20 An edge of Cambridge focus would involve Green Belt development, and loss of significant amounts of high grade agricultural land. The review of the Green Belt identified that it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development on the edge of Cambridge without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. These purposes highlight the importance to the historic City of Cambridge of the quality of its setting as well as the usual role of Green Belts in preventing communities from merging with one another. The recent review of the Green Belt released large areas of less significance to Green Belt purposes, and the land that remains on the inner edge becomes increasingly important.
- A2.21 Development on the edge of Cambridge would be the next closest development option to the urban area of the city, supporting access opportunities by alternative modes, although access to public transport services is better close to radial routes with good services, and some areas around the City currently have more limited access to high quality public transport. Larger developments could include their own local centres, and be accessed by new public transport routes.
- A2.22 Development on the edge of Cambridge could bring dwellings closer to the M11 or A14, areas of relatively poor air quality (with an AQMA on the A14). Major development has the potential to worsen air quality, although it would support greater use of non-car modes than more distributed patterns of development. Development near to busy routes would still add to congestion at peak times.
- A2.23 Green Infrastructure opportunities would vary by site, but larger scale development could support delivery of significant green infrastructure. A number of larger site proposals specifically reference the potential to deliver significant open space or Green Infrastructure beyond the minimum required by policy.

#### New Settlements

- A2.24 A focus on new settlements could utilise previously developed land opportunities, such as former airfields or military barracks, although they would also be likely to still utilise significant areas of greenfield land. New settlements could incorporate significant public transport routes to Cambridge, and new town and local centres as appropriate, to ensure that residents have convenient access to local services and facilities by walking, cycling and public transport. They have the potential to enable focussed investment in public transport and cycling infrastructure, delivering high quality services to provide a significantly higher modal share of travel by non-car modes than village based growth options. The greater distance from Cambridge would mean higher levels of car use (although significantly better than dispersed villages based strategies), and it would result in focused pressure on specific routes. This could have local air quality implications.
- A2.25 New settlements could be developed with a mix of uses with employment delivering jobs locally and their own services and facilities of higher order than smaller scale growth at existing villages. This could provide a degree of self-containment, by providing opportunities to live and work in the same place, however, the greatest concentration of jobs will remain in and close to Cambridge.

A2.26 The scale and mixed use nature of new settlements offer specific opportunities for renewable energy based upon potential for combined heat and power. Impact on landscape would depend on the site, but the scale of a new settlement means that impacts could be significant. Some sites were tested with more limited wider landscape impacts. Located outside the green belt they would have a lesser impact on townscape, and the setting of Cambridge. Sites tested were all outside the Green Belt. New settlements could provide opportunity to deliver significant green infrastructure.

#### More Sustainable Villages

A2.27 A focus on the more sustainable villages would focus development on villages where there is the best access to local services and facilities and best public transport to access higher order services and facilities in Cambridge, but comparatively villages offer a reduced range of opportunities, and the need to travel would be greater than in other options.

A2.28 There are likely to be significantly less opportunities to deliver sustainable transport than a Cambridge focused or new settlement option, as spreading development around villages would be likely to deliver incremental improvements at best, rather than focused investment. Traffic impacts would be spread more around the district, but there would be a higher modal share for car use. Outside the Rural Centres public transport services are generally limited in terms of frequency and journey time. Cycling opportunities would also be lower than other strategy approaches, as distances to Cambridge or market towns would be greater, and would often rely on rural roads rather than dedicated routes.

A2.29 A distribution to smaller sites would have a more incremental impact on the landscape and townscape, but village expansions could negatively impact on village character. The most sustainable villages are inset into the Green Belt close to Cambridge. A village based option would require incremental improvement to village infrastructure. This could put pressure on existing village services and facilities, such as schools, doctors and utilities. A more distributed pattern of village development would provide no direct opportunities to deliver significant scale green infrastructure. In order to identify the quantity of sites required to deliver required levels of development through a village focus, it could require the use of some sites in flood zone 2.

#### Other Villages

A2.30 Focusing more development into less sustainable villages (group and infill villages) would have significant adverse impacts on access to services and facilities, employment, and sustainable transport. A village based strategy requiring development at lower levels of the village hierarchy would increase the proportion of growth at greater distances from major employment areas than other strategic approaches. In many cases public transport in smaller villages is extremely limited, and most lack any significant services and facilities, therefore increasing the journey length to access these.

### Reviewing Potential Development Packages

- A2.31 The review of the development sequence above was accompanied by testing of packages covering full range of strategy options that could be used to meet development needs.
- A2.32 This used the site options in the Green Belt, new settlement options, major expansion of Cambourne and the best available sites at villages have been identified and tested through Sustainability Appraisal, to consider the relative sustainability impact of different development strategy packages. This included looking at different levels of growth at some of the site options to minimise adverse impacts and secure the most sustainable form of development. For comparison, the sustainability impacts of packages made up of site options identified by the councils were compared with package options that included major development sites on the edge of Cambridge that had been rejected through the assessment process.
- A2.33 The results were structured around 8 package options. The summary below draws out impacts structured around the development sequence.

### Edge of Cambridge

- A2.34 Strong performance in improving accessibility to key local services and facilities, access to employment opportunities, provision of new services and facilities, the quality and range of key local services and facilities, and transport.
- A2.35 The scale of development on the edge of Cambridge would result in significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape objective. Loss of high grade agricultural land.

### New Settlements

- A2.36 Scored strongly against objectives regarding: Use of previously developed land; Provision of open space; Quality and range of local services and facilities; Engagement with community activities; Business development and competitiveness; and Safety of the transport network and promotion of non-motorised modes.. Negative impacts in terms of loss of agricultural land, landscape and townscape character.

### Villages

- A2.37 Village development scores less positively in relation to: Quality and range of local services and facilities; Engagement with community activities; Business development and competitiveness; and safety of the transport network and promotion of non-motorised modes.

## **Sustainability Appraisal Addendum 2015 (RD/MC/020)**

A2.38 Prepared in response to the Inspectors Letter, the SA addendum has considered Green Belt sites on the edge Cambridge on a like for like basis with alternatives located elsewhere. This included presenting sites on a like for like proforma at all levels of the development sequence. The SA also reconsidered strategic issues relating to the development sequence, assessing in light of the new evidence prepared in 2015. The summary below draws on the assessment of the stages of the development sequence.

#### Cambridge

A2.39 Development at this level of the development sequence will have many sustainability benefits including protecting the distinctive setting of Cambridge through safeguarding the Green Belt and the associated biodiversity of the Green Belt. However, as highlighted in the Local Plans CSRM report, focusing all development on Cambridge will not meet the identified housing need and this would then lead to greater levels of travel (and effects on air quality) as people from outside the area access new jobs.

#### Edge of Cambridge

A2.40 The Inner Green Belt Study (2015) has concluded that it is unlikely that any development on the edge of Cambridge (apart from a few small exceptions) could be accommodated without substantial harm to the Green Belt purposes. Therefore, the conclusions remain that it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development on the edge of Cambridge without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt.

A2.41 With regard to transport, development on the edge of Cambridge remains the best performing option with regard to modal share. However, these results hide the fact that these locations are in already congested areas of the city where there is little scope to create more capacity for more cars, forcing new trips to be undertaken by active modes. The Local Plans CSRM report shows that different development strategy options do not result in radically different levels of traffic growth, travel times or delay. Whilst there are variations, these are in the context of very high overall traffic growth where significant amounts of development are already committed.

A2.42 Viability work has confirmed that the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make this an attractive location for development meaning potentially higher levels of funding being available for facilities and infrastructure.

A2.43 In conclusion the assessment of edge of Cambridge remains largely as it was in 2013. There are sustainability benefits to development on the edge of Cambridge namely sustainable transport (although access is better close to radial routes) and access benefits and the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make this an attractive location for development meaning that facilities and infrastructure are more viable. However, updated work has confirmed that these benefits would be at the detriment to the purposes of the Green Belt.

#### New Settlements

- A2.44 New evidence has been commissioned in response to the challenges identified in delivering self-contained and viable new settlements.
- A2.45 New settlements could incorporate significant public transport routes to Cambridge, and new town and local centres as appropriate, to ensure that residents have convenient access to local services and facilities by walking, cycling and public transport. They have the potential to enable focussed investment in public transport and cycling infrastructure, delivering high quality services to provide a significantly higher modal share of travel by non-car modes than village based growth options. The Local Plans CSRM report found that the greater distance from Cambridge would mean higher levels of car use than an edge of Cambridge focus but site specific transport measures would reduce the impact of growth, increasing the proportion of trips made by non-car modes, including shift towards Park & Ride.
- A2.46 If designed as a sustainable settlement, new settlements can be developed with a mix of uses with both employment delivering jobs locally and services and facilities of higher order than with village focused development, although this option will still provide homes a greater distance from Cambridge than the edge of Cambridge option.
- A2.47 Viability work has confirmed the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make the edge of Cambridge sites more viable than new settlements, meaning that facilities and infrastructure are more viable. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements. Transport schemes identified to support new settlements are expensive, but would also provide benefit to existing communities. It is expected that City Deal funding would be available to support delivery of major infrastructure required to make the new settlements viable and sustainable.
- A2.48 Impact on landscape would again depend on the site. However, although new settlements could have significant impacts on landscape character they will help to protect Green Belt and the setting of Cambridge

### Villages

- A2.49 Development at this level of the development sequence could be positive for access to services and facilities and public transport, however not as positive as for edge of Cambridge and new settlements. Development that is compatible with the character of even the more sustainable villages is unlikely to deliver very high levels of housing development overall.
- A2.50 A village based strategy would be likely to deliver incremental improvements at best, rather than focused investment. Traffic impacts would be spread more around the district, but there would be a higher modal share for car use. The Local Plans CSRM report found that a purely village based strategy was likely to have a car mode share of close to 80%. Outside the Rural Centres public transport services are generally limited in terms of frequency and journey time. Cycling opportunities would also be

lower than other strategy approaches, as distances to Cambridge or market towns would be greater, and would often rely on rural roads rather than dedicated routes.

- A2.51 A distribution to smaller sites would have a more incremental impact on the landscape and townscape, but village expansions could negatively impact on village character. The most sustainable villages are inset into the Green Belt close to Cambridge and could have a negative effect on the Green Belt (but not as significant an effect as large scale Green Belt releases).



