

## Appendix E:

### Supplement to the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum - November 2015 (Revised)

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
1. Introduction	1
2. Sustainability Appraisal Addendum	3
Appendix 1 Councils' assessment of objections to scoring of individual criteria for specific sites	17
Appendix 2 - New site proforma for new sites or significant variations to sites	34
Appendix 3 – Revised site proforma resulting from Councils' assessment of objections to scoring	145
Appendix 4 – Update of Site Assessment Summary Table	243
Appendix 5 – Screening of Additional Proposed Modifications	252
Appendix 6 – Letter from Natural England regarding Habitats Directive Assessment	278

# 1. Introduction

- 1.1. This document follows consultation on proposed modifications to the Cambridge Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan held between 2 December 2015 and 25 January 2016. The proposed modifications and the supporting additional evidence address the issues raised by the Inspectors holding the examinations into the Local Plans in their preliminary conclusions letter of 20 May 2015. The consultation was accompanied by a Joint Sustainability Appraisal Addendum Report (reference document RD/MC/020).
- 1.2. This document identifies the number of representations received to each section of the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum, a summary of the key issues raised, and the Councils' assessment.
- 1.3. A number of site specific comments were received to the scoring of individual criteria within site assessment proforma which were included in Annex 1 of the SAA (these are considered in Appendix 1). Where new sites or significant variations of sites have been submitted, for completeness these have been reappraised (see new site proforma in Appendix 2). Where changes have been made to existing proforma, these have been updated (appendix 3).
- 1.4. Annex 1 of the SAA included a summary spreadsheet, capturing the results of all the individual site assessments for easy comparison. For completeness, this has been updated, to include the revised scores and new site assessments mentioned above (See appendix 4).
- 1.5. As a result of the consultations, a small number of additional or amended proposed modifications were identified related to both Local Plans. A screening exercise has been undertaken (updating table 10.1 and 10.2 of the SAA), which concluded that the additional changes do not impact on the outcome of the appraisal (see appendix 5).
- 1.6. In developing the Proposed Modifications the Councils considered whether they had any implications for the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Reports<sup>1</sup>. The Councils consider that the proposed modifications do not amend the findings of these screening reports, both of which found that the Submission Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans would not have significant effects on the Natura 2000 or Ramsar sites identified. This conclusion remains the same taking into account the small number of additional or amended proposed modifications following the consultation.
- 1.7. In a letter dated 23 February 2016 Natural England provided confirmation that they were satisfied with the Councils' conclusions that the proposed modifications do not amend the findings of the HRA screening reports and that the Submission Cambridge

---

<sup>1</sup> Cambridge City Council Habitats Regulations Assessment (RD/Sub/C/120), South Cambridgeshire Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Report (March 2014) (part of Draft Final Sustainability Report and HRA Screening Report (RD/Sub/SC/060))

and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans including the Proposed Modifications are unlikely to have significant effects on Natura 2000 or Ramsar sites. A copy of this letter is included as appendix 6.



## 2. Sustainability Appraisal Addendum

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

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

Appendix E: Supplement to the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum - November 2015 (March 2016)