### **Appendix 3: Objectively Assessed Need and Development Strategy – Proposed Modifications to South Cambridgeshire Local Plan**

The modifications set out below propose a change to the South Cambridgeshire housing requirement and textual changes to the plan to refer to the additional work undertaken. The modifications are included in the Local Plan Consultation Document schedule with a reason for the change.

Key – Amendments to the plan as follows (deletions ~~struck through~~, additions underlined):

#### **Chapter 2:**

Amend paragraph 2.11:

- 2.11 The local authorities in the Cambridge Sub Region Housing Market Area have been working together for some time on a range of planning and housing issues and have prepared a joint SHMA, which was updated to inform the new Local Plans being prepared by Councils in the area. The [Cambridge Sub Region SHMA 2012](#) identifies the objectively assessed need for housing in South Cambridgeshire and all other districts in the Cambridge Sub Region housing market area for the period 2011-2031 (Chapter 12). The SHMA considers jobs forecasts as a key part of the analysis of the overall number of homes required to meet the development needs of the area for the period 2011 to 2031. It ~~identified~~ identifies the ~~objectively assessed~~ need for 22,000 additional jobs and 19,000 new homes in South Cambridgeshire. Additional independent technical evidence was prepared in 2015 to further consider need for new housing taking account of national guidance published after the plans were prepared. This identified the full Objectively Assessed Need for South Cambridgeshire as 19,337 homes. This has been rounded to 19,500 in the housing target for the plan period.

#### **The Joint Spatial Approach for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire**

Paragraph 2.17, 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point: add new 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph to read:

- In response to issues raised by the Inspectors during the Local Plan Examination, the Councils commissioned a new independent Inner Green Belt Review in 2015. This also concluded that beyond those locations already identified in the submission Local Plans it is unlikely that any development could be accommodated without substantial harm to Green Belt purposes (in most locations around the edge of the City). Additional work was carried to consider sites on the edge of Cambridge on an equal basis with other sites, through transport modelling and Sustainability Appraisal.

Paragraph 2.17, 4<sup>th</sup> bullet, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph: add additional sentence to the end of the paragraph:

- The Councils undertook a joint Sustainability Appraisal of the overall strategy as part of the plan making process. A range of options around the impact of different levels of growth in the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge, the approach to new settlements, major expansion of Cambourne and the best available sites at villages were identified and tested through Sustainability Appraisal, to consider the relative impact of different development packages. This included looking at different levels of growth at some of the site options to minimise adverse impacts and secure the most sustainable form of development. It identified the importance of balancing the accessibility aspects of sustainable development and the environmental and social aspects. This appraisal was updated in 2015, to take account of new evidence prepared in response to Inspectors during the Local Plan Examination.

Paragraph 2.17, 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph: amend as follows:

- Following consideration of evidence during preparation of the Submission of the Plan, and the additional work prepared and consulted on during the examination, it was ~~It~~ concluded that the removal of additional large scale sites from the Cambridge Green Belt could result in irreversible, significant adverse impacts on the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt and on the special character of Cambridge as a compact historic city and risk the economic success of the Cambridge area, which is in part built on its attractiveness as a place to live and work. ~~It confirmed that a~~ New settlements offer focused opportunities for infrastructure improvements, opportunities to co-locate housing and employment, and achieve high modal share by sustainable transport than more dispersed strategies.

Paragraph 2.17, 5<sup>th</sup> bullet: add a new final 5<sup>th</sup> sub bullet point:

- The Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group (JST&SPG) considered the additional evidence prepared in 2015, and confirmed the approach.

### Comparing the Development Strategy to 2031 with the Structure Plan

Amend wording and figures in table 2.21 and 2.22

2.21 The distribution of housing across the development sequence in the Local Plans is shown below:

	Existing Completions and Commitments (both areas)	New Sites Cambridge	New Sites South Cambs	TOTAL	%
Cambridge Urban Area	<del>3,287</del> <u>5,358</u>	<del>3,324</del> <u>1,470</u>	0	<del>6,611</del> <u>6,282</u>	<del>20</del> <u>19</u>
Edge of Cambridge	<del>11,361</del> <u>11,370</u>	<del>430</del> <u>890</u>	<del>100</del> <u>410</u>	<del>11,891</del> <u>12,670</u>	35
New Settlements and	<del>5,965</del> <u>3,445</u>	0	<del>4,370</del> <u>4,610</u>	<del>10,335</del> <u>8,055</u>	<del>31</del> <u>23</u>

<b><u>Cambourne West</u></b>					
<b><u>Villages Rural Area (including windfalls)</u></b>	<del>3,853</del> <u>7,284</u>	0	<del>895</del> <u>936</u>	<del>4,748</del> <u>8,220</u>	<del>14</del> <u>23</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b><del>24,466</del> <u>27,457</u></b>	<b><del>3,754</del> <u>2,360</u></b>	<b><del>5,365</del> <u>5,956</u></b>	<b><del>33,585</del> <u>35,773</u></b>	<b>100</b>

2.22 This compares with the proportions at each stage in the sequence in the Structure Plan as shown below:

	<b>Structure Plan 1999 to 2016</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>New Local Plan Strategy 2011 to 2031 (both areas)</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Cambridge Urban Area</b>	8,900	27	<del>6,611</del> <u>6,828</u>	<del>20</del> <u>19</u>
<b>Cambridge Fringe Sites</b>	8,000	25	<del>11,891</del> <u>12,670</u>	35
<b>New settlements</b>	6,000	18	<del>10,335</del> <u>8,055</u>	<del>31</del> <u>23</u>
<b>Villages</b>	9,600	30	<del>4,748</del> <u>8,220</u>	<del>14</del> <u>23</u>
<b>TOTAL 1999 to 2016</b>	<b>32,500</b>	<b>100</b>	<b><del>33,585</del> <u>35,773</u></b>	<b>100</b>

Amend paragraph 2.32 as follows and separate out the last sentence into a new paragraph 2.32A:

2.32 The latest Inner Green Belt work Review 2012, undertaken jointly with Cambridge City Council, examined the Green Belt in detail and found a number of small areas on the edge of Cambridge that are not considered of long term importance to Green Belt purposes. Given the level of need for homes and jobs, it is considered that exceptional circumstances exist to justify their release. These comprise a site between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road as an extension to the housing allocation carried forward from the Local Development Framework (Policy SS/2) and a site on Fulbourn Road as an extension to the Peterhouse Technology Park (Policy E/2). The independent Inner Green Belt Review 2015 for both Councils reached the same conclusions about the importance of land on the edge of Cambridge for Cambridge Green Belt purposes with two differences. It concluded that a smaller area adjacent to the Peterhouse Technology Park could be released from the Cambridge Green Belt. It also identified further opportunity for development on land south of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus which avoiding significant harm to Green Belt purposes. (NOTE: PROVISIONAL MODIFICATION to allocate the land in South Cambridgeshire for an extension of the Biomedical Campus subject to consideration of surface water flooding issues).

2.32A In addition, land is released from the Green Belt at Sawston, Impington and Comberton (Policy H/1) to meet the overall need for housing and to provide a flexible and responsive package of sites that will best meet identified needs.

Policy S/5(b): amend housing requirement:

## Provision of New Jobs and Homes

### Policy S/5: Provision of New Jobs and Homes

Development will meet the objectively assessed needs in the district over the period 2011-2031 for:

- a. 22,000 additional jobs to support the Cambridge Cluster and provide a diverse range of local jobs;
- b. 19,000-19,500 new homes, including affordable housing and 85 Gypsy & Traveller pitches.

Paragraph 2.34: amend as follows:

- 2.34     ~~The Cambridge Sub Region Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2012 (SHMA) identifies the objectively assessed~~ took an integrated approach to the identification of the need for additional jobs and homes in South Cambridgeshire over the plan period. Additional assessment of Objectively Assessed Need was carried out in 2015 to take account of national planning guidance published after the submission of the Local Plan to consider issues around the latest national household projections, market signals and affordable housing.

Amend paragraph 2.37

- 2.37     ~~The SHMA. It identifies a need for 19,000 new homes and 22,000 jobs in South Cambridgeshire by 2031. This takes account of natural change in the existing population, including demographic changes such as an ageing population, having regard to the latest information available, including the Census 2011. It also takes account of forecast migration to South Cambridgeshire to support growth in the local economy. Should the economy perform less well than forecast then a revision to the Local Plan for a corresponding reduction in the number of new homes may be necessary. The SHMA~~ It provides a balance between jobs and homes across the HMA and confirms that there is no additional outstanding backlog arising from the Local Development Framework.

New paragraph to follow paragraph 2.37

- 2.37A The Objectively Assessed Need: Further Evidence published in November 2015 takes account of national guidance published after the submission of the Local Plan, the CLG 2012 national household projections, market signals and affordable need. Compared with the SHMA methodology with its integrated approach to jobs and homes it is slightly higher. It identifies a need for 19,337 new homes in South Cambridgeshire by 2031. The higher of the two figures is taken to represent the full objectively assessed need for South Cambridgeshire and in the interests of positive planning has been rounded to 19,500 for the purposes of the plan requirement.

Amend figures in paragraph 2.39

- 2.39 Over the plan period, the figure of ~~19,000~~ 19,500 new homes implies an average delivery rate of ~~950~~ 975 homes per year. While less than the Core Strategy 2007 annualised average of 1,176 homes, for comparison over the period 2001 to 2011 a total of 7,663 homes were built at an average of 766 homes per year and the Local Plan therefore represents a consistent step change in housing delivery over a lengthy period.

Update paragraph 2.40 to show the latest housing land supply position and therefore to read:

- 2.40 Taking account of all forms of housing supply, comprising: completions in 2011-~~1512~~ (the first four years of the plan period) of ~~696~~ 2,735 homes; supply of housing on the ~~major sites~~ existing allocations in adopted plans (including those with planning permission) expected by 2031 of ~~11,113~~ 8,771 homes; ~~and commitments on smaller rural sites with planning permission or allocated for 2,220 homes~~ unallocated sites with planning permission of 1,179 homes; and the Council's forecast windfall allowance of 2,450 homes, in ~~2012~~ 2015 the Council had a supply of ~~14,000~~ 15,135 homes towards the ~~19,000~~ 19,500 home ~~target~~ requirement. This required sufficient new land to be identified to deliver a further ~~5,000~~ 4,365 new homes in the district between 2011 and 2031.

Paragraph 2.44

NOTE: If PROVISIONAL MODIFICATION to allocate land as an extra to Cambridge Biomedical Campus subject to surface water flooding issues is allocated paragraph 2.44 will need to be amended to refer to the site.

#### **Appendix 4: Policy E/2: Fulbourn Road East – Proposed Modifications to South Cambridgeshire Local Plan**

Responding to the findings of the Inner Green Belt Boundary Review 2015, amend the following employment allocation in the Submitted Local Plan; (deletions ~~struck through~~, additions underlined):


Amend the title of Policy E/2 as follows:

**Policy E/2: Fulbourn Road East (Fulbourn) ~~6.9~~ 4.3 hectares**

There will be a consequential amendment to site area shown on the Policies Map.



**Proposed Major Modification: Amendment to Employment Allocation  
(Policy E/2)**



**GB/4 (1b)**  
**(NOTE: no policy area  
in Draft Local Plan)**

**E/7**

**E/2**

**Major Modification to Policies Map.**  
Reduce site boundary of proposed employment allocation and return to Green Belt (to reflect proposed major modification to Policy E/2 and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Policies Map)

**South Cambridgeshire  
Proposed Submission  
Policies Map: July 2013**


**Inset No. 36 Fulbourn  
Map 1 of 5  
Scale 1:5000**

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey Mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

NO FURTHER COPIES MAY BE MADE. SICDC Licence 100022500 (2015)



# Proposed Modification to Figure 2: Key Diagram for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire



- |  |   |                                    |
|--|---|------------------------------------|
| Area Action Plan Boundary                            | New Proposal Site in Cambridge                                  | Cambridgeshire Guided Busway (CGB) |
| Proposed Area Action Plan Boundary                   | Green Belt  | Major Road                         |
| Major Development Site within South Cambridgeshire   | Site to be released from the Green Belt in South Cambridgeshire | Railway Line                       |
| Area of Major Change within Cambridge                | Site to be released from the Green Belt in Cambridge            | Train Station                      |
| Area of Safeguarded Land within South Cambridgeshire | Cambridge City Centre   | Proposed Science Park Station      |
| Area of Safeguarded Land within Cambridge            | Opportunity Area in Cambridge                                   | River Cam                          |
| New Major Development Sites South Cambridgeshire     | District Boundary   |                                    |

Areas identified in Cambridge are indicative only and subject to confirmation via review of the Cambridge Local Plan



## **Appendix 5: Provisional New Allocation at Land South of Cambridge Biomedical Campus**

Responding to the findings of the Inner Green Belt Boundary Review 2015, provisionally allocate an extension to the south of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, subject to the outcome of further investigations, amend the plan as follows (deletions ~~struck through~~, additions underlined):

### **Policy E/1B: Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension**

1. An extension to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus will be supported on land shown on the Policies Map for biomedical and biotechnology research and development within class B1(b) and related higher education and sui-generis medical research institutes.
2. Proposals for development should:
  - a) Create substantial and attractive landscaped edges to the western, eastern and southern boundaries reinforcing existing planting on the southern boundary.
  - b) Provide an appropriate landscaped setting for the Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve, and provide pedestrian access to the Reserve whilst mitigating visitor impacts.
  - c) Demonstrate and ensure that there will be no material impact on the volume, pattern of flow or water quality of the chalk springs at Nine Wells.
  - d) Demonstrate that surface water flood risks can be appropriately managed and mitigated to avoid flood risks to the site and to not increase flood risks elsewhere.
  - e) Have building heights which are no higher than those on the adjoining part of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and which step down to the western, eastern and southern boundaries.
  - f) Provide high quality new public realm and open space, and retain and incorporate existing watercourses.
  - g) Include measures to enhance access to and within the Cambridge Biomedical Campus including for cyclists, pedestrians, wheelchair users and people with other disabilities, and mitigate impacts on the existing road network and parking in the surrounding area.
  - h) Connect to the Addenbrooke's Hospital energy network, where feasible and viable.

New supporting text:

The Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) is an international centre of excellence for patient care, biomedical research and healthcare education. It plays a local, regional and national role in providing medical facilities and medical research. The local plan will support its continuing development as such, and as a high quality, legible and sustainable campus. It also reinforces the existing biomedical and biotechnology cluster in the Cambridge area.

Policy S/6 'The Development Strategy to 2031' sets out a spatial strategy for the location of new employment development, the preferred location being on the edge of Cambridge, subject to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt.

The Employment Land Review 2012 has identified a particular need for office space in or on the edge of Cambridge. Opportunities have been identified on the northern fringe of Cambridge at Cambridge Northern Fringe East and through densification of the Cambridge

Science Park. On the southern fringe, the delivery of development of the CBC has been brought forward by the planned relocation of Astra Zeneca to the site.

The Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study (November 2015), has looked at the whole inner Green Belt including land south of the CBC. It has concluded that development south of CBC could be undertaken without significant harm to Green Belt purposes provided that it avoid rising ground near White Hill, provide a setting for Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve, provide a soft green edge to the city and that new development be no more prominent in views from elevated land to the south east than the existing buildings at Addenbrooke's. The Council considers that the need for jobs can comprise exceptional circumstances justifying a review of the Green Belt so far as this would not cause significant harm to Green Belt purposes. Whilst there is no overall shortage of employment land within South Cambridgeshire for high-tech and research and development companies and organisations, the findings of the new study provide an opportunity to allocate land for an extension to the CBC to provide high quality biomedical development on the edge of Cambridge with its locational benefits, without causing significant harm to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt.

Addenbrooke's Hospital is to develop a new clinical waste facility (energy from waste) to replace an existing facility which will supply energy to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus as a whole. Developments within the site should, therefore, seek to connect to this energy network, subject to feasibility and viability.

Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Trust (the Trust) has a strategic masterplan for the extended campus area which includes the following:

- key routes and street hierarchy;
- public realm strategy and open space;
- building massing;
- potential uses;
- development phasing; and
- sustainability.

This site should be included in future updates to the strategic masterplan and the site developed having regard to its provisions.

The Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (2014) identifies a need to investigate the case for a new railway station in this area to serve the CBC and southern Cambridge. Should a need be demonstrated for a new station and if the preferred location is nearby, the layout of the site should allow for such provision.

Nine Wells is a historically important site containing several chalk springs, which form the source of the Hobson Conduit. The reserve is a mix of woodland, scrub and water. Previously a SSSI (Site of Special Scientific Interest) Nine Wells once contained some rare freshwater invertebrates, however following the drought of 1976 these were lost. Today the chalk watercourses are being managed with the aim of re-creating the conditions favourable for a possible re-introduction of these rare species. It is important that the chalk springs not be compromised in terms of their volume, pattern of flow or water quality.

Parts of the site have been identified as subject to surface water flood risks.

Reason:

The Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study (November 2015) identifies land south of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus which could be released from the Green Belt for development without significant harm to Green Belt purposes. The Council considers that

the need for jobs can comprise exceptional circumstances justifying a review of the Green Belt so far as this would not cause significant harm to Green Belt purposes. Whilst there is no overall shortage of employment land within South Cambridgeshire for high-tech and research and development companies and organisations, the findings of the new study provide an opportunity to allocate land for an extension to the CBC to provide high quality biomedical development on the edge of Cambridge with its locational benefits, without causing significant harm to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. it would not be positive planning for the Local Plan policy to prevent such development if it proves to be deliverable.

Soundness:

To ensure that the plan is positively prepared and is consistent with national policy which places significant weight on supporting economic growth through the planning system.



Proposed Major Modification:  
New employment allocation (Policy E/1b)

PROVISIONAL Major Modification to Policies Map:  
Include new employment allocation, remove land from  
Green Belt and amend boundary of Improved  
Landscaping (to reflect Major Modification to  
South Cambridgeshire Local Plan).

**E/1b**

**CSF/5 (2f-m)**

**SC/1 (2h)**


**SC/1 (1b)**

**SC/1 (1e)**

**South Cambridgeshire  
Proposed Submission  
Policies Map: July 2013  
Inset E South of Addenbrookes  
Map 1 of 1  
Scale 1:15000**



# Proposed Modification to Figure 2: Key Diagram for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire




- |  |   |                                    |
|--|---|------------------------------------|
| Area Action Plan Boundary                            | New Proposal Site in Cambridge                                  | Cambridgeshire Guided Busway (CGB) |
| Proposed Area Action Plan Boundary                   | Green Belt  | Major Road                         |
| Major Development Site within South Cambridgeshire   | Site to be released from the Green Belt in South Cambridgeshire | Railway Line                       |
| Area of Major Change within Cambridge                | Site to be released from the Green Belt in Cambridge            | Train Station                      |
| Area of Safeguarded Land within South Cambridgeshire | Cambridge City Centre   | Proposed Science Park Station      |
| Area of Safeguarded Land within Cambridge            | Opportunity Area in Cambridge                                   | River Cam                          |
| New Major Development Sites South Cambridgeshire     | District Boundary   |                                    |

Areas identified in Cambridge are indicative only and subject to confirmation via review of the Cambridge Local Plan



**Proposed Modification to Figure 6:  
Illustration of Major Development Areas at  
Cambridge Biomedical Campus and Southern Fringe**



## Land South of Cambridge Biomedical Campus – Joint Site Assessment Pro Forma

### Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Sites Assessment Pro forma

<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> Policy E/1B	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land south of Addenbrooke's and south west of Babraham Road	
<b>Functional area (taken from SA Scoping Report):</b> South	
<b>Map</b>	
<p>© Crown Copyright, Ordnance Survey SCDC Licence 100022500 (2015)</p>	
<b>Site description:</b> To the north is Addenbrooke's Hospital and the Biomedical Campus. To the west is the railway line to London, a corridor of public open space and the Clay Farm development. Immediately to the south west is the Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve with its chalk springs, woodland and scrub. To the east and south the land comprises large arable fields with hedgerows.	
<b>Current use:</b> Agricultural	
<b>Proposed use(s):</b> Biomedical and biotechnology research and development, related higher education and sui generis medical research institutes, and associated support activities	
<b>Site size (ha):</b> 8.91 ha (within South Cambridgeshire)	
<b>Assumed net developable area:</b> 8.91 ha	
<b>Assumed residential density:</b> n/a	
<b>Potential residential capacity:</b> n/a	
<b>Existing Gross Floorspace:</b> No existing floorspace.	
<b>Proposed Gross Floorspace:</b> To be determined through the masterplanning process.	
<b>Site owner/promoter:</b> Cambridgeshire County Council	
<b>Landowner has agreed to promote site for development?</b> Yes	
<b>Site origin:</b> LDA Green Belt Study 2015 – review of Green Belt undertaken as part of further work undertaken in response to Inspectors' Preliminary Conclusions.	
<b>Relevant planning history:</b> No previous planning applications or permissions on this site.	
Outline planning permission (06/0796/OUT) for the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (on land to the	



north of the site) was approved in 2009 for up to 215,000sqm floor space for research and treatment and related support activities, landscaping and parking. The development will comprise:

- 60,000sqm of clinical research and treatment (D1)
- 130,000sqm of biomedical and biotech research and development (B1(b))
- 25,000sqm of either clinical research and treatment (D1) or higher education or sui generis medical research institute uses.