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

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

Chapter 5. Strategic Development Sequence			
<b>Representations Received</b>	Support: 0	Object: 24	Total: 24
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that benefits of new settlements are under-played in the appraisal of the development sequence.</li> <li>• Does not acknowledge existing new settlements do not deliver policy compliant levels of affordable housing, and have higher infrastructure requirements</li> <li>• Employment development will focus on Cambridge</li> <li>• Congestion encourages more journeys to be undertaken by walking and cycling, which is more likely to occur from Edge of Cambridge (EoC) Sites.</li> <li>• Plans don't achieve the 'right balance' across the development hierarchy. Over reliant on new settlements. Options discounted due to Green Belt on edge of Cambridge and Better Served villages.</li> <li>• Inaccuracies and inconsistencies in assessment of reasonable alternatives give bias to new settlements.</li> <li>• Not all land at different levels of sequence has the same impacts (e.g. landscape impact, air quality).</li> <li>• Fails to adequately consider benefit of development at villages.</li> </ul>		
<b>Councils' Assessment</b>	<p>The appraisal of the stages of the development sequence appropriately compared the sustainability impacts of the options available, including development at villages.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.4.1 notes that because of the very broad strategic nature of the development sequence, the SA has been carried out to a broad level of detail. There are clearly site by site variations, which are reflected in the individual site assessments. The reasons for scoring are provided in the commentary.</p> <p>Housing objective is scored same for new settlements and other locations, for the reasons stated in table 5.1. Viability and Infrastructure evidence demonstrates there ability to deliver affordable housing. Access to employment is appropriately considered, highlighting that Cambridge likely to be most significant job location, but new settlements and other locations can be developed as mixed use locations providing opportunities to live and work in the same place. The Sustainable Travel objective (22) appropriately identifies the benefits and disbenefits of each location, including infrastructure requirements.</p>		

	<p>Table 5.1 highlights potential impacts of general development locations on air quality. Site specific assessments considered whether development is in or near to an AQMA, and whether development would impact on air quality / AQMA. Not as simple as saying edge of Cambridge is good, as it would introduce traffic directly into an area where air quality is an issue.</p> <p>With regard to green infrastructure, table 5.1 highlights that both urban extensions and new settlements have potential to deliver significant elements of green infrastructure. This reflects the site options considered.</p>
<b>Approach to SAA Addendum section.</b>	No change.

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

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

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

	alternatives which should then be examined in greater detail.”
	The appraisal is considered robust.
<b>Approach to SAA Addendum section.</b>	No change.

<b>Chapter 8. Green Belt in the SA</b>			
<b>Representations Received</b>	Support: 1	Object: 13	Total: 14
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirms it is valid to give weight to impact on Green Belt as appropriate SA objective</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree with conclusions of the Inner Green Belt Study, therefore appraisal unsound.</li> <li>Green Belt was not identified as an SA objective at earlier stages</li> <li>After rejecting land in GB, a further stage of the assessment process should have considered whether the preferred development strategy would deliver sustainable development.</li> <li>Appraisal adopts broad brush approach to dismissing large areas of land due to location of Green Belt despite Inner Green Belt Study acknowledging areas which are acknowledged as contributing significantly to sustainability objectives and less to Green Belt Objectives are capable of release.</li> <li>Approach to Green Belt precludes proper consideration of reasonable alternatives.</li> <li>Report does not take into account Green Belt impacts of Transport Infrastructure needed to support new settlements.</li> </ul>		
<b>Councils' Assessment</b>	<p>Green Belt issues were identified as being within the scope of both the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Appraisals from the earliest stages of the SA process (the 2012 Scoping Reports).</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the SAA considers how Green Belt should be addressed in the SA, and confirms it is an appropriate Sustainability Objective to be included in the scope.</p> <p>The SAA directly compares sites in the Green Belt with sites outside the Green Belt, using the same assessment criteria.</p> <p>The Inner Green Belt Study 2015 was commissioned from specialist consultants, and is appropriately drawn on by the SAA. Issues raised with regard to this study have been considered</p>		



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

<b>Chapter 9. Preferred Approach</b>			
<b>Representations Received</b>	Support: 0	Object: 9	Total: 9
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No information about how weighting of different issues has been applied.</li> <li>• Appraisal adopts broad brush approach to dismissing large areas of land due to location of Green Belt despite Inner Green Belt Study acknowledging areas which are acknowledged as contributing significantly to sustainability objectives and less to Green Belt Objectives are capable of release.</li> <li>• Plans don't achieve the 'right balance' across the</li> </ul>		

	<p>development hierarchy. Over reliant on new settlements. Options discounted due to Green Belt on edge of Cambridge and Better Served villages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Balance between weighting given to sustainability and weighting given to the protection of the Green Belt should be reviewed.</li> <li>• Significant sustainability advantages of locating development on the edge of Cambridge have been identified and acknowledged, but then dismissed by the Council in the development strategy. Contrary to NPPF.</li> <li>• There are inconsistencies and disparities between the assessment of new settlements when compared to the assessment of urban fringes sites.</li> </ul>
<b>Councils' Assessment</b>	<p>Following the SA/SEA process, during plan making the Councils have identified a range of options and alternatives, tested their relative merits against a set of sustainability objectives to consider the magnitude of impacts, and considered mitigation opportunities. Having considered the results of the SAA, and the range of other evidence and issues considered through the plan making process, section 9 sets out the Councils preferred approach and their reasons for choosing it. This meets the requirements of the SEA Directive.</p> <p>Options that would require Green Belt review have been appropriately compared with options outside the Green Belt, supporting the consideration required by paragraph 84 and 85 of the NPPF. The decision of the Councils regarding weight given to green belt versus other issues has been clearly explained (SAA section 9.4).</p>
<b>Approach to SAA Addendum section.</b>	No change.

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

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

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

Appendices			
<b>Representations Received</b>	Support: 0	Object: 4	Total: 4
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not applicable</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Coalition of Parish Councils</b> - using the Councils own information, that edge of city sites are more sustainable and cost-effective than new settlements. New settlements will not contribute to transport objective.</li> </ul>		

Appendix E: Supplement to the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum - November 2015 (March 2016)

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

<b>Annex 1</b>			
<b>Representations Received</b>	Support: 0	Object: 29	Total: 29
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not applicable</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objection to scoring of individual criteria on the following sites:  <u>Local Plan Allocations:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bourn Airfield (Policy SS/6) - Site SC057 &amp; 238</li> <li>Land south of Addenbrooke's and southwest of Babraham Road (Policy E/1B)</li> <li>Fulbourn Road East (Policy E/2) - Site GB/5 / SC300</li> </ul> <u>Strategic / Edge of Cambridge Sites:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>North Cambourne - Site SC265</li> <li>Land north of Barton Road (Broad Location 2) - Site CCSC1001</li> <li>Land South of Barton Road (Broad Location 1) - Site CCSC1002</li> <li>Land to the south of Addenbrooke's Road, Cambridge (Broad Location 5) - Site CCSC1004</li> <li>Land west of Hauxton Road, Trumpington (Broad Location 4) – SC068</li> <li>Land at Fen Ditton (Broad Location 9) - Site</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

	<p>CCSC1006</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land east of Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton (Broad Location 9) - Site SC036</li> </ul> <p><u>Sites at Rural Centres:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land south of Great Shelford Caravan and Camping Club, Cambridge Road, Great Shelford - Site SC188</li> <li>Land to the north of Mingle Lane and east of Hinton, Great Shelford– Sites SC207 &amp; SC212</li> <li>Impington Lane, Histon - Site SC114</li> <li>Buxhall Farm, Histon - Site SC133</li> <li>Land west of 113 Cottenham Road, Histon - Site SC306</li> </ul> <p><u>Sites at Minor Rural Centres:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land north of Elbourn Way, Bassingbourn - Site SC 219</li> <li>Land East of Bush Close, Comberton - Site SC255</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New sites or significant variations to (with new site proforma): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land South of Worts' Causeway (Policy GB2) – slightly revised boundary to include Newbury Farm - Site CC929a</li> <li>Cambridge South East - Land west of Limekiln Road and Cherry Hinton Road (Broad Location 7) - Site CCSC1005a – Revision to CCSC1005 / smaller site</li> <li>Grange Farm (Broad Location 1) - smaller development area - Site CC916a</li> <li>Land North of Barton Road (Broad Location 2) and Grange Farm (Broad Location 1) – Site CCSC1001a</li> <li>Land north of Babraham Road, Sawston (Policy H/1b) – increased development - Site SC313a</li> <li>New site - Land at Hallmark Hotel, Bar Hill – Site SC340</li> <li>Land at Fulbourn Old Drift (south of Cambridge Road and north of Shelford Road), Fulbourn – smaller site - Site SC037a</li> <li>Land north of Cambridge Road, Fulbourn – employment use - Site SC038a</li> <li>Land west of A10, Milton – employment use – Site SC327a</li> <li>Land South of Hale Road, Swavesey – smaller site – Site SCC071a</li> <li>Land east of Cherry Hinton Road, Teversham – revised boundary – Site SC098a</li> <li>Land south of Bourn Bridge Road, Little Abington – smaller site – Site SC025a</li> </ul> </li> <li>Object to non-appraisal of Land off Highfields Road,</li> </ul>
--	---