It will include related support activities within use classes A1, A3, B1 or sui generis uses with no individual premises exceeding 500sqm, a primary sub-station, new areas of public realm, landscaping, parking areas, highway works, drainage works and all other associated infrastructure.

A number of reserved matters applications have been approved, including for the new Papworth Hospital, The Forum, AstraZeneca, an Energy Innovation Centre, the Southern Spine Road and a multi-storey car park.

## Level 1

### Part A: Strategic Considerations

#### Flood Risk

Criteria	Performance	Comments
<p>Is site within a flood zone?</p> <p><i>The assessment will address whether the proposed use is considered suitable for the flood zone with reference to the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. In line with the requirements of the NPPF a sequential test will be applied when determining the allocation of new development in order to steer development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding (Zone 1). Sites that fall within Flood Zone 3 will only be considered where there are no reasonably available sites in Flood Zones 1 or 2, taking into account the flood risk vulnerability of land uses and applying the Exceptions Test as required.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Flood risk zone 3  <b>A</b> = Flood risk zone 2  <b>G</b> = Flood risk zone 1</p>	<p>Amber: Parts of site at risk of surface water flooding. Parts of the site are within flood zones 2 and 3. [see below]</p>
<p>Is site at risk from surface water flooding?</p> <p><i>In addition to identifying whether site is in a high risk flood zone, consideration needs to be given to the risk of surface water flooding on the site. The Surface Water Management Plan for Cambridge (2011) shows that the majority of the City is at high risk of surface water flooding. Development, if not undertaken with due consideration of the risk to the development and the existing built environment, will further increase the risk. Consideration should also be given to the scope for appropriate mitigation, which could reduce the level of risk on site and potentially reduce flood risk elsewhere (for example from site run-off).</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = High risk,  <b>A</b> = Medium risk  <b>G</b> = Low risk</p>	<p>AMBER = Flood Zones 2 and 3 / medium risk.</p> <p>Parts of site at risk of surface water flooding. Parts of the site are within flood zones 2 and 3. Careful mitigation required considering the sequential test and the following points:</p> <p>Historically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the watercourse which runs through the site has overtopped in heavy rainfall events; and</li> <li>• this site has become waterlogged during some winters.</li> </ul> <p>This site has a clear flood flow route through it and this means that flood risk mitigation</p>



		<p>measures used on this site could have impacts on adjoining or nearby sites (e.g. through using techniques like land raising). This may be an issue if there are other new developments planned in the surrounding undeveloped land. The Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan identifies some wetspots nearby, which while they do not cover the site, may add extra pressure to the local development situation as land uses and heights vary.</p> <p>Consent for any modifications to the watercourse would need to be sought from the Flood and Water Team at Cambridgeshire County Council, but significant changes such as culverting would be discouraged and would require modelling to prove no increase or relocation of risk.</p>
<b>Land Use / Green Belt</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p><b>Will allocation make use of previously developed land (PDL)?</b></p> <p><i>The NPPF promotes the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed, provided it is not of high environmental value.</i></p>	<p>Not on PDL  <b>A</b> = Partially on PDL  <b>G</b> = Entirely on PDL</p>	<p>Red: Agricultural land therefore not on PDL.</p>
<p><b>Will the allocation lead to loss of land within the Green Belt?</b></p> <p><i>There is a small amount of Green Belt within the built up area of the City, such as Stourbridge Common, Coldhams Common and along the River Cam corridor. The Green Belt at the fringe of the City is considered in more detail in the joint pro forma with SCDC which looks at sites on the fringe of the City.</i></p>	<p>Site is in the Green Belt  <b>G</b> = Site is not in the Green Belt</p>	<p>Red: Site is in the Green Belt. However LDA Green Belt Study 2015 identifies scope for development in this location without there being significant harm to Green Belt purposes provided that it avoids rising ground near White Hill, provide a setting for Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve, provide a soft green edge to the city and that new development be no more prominent in views from elevated land to the south east than the existing buildings at Addenbrooke's.</p>
<b>Impact on national Nature Conservation Designations</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Site is on or adjacent to an SSSI with negative impacts incapable of mitigation</p>	<p>Green: The site is not near to a SSSI.</p>

<i>The assessment will take into account the reasons for the SSSI's designation and the potential impacts that development could have on this.</i>	<b>A</b> = Site is on or adjacent to an SSSI with negative impacts capable of mitigation <b>G</b> = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts	
<b>Impact on National Heritage Assets</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?</p> <p><i>Scheduling is the process through which nationally important sites and monuments are given legal protection. National planning policy requires substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest Significance, notably scheduled monuments, to be wholly exceptional. As such consideration needs to be given to the impact that development could have on any nearby SAMs, taking account of the proposed development use and distance from the centre of the site to it. Development that is likely to have adverse impacts on a SAM or its setting should be avoided.</i></p>	<b>R</b> = Site is on a SAM or allocation will lead to development adjacent to a SAM with the potential for negative impacts incapable of mitigation <b>A</b> = Site is adjacent to a SAM that is less sensitive / not likely to be impacted / or impacts are capable of mitigation <b>G</b> = Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM	Amber: A Scheduled Ancient Monument lies 250m to the south west.
<p>Would development impact upon Listed Buildings?</p> <p><i>Listed buildings are categorised as either Grade 1 (most important), Grade 2* or Grade 2. Consideration needs to be given to the likely impact of development on the building and its setting taking account of the listing category, the distance from the listed building, the proposed use, and the possibility of mitigation.</i></p>	<b>R</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for Significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation <b>A</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation <b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings	Green: The site does not contain or adjoin any listed buildings and does not have any impact on the setting of any listed buildings.
<b>Part B: Deliverability and Viability Criteria</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>Is the site allocated or safeguarded in the Minerals and Waste LDF?</p> <p><i>Reference needs to be made to the Minerals and Waste LDF in order to determine whether development of the site could prejudice any future Minerals and Waste sites. NB: Land that falls within an 'Area of Search' should be flagged up, but this would not necessarily rule out the allocation of a site.</i></p>	<b>R</b> = Site or a Significant part of it falls within an allocated or safeguarded area, development would have Significant negative impacts <b>A</b> = Site or a Significant part of it falls within an allocated or safeguarded area, development would have minor negative impacts <b>G</b> = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.	Amber: Part of the site falls within a Waste Consultation Area.

Is the site located within the Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone (PSZ) or Safeguarding Zone (SZ)?	<p><b>R</b> = Site is within the PSZ or is designated as an area where no development should occur</p> <p><b>A</b> = Site or part of site within the SZ (add building height restriction in comments)</p> <p><b>G</b> = Site is not within the PSZ or SZ</p>	Amber: The site is not located in the Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone, however the site is located within the Cambridge Airport Safeguarding Zone for structures over 15m above ground level. The development will need to have building heights which are no higher than those on the adjoining part of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus.
<p>Is there a suitable access to the site?</p> <p><i>The assessment needs to consider whether the site is capable of achieving appropriate access that meets County Highway standards for scale of development.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = No</p> <p><b>A</b> = Yes, with mitigation</p> <p><b>G</b> = Yes</p>	<p>Amber: This site does not benefit from direct access to the local highway network; as such the most logical point of access to the site would appear to be via the proposed Cambridge Biomedical Campus Phase 2 development. There is, therefore, a risk that the layout and access strategy for Cambridge Biomedical Campus Phase 2 could prejudice the ability of adequate access to this site being achieved, as such early discussions with the developer of Cambridge Biomedical Campus Phase 2 would be recommended to minimise this risk.</p> <p>With regard to rail access, a portion of this site may need to be safeguarded to facilitate the delivery of the proposed Addenbrooke's railway station (which is listed as a scheme in the County Council's Long Term Transport Strategy).</p> <p>If allocated, any subsequent planning application would need to be accompanied by a full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.</p>

<p>Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the local highway capacity?</p> <p><i>Consideration should be given to the capacity of the local highway network and the impacts the development is likely to have on it.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects incapable of appropriate mitigation.  <b>A</b> = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.  <b>G</b> = No capacity constraints identified that cannot be fully mitigated</p>	<p>Amber: Significant congestion already occurs in this quadrant of Cambridge which is likely to be exacerbated by the full build out of the planned and approved Cambridge Biomedical Campus developments. While substantial sustainable transport improvements are identified through the City Deal Programme that may provide some headroom, any Transport Assessment will need to carefully examine and clearly demonstrate how the site can be delivered without having an unacceptable impact on the surrounding transport networks.</p>
<p>Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the strategic road network capacity?</p> <p><i>Consideration should be given to the capacity of the strategic road network and the impacts the development is likely to have on it.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects incapable of appropriate mitigation.  <b>A</b> = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.  <b>G</b> = No capacity constraints identified that cannot be fully mitigated</p>	<p>Amber: This site could have a significant impact on the strategic road network at junction 11 of the M11. Any impacts would need to be identified via a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage and appropriate mitigation proposed at that stage. This should include consultation with Highways England regarding any trunk road impacts.</p>
<p>Is the site part of a larger site and could it prejudice development of any strategic sites?</p> <p><i>Comments should flag up whether the site is part of a larger development site or whether it is located in close proximity to a strategic site. Consideration of this at allocation stage can help ensure coordination of development.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Yes  <b>G</b> = No</p>	<p>Green: New phase of development of Cambridge Biomedical Campus, the development of this site will not prejudice the development of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus site.</p>
<p>Are there any known legal issues/covenants that could constrain development of the site?</p> <p><i>A summary of any known legal issues that could constrain the development of the site should be given. Issues that should be considered are; whether the site is in multiple ownership, the presence of ransom strips, covenants, existing use agreements, owner agreement or developer agreement.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Yes  <b>G</b> = No</p>	<p>Green: No, Cambridgeshire County Council has confirmed site is available for development.</p>
<p>Timeframe for bringing the site forward for development?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Beyond 2031 (beyond plan period)  <b>A</b> = Start of construction</p>	<p>Amber: Cambridgeshire County Council have confirmed site is available for development within</p>