	Caldecote due to Group village status.
<b>Councils' Assessment</b>	<p>Comments relating to the scoring of individual criteria of specific sites have been considered (in Appendix 1). In a small number of cases some minor amendments are proposed to either the criterion score and/or the accompanying descriptive wording in the site assessment proforma.</p> <p>Where representors have proposed new sites or significant variations to sites the Councils have prepared new site proforma (see Appendix 2). This includes a site assessment of the amended Cambridge Local Plan Policy GB2, to incorporate a small parcel of land at Newbury Farm. This did not change the site scoring compared to the original GB2 proforma. The wording of the policy is not proposed to be changed other than the site area.</p>
<b>Approach to SAA Addendum section.</b>	<p>Make the stated revisions to the site assessment proforma and include new site proforma within the Councils' Sustainability Appraisals.</p> <p>Include a new proposed modification to the Cambridge Local Plan, to include a small parcel of land at Newbury Farm within site allocation GB2 (Mod reference PM/CC/B/B).</p>

## Appendix 1 Councils' assessment of objections to scoring of individual criteria for specific sites

### Local Plan Allocations:

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

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

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

#### **Strategic / Edge Cambridge Sites:**

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
<p>North Cambourne (SC265)</p> <p>(Comparison with Bourn Airfield (SC057 &amp; SC238))</p> <p>Martin Grant Homes &amp; Harcourt Developments (UK) Ltd (Savills)</p> <p>Rep 66038</p>	Pollution should score Amber. North Cambourne is an enlarged settlement so more journeys will be by foot / cycle to facilities in Cambourne. Should be green but for being close to commercial uses and a motorcross - these can be mitigated.	Pollution scores Red. Acknowledge in the assessment that the promoter proposes to relocate motorcross which would improve the score from Red to Amber. No change to score.	Amend site assessment Pollution wording to note the intention to move the motorcross.
	Landscape description reads as Amber. Promoter proposes space for country park to mitigate impacts. Should score Green or at worst Amber.	Landscape scores Red – which reflects the elevation and open character of the site. Development would urbanise the rural approach to Knapwell and swamp the village.	No change.
	Climate Change should score Green, consistent with Bourn Airfield. Similar scale of development.	Climate Change scores Amber. Acknowledge the scale of development is similar to Bourn Airfield which has been scored Green. The promoters of Bourn Airfield stated they would deliver additional opportunities for renewable energy, hence the difference in score.	No change.



	Open Space should score GG to reflect the greater opportunities.	Open Space scores Green - consistent with other sites.	No change.
	Access to services & facilities – both sites rated the same but site has better access / integration to Cambourne.	Access to services & facilities – both sites will provide new services & facilities and have access to Cambourne.	No change.
	Integration should score Green, the same as Bourn Airfield. Site will integrate with Cambourne. Bourn Airfield scores Green yet a stand alone settlement.	Integration scores Red – despite proposed new green bridges across the A428, the trunk road still forms a (real and perceived) separation from Cambourne.	No change.
	Economy should score the same as Bourn Airfield (GG). Whilst site does not propose commercial uses, it has potential and has synergies with Cambourne.	Economy scores Green. The promoter does not propose employment on site. The Employment Accessibility criterion considers links to other employment sites.	No change.
	Education should score Green, the same as Bourn Airfield. The development will include a secondary school on site. Bourn Airfield promoters have not confirmed provision (which would take land away from other uses).	<p>UPDATED: The site proforma for Site 265 Land to the North of the A428 Cambourne states for 'distance to secondary school' - <i>'Potential to provide new secondary school, or be served by existing Cambourne site, depending whether this development would take place in combination with others. Promoter proposes new secondary school on-site'</i>.</p> <p>This results in the same score as Bourn Airfield, where delivery of a new secondary school was also assumed.</p>	No Change.
	Transport should score similar to Bourn Airfield. Scores fail to recognise provision of Park & Ride, which would make the site better than Bourn Airfield.	Sustainable Transport scores are only 1 point different, which reflects the greater distance to Cambridge from Cambourne North. The assessments consistently reflect the relative opportunities of the two sites to connect into, and benefit from, the transport improvements proposed.	No change.

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

	would not lead to coalescence with outlying villages.	Green Belt Study 2015.	
	Any development on the Site would not be at risk of flooding or cause increased flood risk to others.	Flood risk scores Amber - recognising the existing risks affecting the site, but which can be mitigated.	No change.
	Areas of greatest archaeological potential are outside or on the northern and western edges of the site. Any development would avoid such area. No archaeological constraints to the principle of development.	Heritage scores Amber. This score recognises previous finds in the area and seeks assessment to inform planning application and ensure appropriate mitigation.	No change.

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
South of Barton Road (Broad Location 1) (CCSC1002)  South BRLOG (Bidwells)  Rep 66156	The air quality, noise and pollution matters do need to be investigated further, but built development at the Site would be located away from the M11.	AQMA correctly scores Red as the site is adjacent to M11. Acknowledge the promoter intends to locate development away from the M11, which could reduce the score from Red to Amber.  Noise scores Amber due to traffic on M11 & Barton Road, from Laundry Farm and the Animal Breeding Centre.  The site assessment recognises it is possible to mitigate Air Quality, noise and pollution impacts.	Amend site assessment AQMA wording to record promoter's intention to locate development away from the M11.
	Initial ecological surveys of the Site have been undertaken, and the existing features would be retained and enhanced within the proposed development.	Ecology scores Amber, which recognises that development could mitigate impacts. Development located away from the M11 would avoid harm to CWS.	No change.
	The landscape, townscape and Green Belt impacts could be addressed through strategic landscaping and green infrastructure measures.	Landscape & Townscape both score Red and Green Belt scores Red Red, in recognition of the rural character of the landscape and importance for the setting of the City.	No change.
	The Site would be well-related to the employment and research facilities at West Cambridge and at Addenbrookes/Cambridge	Employment Accessibility scores Green.	No change.

	Biomedical Campus once the planned Western Orbital Route is delivered.		
	The Site is located adjacent to existing cycle and bus routes, and the proposed development is capable of delivering improvements to public transport and cycling facilities.	Cycle Routes scores Amber due to the medium quality path available, although it recognises there is potential for improvement  HQPT score was updated from Red to Amber to reflect the site could improve services to 20 minute frequency.	No change.
	Development would provide new local and community facilities and connect with existing and planned services and facilities in neighbouring areas and City Centre, making it more likely that residents would use non-car modes of transport.	Key Local Facilities scores Green, reflecting that new or improved facilities are proposed.  Sustainable Transport scores GG, recognising the opportunities for non-car modes.	No change.
	The planned City Deal projects in the vicinity of the Site have not been included within the assessment process. Site would derive sustainability benefits from the Western Orbital Route projects.	Allowance has been made for City Deal within the site assessments. However, the Barton Road corridor has less scope than others for substantial improvement for cycle and public transport.	No change.