Knowledge of the timeframe for bringing forward development will help inform whether allocation of the site would have the potential to contribute to the Council's required land supply for housing/employment land etc.	between 2017 and 2031 <b>G</b> = Start of construction between 2011 and 2016	the plan period to 2031.
Would development of the site require significant new / upgraded utility infrastructure?	<b>R</b> = Yes, Significant upgrades likely to be required but constraints incapable of appropriate mitigation <b>A</b> = Yes, Significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation <b>G</b> = No, existing infrastructure likely to be sufficient	Amber: Significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation.
Is the site in the vicinity of an existing or proposed district heating network/community energy networks?	<b>G</b> = Yes <b>A</b> = No	Green: adjacent to Addenbrooke's Hospital which is to develop a new clinical waste facility (energy from waste) to replace an existing facility which will supply energy to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus as a whole. Connection to this network will be subject to feasibility and viability.
Would development of the site be likely to require new education provision?	<b>R</b> = School capacity not sufficient, constraints cannot be appropriately mitigated. <b>A</b> = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated <b>G</b> = Non-residential development / surplus school places	Green: Non-residential development.
<b>Level 1 Conclusion</b>		
<p>Level 1 Conclusion (after allowing scope for mitigation)</p> <p><i>Include an assessment of the suitability of the proposed use. Also whether the development of this site for this use would be in line with emerging policy in the Local Plan – from the Issues and Options Report and key issues emerging from consultation responses.</i></p>	<b>RR</b> = Very Significant constraints or adverse impacts <b>R</b> = Significant constraints or adverse impacts <b>A</b> = Some constraints or adverse impacts <b>G</b> = Minor constraints or adverse impacts <b>GG</b> = None or negligible constraints or adverse impacts	<p>Amber:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Careful mitigation of surface water flooding and flood risk required and the mitigation measures used on this site will need to ensure that there are no impacts on adjoining or nearby sites.</li> <li>Building heights need to take account of the site being located within the Cambridge Airport Safeguarding Zone for structures over 15m above ground level.</li> <li>Site access will need to be via the proposed Phase 2 of Cambridge Biomedical Campus and therefore early discussions will need to be undertaken to ensure the</li> </ul>

		<p>ability to gain suitable access is not prejudiced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Transport Assessment will be needed to demonstrate how the site can be delivered without having an unacceptable impact on the surrounding transport networks.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

Level 2		
Accessibility to existing centres and services		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
<p>How far is the site from edge of defined Cambridge City Centre?</p> <p><i>A key element of sustainable development is ensuring that people are able to meet their needs locally, thus helping to encourage a modal shift. This criteria has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site. Sites located closer to the City Centre, where the majority of services are located, are expected to score more highly in sustainability terms.</i></p>	<p>&gt;800m  <b>A</b> = 400-800m  <b>G</b> = &lt;400m</p>	<p>Red: The site is over 800m from Cambridge City Centre.</p>
<p>How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?</p> <p><i>A key element of sustainable development is ensuring that people are able to meet their needs locally, thus helping to encourage a modal shift. Criteria measuring the distance of a site from its nearest district/local centre has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site and to determine the appropriate density of development of a site.</i></p>	<p>&gt;800m  <b>A</b> = 400-800m  <b>G</b> = &lt;400m</p>	<p>Red: The site is over 800m from the nearest local centre at Wulfstan Way. There are some facilities available on the Addenbrooke's site.</p>
<p>How far is the nearest health centre or GP service?</p> <p><i>Local services are essential to the quality of life of residents and employees. In planning for new development, consideration needs to be given to the proximity of development to local services so that new residents can access these using sustainable modes of transport. As such, measuring the distance of a site from the nearest health centre/GP service has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site.</i></p>	<p>&gt;800m  <b>A</b> = 400-800m  <b>G</b> = &lt;400m</p>	<p>Red: The site is over 800m from the nearest GP Surgery, which is located at the Queen Edith Medical Practice.</p>
<p>Would development lead to a loss of community facilities?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Allocation would lead to loss of community facilities  <b>G</b> = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement /appropriate</p>	<p>Green: The site is currently agricultural land and therefore the development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities.</p>



	mitigation possible	
<p>How far is the nearest secondary school?</p> <p><i>In planning for new development, consideration needs to be given to the proximity to schools so that new residents can access these using sustainable modes of transport. As such, measuring the distance of a site from the nearest secondary school has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site. Development will also be required to contribute to the provision of new local services.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;3km  <b>A</b> = 1-3km  <b>G</b> = &lt;1km or non-housing allocation</p>	Green: Non-residential development.
<p>How far is the nearest primary school?</p> <p><i>In planning for new development, consideration needs to be given to the proximity to schools so that new residents can access these using sustainable modes of transport. As such, measuring the distance of a site from the nearest primary school has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site. Development will also be required to contribute to the provision of new local services.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;800m  <b>A</b> = 400-800m  <b>G</b> = &lt;400m or non-housing allocation</p>	Green: Non-residential development.
<b>Accessibility to outdoor facilities and green spaces</b>		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Is the site defined as protected open space or have the potential to be protected?	<p><b>R</b> = Yes  <b>G</b> = No</p>	Green: the site is not within Cambridge City Council's boundary and therefore is not defined as protected open space.
If the site is protected open space can the open space be replaced according to CLP Local Plan Policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space	<p><b>R</b> = No  <b>G</b> = Yes</p>	N/A
If the site does not involve any protected open space would development of the site be able to increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space / outdoor sports facilities and achieve the minimum standards of onsite public open space provision?	<p><b>RR</b> = No, the site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of OS and is located in a ward or parish with identified deficiency.</p> <p><b>R</b> = No, the site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of OS.</p> <p><b>G</b> = Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite</p> <p><b>GG</b> = Development would create the opportunity to deliver significantly enhanced provision of new public open spaces in</p>	Proposed use is non-residential development and therefore onsite provision of open space is not required. Could provide more direct pedestrian access to Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve.

	excess of adopted plan standards	
<p>How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?</p> <p><i>A key objective of national planning policy is for planning to promote healthy communities. Good accessibility to sports facilities is likely to encourage healthier lifestyles. Inclusion of criteria that measures distance from the site to outdoor sports facilities has therefore been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site. The assessment should also give consideration as to whether the size of the site and scale of development are likely to require a contribution to the provision of new local services such as new outdoor sports facilities via S106 contributions.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;3km  <b>A</b> = 1 - 3km  <b>G</b> = &lt;1km; or allocation is not housing</p>	Green: Non-residential development.
<p>How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?</p> <p><i>Proximity to high quality play spaces makes an important contribution to the health and well-being of children. As such, measuring the distance of a site from the nearest children's play space has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site. The assessment should also give consideration as to whether the size of the site and scale of development are likely to require a contribution to the provision of new local services such as new play space via S106 contributions.</i></p>	<p><b>A</b> = &gt;400m from children and teenager's play space  <b>G</b> = &lt;400m; or allocation is not housing</p>	Green: Non-residential development.
<p>How far is the nearest accessible natural greenspace of 2ha?</p> <p><i>Proximity to high quality open spaces makes an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. In planning for new development, consideration needs to be given to the proximity of development to parks/open space/multi-functional greenspace so that new residents can access these using sustainable modes of transport. As such, measuring the distance from the site to such spaces (as identified in the Council's Open Space Strategy) has been included to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site. The assessment should also give</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;400m  <b>G</b> = &lt;400m; or allocation is not housing or employment</p>	Green: Non-residential development.



consideration as to whether the size of the site and scale of development		
<b>Supporting Economic Growth</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>How far is the nearest main employment centre?</p> <p><i>National planning policy promotes patterns of development which facilitate the use of sustainable modes of transport. Proximity between housing and employment centres is likely to promote the use of sustainable modes of transport. Criteria has therefore been included to measure the distance between the centre of the site and the main employment centre to provide an indication of the sustainability of the site.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = &gt;3km  <b>A</b> = 1-3km  <b>G</b> = &lt;1km or allocation is for or includes a significant element of employment or is for another non-residential use</p>	<p>Green: The site is adjacent to Addenbrooke's Hospital and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus.</p>
<p>Would development result in the loss of employment land identified in the Employment Land Review?</p> <p><i>The ELR seeks to identify an adequate supply of sites to meet indicative job growth targets and safeguard and protect those sites from competition from other higher value uses, particularly housing. Proposals for non employment-uses for sites identified for potential protection in the ELR should be weighed up against the potential for the proposed use as well as the need for it.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Significant loss of employment land and job opportunities not mitigated by alternative allocation in the area (&gt; 50%)  <b>A</b> = Some loss of employment land and job opportunities mitigated by alternative allocation in the area (&lt; 50%).  <b>G</b> = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development</p>	<p>Green: No loss of employment land and the proposed use is employment.</p>
<p>Would allocation result in development in deprived areas of Cambridge?</p> <p><i>The English Indices of Deprivation 2010 are measures of multiple deprivation at the small area level. The model of multiple deprivation which underpins the Indices of Deprivation 2010 is based on the idea of distinct domains of deprivation which can be recognised and measured separately. These domains are experienced by individuals living in an area. Inclusion of this criteria will identify where development may benefit areas where deprivation is an issue.</i></p>	<p><b>A</b> = Not within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.  <b>G</b> = Within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.</p>	<p>Amber: Not within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.</p>
<b>Sustainable Transport</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site?</p> <p><i>National Planning Policy promotes</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Service does not meet the requirements of a high quality public transport (HQPT)  <b>A</b> = Service meets requirements of high quality public transport</p>	<p>Green: The site has access to public transport service using the Addenbrooke's Hospital public transport hub, located within 600m of the eastern edge</p>