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

	ground.		
	Townscape should score Green – opportunity to create a soft green edge. No development will be on the higher ground. Can be compatible with local townscape character.	Townscape scores Red – due to impacts on the setting of the City, despite avoiding development on the higher ground.	No change.
	Green Belt should score Amber – land is not the same importance across the whole site. Masterplan can take account of GB purposes, coalescence, etc. Can create a positive green approach.	Green Belt scores Red – Inner Green Belt Study 2015 states that there should be no release in this sector. Development would impact on openness and coalescence.	No change.
	Cycle Routes should score Green – there has been an underestimation of good routes nearby and the possibility of upgrade.	Cycle Routes would currently score Red but the assessment acknowledges improvements can be made, therefore the score is Amber.	No change.

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

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

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land at Fen Ditton (Broad Location 9) (CCSC1006)  The Quay Estate (Carter Jonas)  Rep 65948	AQMA should score Amber – the parcels of land under consideration not adjacent to A14.	AQMA scores Red as the larger site boundary is adjacent to A14.  Acknowledge the promoter is proposing a smaller area, which is not adjacent to but is within 1,000m of the AQMA, which would change the score from Red to Amber. No change to score.	Amend site assessment AQMA wording to record that development would not be adjacent to the A14, but within 1,000m.
	Land Contamination should score Green – agricultural land and the old railway is not within smaller parcel of land.	Land Contamination scores Amber.  Acknowledge that the railway crossing is not within the smaller site, which would change the score from Amber to Green. No change to score.	Amend site assessment Land contamination wording to record that the railway crossing is not within the smaller area.
	Biodiversity should score Green - drains, hedges and field margins are likely to remain. New development is likely to introduce new habitats and opportunities that will enhance the biodiversity	Biodiversity scores Amber – reflects existing features but that the impacts of development are mitigatable. Consistent approach with other sites.	No change.

	value of the Site.		
	Landscape should score Green - consistency with larger developments.	Landscape and Townscape both score Red – this reflects the specific sensitivities of this location.	No change.
	Townscape should score Amber or Green		

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

### **Sites at Rural Centres:**

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

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land to the north of Mingle Lane and east of Hinton Way, Great Shelford (SC207 & SC212)  Scott Properties (Barton Wilmore)  Rep 65991	Promoter submitted a Stage 1 Development Framework and Vision document for a site which comprises sites SC207 & SC212 combined.	The original site assessments score red for Landscape, Townscape, Green Belt, Integration with Existing Communities and Access, which makes them unsuitable for further consideration.	No action.

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

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



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

#### **Sites at Minor Rural Centres:**

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

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

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

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land south of Wort's Causeway (GB2) (CC929a)  Cambridgeshire County Council  Rep 66227	It is the County's wish and intent to include the 0.9ha farmstead (Newbury Farm) in any master planning exercise for GB1 and GB2 so that the farmstead may, when available, be fully integrated into the development.	New site assessment undertaken to include Newbury Farm. Minor difference with the original site assessment. Redevelopment of the farm removes a potential source of noise, although this does not change the overall Pollution score.	A new Modification is proposed to include Newbury Farm within GB2 (PM/CC/B/B)