<p>the need to support a pattern of development which facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport. Access between residential, employment and retail uses and high quality public transport routes is pivotal to achieving that aim. As such the inclusion of criteria that measures the distance of a site from the nearest high quality public transport route will provide an indication of the sustainability of the site. In assessing the performance of this criteria, reference should be made to the Cambridge City Local Plan definition of 'high quality public transport routes'.</p>	<p>in most but not all instances <b>G</b> = High quality public transport service</p>	<p>of the site.</p>
<p>How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?</p> <p>National Planning Policy promotes the need to support a pattern of development which facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport. Access between residential, employment and retail uses and high quality public transport routes is pivotal to achieving that aim. As such the inclusion of criteria that measures the distance of a site from the nearest train station will provide an indication of the sustainability of the site.</p>	<p>&gt;800m <b>A</b> = 400 - 800m <b>G</b> = &lt;400m</p>	<p>Red: Site is more than 800m from Cambridge Station; however the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (2014) identifies a need to investigate the case for a new railway station in this area to serve the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and southern Cambridge. Should a need be demonstrated for a new station and if the preferred location is nearby, the layout of the site should allow for such provision.</p>
<p>What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?</p> <p>National Planning Policy stresses the importance of developments being located and designed where practical to give priority to pedestrian and <b>cycle movements</b>. The inclusion of criteria that measures the distance of a site from the nearest cycle route will provide an indication of the sustainability of the site.</p>	<p><b>RR</b> = no cycling provision and traffic speeds &gt;30mph with high vehicular traffic volume.</p> <p><b>R</b> = No cycling provision or a cycle lane less than 1.5m width with medium volume of traffic. Having to cross a busy junction with high cycle accident rate to access local facilities/school.</p> <p><b>A</b> = Poor or medium quality off-road path.</p> <p><b>G</b> = Quiet residential street speed below 30mph, cycle lane with 1.5m minimum width, high quality off-road path e.g. cycleway adjacent to guided busway.</p> <p><b>GG</b> = Quiet residential street designed for 20mph speeds, high quality off-road paths with good segregation from pedestrians, uni-directional hybrid cycle lanes.</p>	<p>Amber: Medium quality off-road path. Potential for links through Biomedical Campus, Addenbrooke's Hospital site and Bell School site.</p>

Air Quality, pollution, contamination and noise		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
<p>Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?</p> <p><i>The planning system has a role to play in the protection of air quality by ensuring that land use decisions do not adversely affect, or are not adversely affected by, the air quality in any AQMA, or conflict with or render ineffective any elements of the local authority's air quality action plan. There is currently one AQMA within Cambridge.</i></p> <p><i>Inclusion of criteria that measures the distance between the site and the AQMA, as well as between the site and roads with the highest traffic volumes causing poor air quality, will provide an indication of the sustainability of the site.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Within or adjacent to an AQMA, M11 or A14</p> <p><b>A</b> = &lt;1000m of an AQMA, M11 or A14</p> <p><b>G</b> = &gt;1000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14</p>	<p>Green: the site is over a 1,000m from the AQMA, M11 and A14.</p>
<p>Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?</p> <p><i>National planning policy requires preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of air pollution.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Significant adverse impact</p> <p><b>A</b> = Adverse impact</p> <p><b>G</b> = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact</p>	<p>Amber: The site lies near the source of air pollution, or development could impact on air quality. The site may have an adverse impact on air quality from traffic generation particularly as close to Addenbrooke's. An air quality assessment is essential.</p>
<p>Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</p> <p><i>National planning policy requires preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of noise pollution.</i></p> <p><i>Criteria has been included to assess whether there are any existing noise sources that could impact on the suitability of a site, which is of particular importance for residential development. The presence of noise sources will not necessarily render a site undevelopable as appropriate mitigation measures may be available, and will also depend on the proposed development use.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p><b>A</b> = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation</p> <p><b>G</b> = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation</p>	<p>Amber: Site is close to Addenbrooke's Hospital site and the western part is adjacent to railway line to London. Noise assessment and potential mitigation measures required.</p>
<p>Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p><b>A</b> = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation</p> <p><b>G</b> = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation</p>	<p>Green: the site is adjacent to existing and proposed biomedical employment uses.</p>
<p>Are there potential odour</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Significant adverse impacts</p>	<p>Green: the site is adjacent to</p>

problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?	incapable of appropriate mitigation <b>A</b> = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation <b>G</b> = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation	existing and proposed biomedical employment uses.
Is there possible contamination on the site?  <i>Contaminated land is a material planning consideration, and Land Use History Reports are available from the Council's Environmental Health Scientific Team. The presence of contamination will not always rule out development, but development should not be permitted in areas subject to pollution levels that are incompatible with the proposed use. Mitigation measures can be implemented to overcome some contaminated land issues, although this may have an impact on the economic viability of the development. Further investigation will be required to establish the nature of any contamination present on sites and the implications that this will have for development.</i>	<b>R</b> = All or a Significant part of the site within an area with a history of contamination which, due to physical constraints or economic viability, is incapable of appropriate mitigation during the plan period <b>A</b> = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development <b>G</b> = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination	Amber: Agricultural use may have led to some contamination with agricultural chemicals. Appropriate assessment required.
<b>Protecting Groundwater</b>		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would development be within a source protection zone (EA data)?  <i>Groundwater sources (e.g. wells, boreholes and springs) are used for public drinking water supply. These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area.</i>	<b>A</b> = Within SPZ 1 <b>G</b> = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace	Green: the site is not within any source protection zones.
<b>Protecting the townscape and historic environment</b> ( <i>Landscape addressed by Green Belt criteria</i> )		
Criteria	Performance	Comments
Would allocation impact upon a historic park/garden?  <i>Historic parks and gardens that have been registered under the 1983 National Heritage Act have legal protection. There are 11 historic parks and gardens in Cambridge. National planning policy requires substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, including historic parks, to be wholly exceptional. As such this criteria has been included to allow consideration of whether development on the site would have an adverse impact on a historic</i>	<b>R</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such areas with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation <b>A</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such areas with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation <b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin such areas, and there is no impact to the setting of such areas	Green: Site does not contain or adjoin a historic park or garden.

<p><i>park or garden its setting.</i></p> <p>Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?</p> <p><i>The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, imposes a duty on planning authorities to designate as conservation areas 'areas of special architectural or historic interest that character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance'. Cambridge's Conservation Areas are relatively diverse. As such consideration needs to be given to the potential impact that development may have on the setting, or views into and out of a Conservation Area.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such an area with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p><b>A</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such an area with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p><b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin such an area, and there is no impact to the setting of such an area</p>	<p>Green: Site does not contain or adjoin a Conservation Area.</p>
<p>Would development impact upon buildings of local interest?</p> <p><i>There are over 1,000 buildings in Cambridge that are important to the locality or the City's history and architectural development. Local planning policy protects such buildings from development which adversely affects them unless:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>The building is demonstrably incapable of beneficial use or reuse;</i></li> <li>- <i>or there are clear public benefits arising from redevelopment.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>As such the presence of a locally listed building on a site would not necessarily rule development; however detailed justification would be required to demonstrate acceptability of schemes at the planning application stage.</i></p>	<p><b>A</b> = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p><b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings</p>	<p>Green: Site does not contain or adjoin any buildings of local interest.</p>
<p>Would development impact upon archaeology?</p>	<p><b>A</b> = Known archaeology on site or in vicinity</p> <p><b>G</b> = No known archaeology on site or in vicinity</p>	<p>Amber: Extensive and intensive evidence for Bronze Age, Iron Age, Roman and medieval archaeology is recorded to the north. Cropmarks to the south indicate that archaeological assets are likely to extend throughout the landscape. A site of national importance is located 250m to the south west (Scheduled Monument Number 57).</p> <p>Further evidence through archaeological evaluation would be needed regarding the extent, character and significance of archaeology in the area prior to consideration of a planning application.</p>
<p><b>Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure</b></p>		




Criteria	Performance	Comments
<p>Would development impact upon a locally designated wildlife site i.e. Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site?</p> <p><i>Sites of local nature conservation include Local Nature Reserves, County Wildlife Sites and City Wildlife Sites. Local authorities have a Duty to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in exercising their functions. As such development within such sites, or that may affect the substantive nature conservation value of such sites, will not normally be permitted. Where development is permitted, suitable mitigation and/or compensatory measures and nature conservation enhancement measures should be implemented.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site and impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Does not contain, is not adjacent to or local area will be developed as greenspace</p>	<p>Amber: Site adjoins the Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve. The development will need to mitigate visitor impacts on, provide pedestrian access to, and provide an appropriate landscaped setting for, the Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve, and demonstrate that there will be no material impact on the volume, pattern of flow or water quality of the chalk springs at Nine Wells.</p>
<p>Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery? <i>Green infrastructure plays an important role in delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities. As such criteria has been included to assess the opportunity that development on the site could have on creating and enhancing green infrastructure delivery.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Development involves a loss of existing green infrastructure which is incapable of appropriate mitigation.  <b>A</b> = No Significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure</p>	<p>Green: Could provide more direct pedestrian access to Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve and likely to provide new public open space around existing watercourses. The site is within the the Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p>
<p>Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)</p> <p><i>A number of Biodiversity Species and Habitat Action Plans exist for Cambridge. Such sites play an important role in enhancing existing biodiversity for enjoyment and education. National planning policy requires the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets. As such development within sites where BAP priority species or habitats are known to be present, or that may affect the substantive nature conservation value of such sites, will not normally be permitted. Where development is permitted, suitable mitigation and/or compensatory measures and nature conservation enhancement measures should be implemented.</i></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links incapable of appropriate mitigation  <b>A</b> = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation  <b>G</b> = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links</p>	<p>Green: Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation. Assumptions for a neutral impact are that existing features that warrant retention can be retained or appropriate mitigation will be achieved through the development process.</p>
<p>Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Development likely to have a Significant adverse impact on</p>	<p>Green: Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees.</p>



<p>by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?</p> <p><i>Trees are an important facet of the townscape and landscape and the maintenance of a healthy and species diverse tree cover brings a range of health, social, biodiversity and microclimate benefits. Cambridge has in excess of 500 TPOs in force. When considering sites that include trees covered by TPOs, the felling, Significant surgery or potential root damage to such trees should be avoided unless there are demonstrable public benefits accruing from the development that outweigh the current and future amenity value of the trees.</i></p>	<p>the protected trees incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p><b>A</b> = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p><b>G</b> = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees</p>	
<p><b>Any other information not captured above?</b></p> <p>N/A</p>		
<p><b>Level 2 Conclusion</b></p>		
<p><b>Level 2 Conclusion</b> (after allowing scope for mitigation)</p>	<p><b>R</b> = Significant constraints or adverse impacts</p> <p><b>A</b> = Some constraints or adverse impacts</p> <p><b>G</b> = Minor constraints or adverse impacts</p>	<p>Green:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is over 800m from services and facilities in the centre of Cambridge or at the nearest local centre, however there are some facilities available on the adjacent Addenbrooke's site including its public transport hub.</li> <li>The proposed development could provide more direct access to the Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve; however this will need to be balanced with the need to mitigate visitor impacts on the site and to provide an appropriate landscaped setting for the site.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Overall Conclusion</b></p>	<p><b>R</b> = Site with no Significant development potential (Significant constraints and adverse impacts)</p> <p><b>A</b> = Site with development potential (some constraints or adverse impacts)</p> <p><b>G</b> = Site with development potential (few or minor constraints or adverse impacts)</p>	<p>Amber: Site with development potential (some constraints or adverse impacts)</p> <p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjacent to expanding Cambridge Biomedical Campus.</li> <li>Opportunities for improving pedestrian access to Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve.</li> </ul> <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential surface water flooding and flood risk constraints that need to be</li> </ul>

		<p>carefully mitigated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant congestion already occurs in this quadrant of Cambridge which is likely to be exacerbated by the development of the expanding Cambridge Biomedical Campus.</li> </ul>
<b>Viability feedback (from consultants)</b>	<b>R</b> = Unlikely to be viable <b>A</b> = May be viable <b>G</b> = Likely to be viable	Green: adjoins Cambridge Biomedical Campus which is being delivered for similar uses.
<b>Landowner comments</b>	<b>R</b> = Site unlikely to be available <b>A</b> = No immediate plans to release site <b>G</b> = Site likely to be available in plan period	Green: Cambridgeshire County Council has confirmed site is available for development.
<b>Issues and Options 2 representations</b>	<b>R</b> = Major planning objections to the allocation <b>A</b> = Significant planning concerns expressed, but can be addressed <b>G</b> = No significant planning objections to the allocation	N/A, site not previously consulted on.
<b>Conclusions for Submission Local Plan</b>	New employment allocation on the edge of Cambridge, adjacent to the expanding Cambridge Biomedical Campus.	



# Land South of Cambridge Biomedical Campus – Joint Sustainability Appraisal Pro Forma

<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Edge of Cambridge Broad Location 6 Land to south of Addenbrooke's Road between Babraham Road and Shelford Road</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> E/1B	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b>	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land south of Addenbrooke's and southwest of Babraham Road	
<b>Map:</b>	
 <p>The map shows the site location south of Addenbrooke's Hospital and the Biomedical Campus. Key features include the railway line to the west, the Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve to the south-west, and the site area shaded in grey. Surrounding roads include Babraham Road, Shelford Road, and Addenbrooke's Road. The map also shows the district boundary and various landmarks like the School, Laboratories, and Cycle Path.</p>	
<p><b>Site description:</b> To the north is Addenbrooke's Hospital and the Biomedical Campus. To the west is the railway line to London, a corridor of public open space and the Clay Farm development. Immediately to the south west is the Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve with its chalk springs, woodland and scrub. To the east and south the land comprises large arable fields with hedgerows.</p>	
<p><b>Current use(s):</b> Agricultural</p>	
<p><b>Proposed use(s):</b> Biomedical and biotechnology research and development, related higher education and sui generis medical research institutes and associated support activities.</p>	
<p><b>Site size (ha):</b> South Cambridgeshire: 8.91 ha. - Cambridge: 0 ha.</p>	
<p><b>Potential residential capacity:</b> N/A</p>	

<b>LAND</b>			
PDL	Would development make use of previously developed land?		RED = Not on PDL
Agricultural Land	Would development lead		AMBER = Minor loss of grade 1 and 2 agricultural land.

	to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?		The site is Grade 2 land.
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		AMBER = Site or a significant part of it falls within an allocated or safeguarded area, development would have minor negative impacts. Part of the site falls within a Waste Consultation Area.
<b>POLLUTION</b>			
Air Quality	Would the development of the sites result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?		AMBER = Site lies near source of air pollution, or development could impact on air quality adverse impacts  The site may have an adverse impact on air quality from traffic generation particularly as close to Addenbrooke's. An air quality assessment is essential.
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		GREEN = >1,000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14.  The site is not within an Air Quality Management Area. The site may impact on air quality from traffic generation particularly as close to Addenbrooke's.
Pollution	Are there potential Odour, light noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator (including compatibility with neighbouring uses)?		AMBER = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation.  Site is close to Addenbrooke's Hospital site and the western part is adjacent to railway line to London. Noise assessment and potential mitigation measures required.
Contamination	Is there possible contamination on the site?		AMBER = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development (potential to achieve benefits subject to appropriate mitigation).  Agricultural use may have led to some contamination with agricultural chemicals. Appropriate assessment required.
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		AMBER = Development has potential to affect water quality, with minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation.  Site lies close to the natural chalk springs at Nine Wells which feed into Hobsons Brook.
<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated	Will it conserve		AMBER = Contains or is adjacent to an

Sites	protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		existing site designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation.  Site adjoins the Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve.
Biodiversity	Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets, and maintain connectivity between green infrastructure)?		AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation.  Assumptions for a neutral impact are that existing features that warrant retention can be retained or appropriate mitigation will be achieved through the development process.
TPO	Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?		GREEN = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees
Green Infrastructure	Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery of and access to green infrastructure?		AMBER = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation.  Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process. Site within the Countywide Green Infrastructure Strategy. Potential for improved access to LNR from north.
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		AMBER = negative impact on landscape character, incapable of full mitigation.  Minor negative impact (development conflicts with landscape character, minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation) - development of this site would result in further encroachment of the built area into open countryside to the south of Addenbrooke's Hospital and the Biomedical

			Campus. This would have a negative impact on the purposes of the Green Belt affecting openness, setting and views.
Townscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?		<p>GREEN = No impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local townscape character, or provide minor improvements)</p> <p>Development of this site would result in further encroachment of the built area into open countryside to the south of Addenbrooke's Hospital and the Biomedical Campus. However, there is scope to provide a new softer edge to the city.</p>
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		<p>AMBER = negative impact on Greenbelt purposes.</p> <p>UPDATE INNER GREEN BOUNDARY STUDY 2015 LDA Green Belt Study 2015 identifies scope for development in this location without there being significant harm to Green Belt purposes.</p> <p>Limited development in the northern and eastern parts of sector 10 could be undertaken without significant long-term harm to Green Belt purposes, if carefully planned and designed in accordance with the parameters set out below. These parameters would avoid significant harm as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new Green Belt boundary would be no further from the historic core than existing boundaries to the west at Trumpington and the east at Cherry Hinton. A permanent, well-designed edge to the city would be created. Thus, the increase in urban sprawl would be permanently limited and would not affect perceptions of the compact nature of the city.</li> <li>• A well-vegetated, soft green edge to the city would minimise the urban influences on the retained Green Belt, thus minimising the perception of encroachment into the countryside.</li> <li>• The rising topography of the Gog Magog Hills would be kept open, retaining a key feature of the setting of the city, and open rural land would be retained at the foot of the hills, protecting the foreground in key views and the quality</li> </ul>

			of the approach to the city along Babraham Road.
Heritage	Will it protect or enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments)?		<p>AMBER = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such sites, buildings and features, with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>Extensive and intensive evidence for Bronze Age, Iron Age, Roman and medieval archaeology is recorded to the north. Cropmarks to the south indicate that archaeological assets are likely to extend throughout the landscape. A site of national importance is located 250m to the south west (Scheduled Monument Number 57.</p> <p>Further evidence through archaeological evaluation would be needed regarding the extent, character and significance of archaeology in the area prior to consideration of a planning application.</p>
<b>CLIMATE CHANGE</b>			
Renewables	Will it support the use of renewable energy resources?		AMBER = Standard requirements for renewables would apply
Flood Risk	Is site at flood risk?		<p>AMBER = Flood Zone 2 / medium risk.</p> <p>Parts of site at risk of surface water flooding. Parts of the site are within flood zones 2 and 3. Careful mitigation required considering the sequential test and the following points:</p> <p>Historically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the watercourse which runs through the site has overtopped in heavy rainfall events; and</li> <li>this site has become waterlogged during some winters.</li> </ul> <p>This site has a clear flood flow route through it and this means that flood risk mitigation measures used on this site could have impacts on adjoining or nearby sites (e.g. through using techniques like land raising). This may be an issue if there are other new developments planned in the surrounding undeveloped land. The Cambridge and Milton Surface Water Management Plan identifies some wetspots nearby, which while they do not cover the site, may add extra pressure to the local development situation as land uses and heights vary.</p>

			Consent for any modifications to the watercourse would need to be sought from the Flood and Water Team at Cambridgeshire County Council, but significant changes such as culverting would be discouraged and would require modelling to prove no increase or relocation of risk.
<b>HUMAN HEALTH AND WELL BEING</b>			
Open Space	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space?		GREEN = Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite
Distance: Outdoor Sport Facilities	How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?		GREEN = <1km or onsite provision Allocation is not for housing.
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		GREEN =<400m Allocation is not for housing.
Gypsy & Traveller	Will it provide for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?		AMBER = No Impact
Distance: District or Local Centre	How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?		RED =>800m  The site is over 800m from the nearest local centre at Wulfstan Way. There are some facilities available on the Addenbrooke's site.
Distance: City Centre	How far is the site from edge of defined Cambridge City Centre?		R = >800m
Distance: GP Service	How far is the nearest health centre or GP service?		R = >800m  The site is over 800m from the nearest GP Surgery, which is located at the Queen Edith Medical Practice, 59 Queen Edith's Way
Key Local Facilities	Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?)		AMBER = No impact on facilities (or satisfactory mitigation proposed).
Community	Will it encourage		GREEN = Development would not lead to

Facilities	and enable engagement in community activities?		the loss of any community facilities or replacement / appropriate mitigation possible
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?		GREEN = Good scope for integration with existing communities / of sufficient scale to create a new community.
<b>ECONOMY</b>			
Deprivation (Cambridge)	Does it address pockets of income and employment deprivation particularly in Abbey Ward and Kings Hedges? Would allocation result in development in deprived wards of Cambridge?		AMBER = Not within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.
Shopping	Will it protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres?		GREEN = No effect or would support the vitality and viability of existing centres.
Employment - Accessibility	How far is the nearest main employment centre?		GREEN = <1km or allocation is for or includes a significant element of employment or is for another non-residential use  Adjacent to Addenbrooke's Hospital and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus.
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		GG = Development would significantly enhance employment opportunities  Site is an employment allocation.
Utilities	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?		AMBER = Significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation
Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education		GREEN= Non-residential development / surplus school places



	capacity?		Allocation is not for housing.
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		G =<400m Allocation is not for housing.
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		G = Within 1km (or site large enough to provide new) Allocation is not for housing.
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		AMBER = Medium quality off-road path.  Potential for links through Biomedical Campus, Addenbrooke's and Bell School site.
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		GREEN = High quality public transport service  The site has access to public transport service using the Addenbrooke's Hospital public transport hub, located within 600m of the eastern edge of the site.
Sustainable Transport Score (SCDC)	Scoring mechanism has been developed to consider access to and quality of public transport, and cycling. Scores determined by the four criteria below.		GREEN = Score 15-19 from 4 criteria below  Total score 18
Distance: bus stop / rail station			G = Within 600m (4)
Frequency of Public Transport			G = 20 minute frequency (4)
Public transport journey time to City Centre			G = 21 to 30 minutes (4)  Potential for GG via Guided Bus
Distance for cycling to City Centre			GG = Up to 5km (6)
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		R = >800m.  Potential for new railway station to serve Addenbrooke's and Biomedical Campus which would provide for at least an Amber score.
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is		AMBER = Insufficient capacity / access. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.