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
<p>Cambridge South East - Land west of Limekiln Road and Cherry Hinton Road (Broad Location 7) (CCSC1005a)</p> <p>Commercial Estates Group (Nathaniel Lichfield &amp; Partners)</p> <p>Rep 66022</p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council (Strategic Assets Team) (Carter Jonas)</p> <p>Rep 66127</p>	Representors propose a smaller site 1,300 houses, primary school, local centre & associated works.	New site assessment undertaken on smaller site.	
	Agricultural Land score should change to Amber as it is a smaller site.	Agricultural Land scores Red – the site contains 25ha. grade 2 land, a significant loss.	No change.
	Air quality, noise and pollution matters need to be investigated in more detail, but development could be separated from the source of these pollutants.	Air Quality scores Amber – due to traffic and static emissions. Impacts are mitigatable.	No change.
	Air Quality should change to Amber – smaller site does not require major link road through the site.	Pollution scores Amber – noise from roads and farms (if they remain). Impacts are mitigatable.	
	Existing nature conservation interest at the site and in surrounding area would be protected, retained and enhanced as part of development.	Designated Sites & Biodiversity both score Amber – which reflects that there are several designated areas in the vicinity, but that it should be possible to mitigate impacts. Consistent approach with other sites of this nature.	No change.
	Biodiversity should score green – ecological surveys will be undertaken prior to development – full mitigation / enhancement.		
	Landscape should change to Amber – the site is situated on low lying / less sensitive areas adjacent to urban area	Landscape and Townscape score Red due to the importance of this land as supportive landscape which should be kept largely open. Development would interrupt key views to the historic core and setting of the City from the west and south.	No change.
	Townscape should score Green – as the site will be an extension of the urban area of Cambridge in area of poor townscape quality. Would improve approach to City.		
	Green Belt should score Amber – Inner Green Belt Study 2015 states that a small scale release of land not extending up slopes of Gogs is appropriate.	Green Belt scores Red Red – based on the findings of the Inner Green Belt Study 2015. The site extends across a wider area than referred to in the Green Belt Study, and encroaches onto land which is of significance to the setting of the City.	No change.
	Impact on archaeological interest at the site and in the surrounding area can	Archaeology scores Amber – which reflects the need for a predevelopment	No change.

	be addressed through a programme of archaeological works prior to development.	survey to be undertaken.	
	Flood Risk should score Green as the site is within Flood Zone 1 and not at risk of flooding. Mitigation measures can be provided to address surface water drainage impacts on the surrounding area.	Flood Risk scores Amber – as it is a significant site for surface water flooding. Could offer benefits depending on densities and Green Infrastructure.	No change.
	Education –a primary school proposed.	Education scores Amber as the site does not address impact on Secondary education.	No change.
	Site accessible by public transport and cycling, and development at the site would provide improvements to public transport including a link to Park & Ride site, and to nearby walking and cycling facilities.  Frequency of Public Transport should score GG.	Frequency of Public Transport scores Green. Only parts of the site have access to HQPT. Park & Ride services do not meet HQPT (no evening service). At best the site itself will achieve a 20 minute frequency.  Improvements in walking and cycling opportunities will be required.	No change.
	Access should score Green as a link road is not required. The development of a traffic calmed environment would ensure effects minimised.	Access scores Amber reflecting the significant congestion that already occurs in the vicinity of the site, the scale of development and the need for appropriate mitigation.	No change.

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

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

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

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

Site / Promoter / Rep(s)	Representor's Issue	Councils' Response	Action
Land at Fulbourn Old Drift (south of Cambridge Road (Part of SC037) and north of Shelford Road) Fulbourn (SC038) (SC037a)  Ely Diocesan Board of Finance, (Bidwells)  Rep 66118	Built development should be located towards the edge of Fulbourn on site 037.  The landscape, townscape, heritage and Green Belt impacts could be addressed through strategic landscaping and green infrastructure measures, and through careful design and layout.	New site assessment undertaken for the smaller site (SC037). (No change proposed to Site 038)  Landscape, Townscape, Green Belt and Heritage all score Red – in recognition of the importance of this land to the setting of the City, Fulbourn village and two Conservation Areas, as well as for the avoidance of coalescence. Appropriately reflects findings in the Inner Green Belt Study 2015.	No change.