	available capacity?		<p>This site does not benefit from direct access to the local highway network; as such the most logical point of access to the site would appear to be via the proposed Cambridge Biomedical Campus Phase 2 development. There is, therefore, a risk that the layout and access strategy for Cambridge Biomedical Campus Phase 2 could prejudice the ability of adequate access to this site being achieved, as such early discussions with the developer of Cambridge Biomedical Campus Phase 2 would be recommended to minimise this risk.</p> <p>With regard to rail access, a portion of this site may need to be safeguarded to facilitate the delivery of the proposed Addenbrooke's railway station (which is listed as a scheme in the County Council's Long Term Transport Strategy).</p> <p>If allocated, any subsequent planning application would need to be accompanied by a full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.</p> <p>Significant congestion already occurs in this quadrant of Cambridge which is likely to be exacerbated by the full build out of the planned and approved Cambridge Biomedical Campus developments. While substantial sustainable transport improvements are identified through the City Deal Programme that may provide some headroom, any Transport Assessment will need to carefully examine and clearly demonstrate how the site can be delivered without having an unacceptable impact on the surrounding transport networks.</p>
Non-Car Facilities	Will it make the transport network safer for public transport, walking or cycling facilities?		<p>AMBER = No impacts</p> <p>The Highway Authority will require new development to provide or contribute to the provision of infrastructure to encourage more sustainable transport links both on and off site. Provision or contribution from this site would result in minor improvement to public transport, walking or cycling facilities.</p>

## **Appendix 6: Development Strategy – Proposed Modifications to Cambridge Local Plan**

The modifications set out below propose textual changes to the plan to refer to the additional work undertaken. The modifications are included in the Local Plan Consultation Document schedule with a reason for the change.

Key – Amendments to the plan as follows (deletions ~~struck through~~, additions underlined):

### **Section Two: The spatial strategy**

#### **Amend paragraph 2.17 to read:**

- 2.17 The councils in Cambridgeshire, along with Peterborough City Council have undertaken joint technical work and an update of the strategic housing market assessment (SHMA) for the Cambridge housing market area in order to identify objectively assessed needs for homes and jobs across the sub-region. The councils undertook this work cooperatively and a memorandum of cooperation and joint spatial approach has been agreed. This was published in May 2013. This confirmed Cambridge's need was for 14,000 additional homes and 22,100 jobs between 2011 and 2031. Additional independent technical evidence was prepared in 2015 to further consider need for new housing taking account of national guidance published after the plan was prepared. This has confirmed that the full Objectively Assessed Need for Cambridge is 14,000 homes. This need is being met in full in this new plan.

#### **Add new paragraph 2.17a to read:**

- 2.17a A Memorandum of Understanding was also agreed between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council in September 2014, which agrees that the housing trajectories for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, as updated each year in the Annual Monitoring Report, will be considered together for the purposes of phasing of housing delivery, including for calculating 5-year housing land supply in development management decisions that concern housing development.

#### **Amend paragraph 2.27 to read:**

- 2.27 This approach has been endorsed by the Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group (JST&SPG), the member governance group set up to guide the collaborative preparation of development plans in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and the associated transport strategy. This group has also considered the additional evidence prepared in 2015.

#### **Insert new paragraph after 2.29 to read:**

In response to issues raised by the Inspectors during the Local Plan Examination, the Councils commissioned a new independent Inner Green Belt Review in 2015. This also concluded that beyond those locations already identified in the submission Local Plans it is unlikely that any development could be accommodated without substantial harm to Green Belt purposes (in most locations around the edge of the City). Additional work was carried to consider sites on the edge of Cambridge on an equal basis with other sites, through transport modelling and Sustainability Appraisal.

#### **Amend current paragraph 2.30 to read:**

- 2.30 The conclusion of the consideration of reasonable site options for development on the edge of Cambridge is to require development away from the edge of Cambridge to meet the remaining development needs of the wider Cambridge area. The sustainability appraisal of broad locations undertaken as part of the joint work endorsed by the JST&SPG demonstrates clearly that new settlements are the next most sustainable location for growth and that development in villages should be limited for sustainability reasons. This appraisal was updated in 2015, to take account of new evidence prepared in response to the Inspectors during the Local Plan Examination.

**Amend figures in Table 2.2 as shown below:**

	<b>Structure Plan 1999 to 2016</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>New Local Plan Strategy 2011 to 2031 (both areas)</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Cambridge Urban Area</b>	8,900	27	<del>6,614</del> <u>6,828</u>	<del>20</del> <u>19</u>
<b>Cambridge Fringe Sites</b>	8,000	25	<del>11,891</del> <u>12,670</u>	35
<b>New settlements</b>	6,000	18	<del>10,335</del> <u>8,055</u>	<del>31</del> <u>23</u>
<b>Villages</b>	9,600	30	<del>4,748</del> <u>8,220</u>	<del>14</del> <u>23</u>
<b>TOTAL 1999 to 2016</b>	<b>32,500</b>	<b>100</b>	<b><del>33,585</del> <u>35,773</u></b>	<b>100</b>

**Amend the second paragraph of policy 3 to read:**

Provision will be made for the development of not less than 14,000 additional dwellings within Cambridge City Council's administrative boundary over the period from April 2011 to March 2031 to meet the objectively assessed need for homes in Cambridge. This will enable continuous delivery of housing for at least 15 years from the anticipated date of adoption of this local plan. The housing trajectories for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, as updated each year in the Annual Monitoring Report, will be considered together for the purposes of phasing and housing delivery, including for calculating 5-year housing land supply in development management decisions that concern housing development. ~~This p~~Provision includes two small sites to be released from the Cambridge Green Belt at Worts' Causeway, which will deliver up to 430 dwellings.

**Amend paragraph 2.43 to read:**

- 2.43 As of April ~~2012~~ 2015, there is planning permission for ~~9,385~~ 7,036 new homes within the urban area and in the agreed urban extensions. There are a further ~~724~~ 1,010 planned dwellings on existing allocated sites that do not have planning permission. Completions between 2011/~~12~~ and ~~2012~~ 2014/15 account for ~~334~~ 2,860 dwellings. In addition, the Council's strategic housing land availability assessment (SHLAA), together with findings of the council's annual housing trajectory which assesses the capacity for future housing within the existing urban area, indicates capacity for a further 3,754 3,777 dwellings in the urban area of Cambridge (including two small Green Belt releases). Taken together, these could provide ~~44,194~~ 14,682 new homes for Cambridge over the local plan period (See Table 2.3 – Housing provision to 2031).

Replace table 2.3 with new table as below:

<b>Dwelling provision 2011 to 2031</b>	<b>Number of dwellings</b>
<b>Completions</b>	
Completions 2011 – 2012	<del>331</del>
<b>Existing Commitments</b>	
Urban extensions with planning permission	7,000
Urban extensions without planning permission	408
Large allocations with planning permission	1,563
Allocated sites without planning permission	721
Deliverable sites with planning permission (not allocated)	414
<b>Potential supply</b>	
Local plan review allocation sites	1,904
Windfall	1,850
<b>Total</b>	<b>14,191</b>
<b>Surplus</b>	<b>191</b>

	<u><b>Existing Completions and Commitments (both areas)</b></u>	<u><b>New Sites Cambridge</b></u>	<u><b>New Sites South Cambs</b></u>	<u><b>TOTAL</b></u>	<u><b>%</b></u>
<u><b>Cambridge Urban Area</b></u>	<u>5,358</u>	<u>1,470</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6,282</u>	<u>19</u>
<u><b>Edge of Cambridge</b></u>	<u>11,370</u>	<u>890</u>	<u>410</u>	<u>12,670</u>	<u>35</u>
<u><b>New Settlements and Cambourne West</b></u>	<u>3,445</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4,610</u>	<u>8,055</u>	<u>34-23</u>
<u><b>Villages Rural Area (including windfalls)</b></u>	<u>7,284</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>936</u>	<u>8,220</u>	<u>23</u>
<u><b>TOTAL</b></u>	<u><b>27,457</b></u>	<u><b>2,360</b></u>	<u><b>5,956</b></u>	<u><b>35,773</b></u>	<u><b>100</b></u>

Amend paragraph 2.45 to read:


- 2.45 The Cambridge housing trajectory included and updated each year in the Annual Monitoring Report set out in Figure 2.2 illustrates the expected rate of delivery of new dwellings. It demonstrates how the objectively assessed need for an additional 14,000 homes to 2031 could be achieved. To meet objectively assessed need, an average of 700 additional dwellings a year are required between 2011 and 2031. As outlined in paragraph 2.17a, the Councils have agreed that the housing trajectories

for both areas be considered together for the purposes of housing delivery, including calculation of 5-year housing land supply in development management decisions that concern housing development. This is consistent with the development sequence and spatial development strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, and the phasing of housing delivery reflecting that strategy. As such, sites at the top of the development sequence in and on the edge of the urban area of Cambridge will deliver in the early and middle part of the plan period. Delivery in South Cambridgeshire will be greater in the middle and latter parts of the plan period, in particular as the fringe sites build out from the edge of Cambridge and move across the administrative boundary into South Cambridgeshire and as the new settlements come forward. There will also be some housing in larger villages early in the plan period.

## Delete paragraphs 2.46 and 2.47

- ~~tt. All dwelling figures in the trajectory are net additional dwellings (i.e. completed dwellings minus losses of dwellings). The yellow horizontal line at 700 dwellings represents the annual average requirement.~~
- ~~uu. The maroon bars illustrate the projected net completions on sites that are currently known (i.e. existing commitments). The light blue bars represent total net additional dwellings including local plan allocations and windfall sites.~~

## Delete Figure 2.2: Housing Trajectory:



This page is intentionally left blank