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

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

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

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


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

#### **Non-appraisal of Land off Highfields Caldecote:**

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

## **Appendix 2 - New site proforma for new sites or significant variations to sites**



<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Edge of Cambridge Broad Location 7- Land Between Babraham Road and Fulbourn Road</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> CC929a	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b> GB2	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land South of Worts' Causeway	
<b>Map:</b> 	
<b>Site description:</b> Arable open field south of Worts' Causeway and north of Babraham Road. The site includes the farmyard at Newbury Farm.	
<b>Current use(s):</b> Agriculture and farm yard	
<b>Proposed use(s):</b> Residential	
<b>Site size (ha):</b> South Cambridgeshire: 0 Cambridge: 7.73 ha.	
<b>Potential residential capacity:</b> 230 dwellings (40dph)	

<b>LAND</b>			
PDL	Would development make use of previously developed land?		RED = Not on PDL
Agricultural Land	Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile		AMBER = Minor loss of grade 1 and 2 land  Approx. half (3.4ha) of the site is on Grade 2 land with the remainder on

	agricultural land?		urban land.
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded 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.
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		SUB INDICATOR: Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14? GREEN = >1000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14
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 adjacent in part to a major road and to a busy access road. Frontages will be the noisiest part of the site from the road. Possible commercial building to the west, may also impact on proposed residential. Some uses particularly industrial could affect existing residential. 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)  A contamination assessment is required. Site has been used for agricultural purposes and farm yard.
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation
<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and		AMBER = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation

	geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		Site adjacent to Netherhall Farm Meadow County Wildlife Site and Worts' Causeway Protected Roadside Verge. Sites potentially vulnerable if changes to existing management are proposed.
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)?		<p>GREEN = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links</p> <p>Double hedgerow and verge along northern boundary with Worts' Causeway is of particular ecological value.</p> <p>As with other arable sites this area is likely to support declining farmland bird species such as Grey Partridge and Corn Bunting.</p>
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?		<p>GREEN = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure</p> <p>Site already has permissive access allowing access to the area of Farmland identified in the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy 2011. Potential to be beneficial if limited development could deliver wider GI vision for the area.</p>
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		<p>GREEN = No impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local landscape character, or provide minor improvements)</p> <p>Development of this site will need to include considerable landscape enhancement in order to ensure that a strong and defensible Green Belt boundary is created.</p> <p>UPDATE INNER GREEN BELT BOUNDARY STUDY 2015 – While the report notes that the whole of sector 11 is assessed as supportive landscape, it</p>

			<p>also notes that limited development on the relatively flat ground in the western parts of the sector, in both sub areas 11.1 and 11.2, in which GB1 and GB2 are located, could be undertaken without significant long-term harm to Green Belt purposes subject to the early establishment of a generous landscape edge to create an appropriate buffer and distinctive city edge between the development and the Cambridge Green Belt.</p>
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>The early establishment of a generous landscape edge is required to create an appropriate buffer and distinctive city edge between the development and the Cambridge Green Belt.</p> <p>UPDATE INNER GREEN BELT BOUNDARY STUDY 2015 – While the report notes that the whole of sector 11 is assessed as supportive landscape, it also notes that limited development on the relatively flat ground in the western parts of the sector, in both sub areas 11.1 and 11.2, in which GB1 and GB2 are located, could be undertaken without significant long-term harm to Green Belt purposes subject to the early establishment of a generous landscape edge to create an appropriate buffer and distinctive city edge between the development and the Cambridge Green Belt.</p>
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		<p>AMBER = negative impact on Greenbelt purposes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To preserve the unique character of Cambridge – Red: Development would extend the urban edge eastward and would have an impact on compactness;</li> <li>• Coalescence – Green: There would be no coalescence issues related to this site;</li> <li>• Setting of Cambridge – Amber: The setting of the City could be maintained if develop were restricted to 2-storey and include</li> </ul>

		<p>landscape buffer areas;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key views of Cambridge – Amber: Views of the site from the west are partially screened by existing vegetation to the west of the site;</li> <li>• Soft green edge - Amber: There is a lesser quality existing soft green edge to Alwyne Road (garden boundaries) which could be replicated and improved to the west of the site;</li> <li>• Distinctive urban edge – Green: No effect on distinctive urban edge;</li> <li>• Green corridors – Green: There would be no loss of land associated with a recognised green corridor;</li> <li>• Green Belt villages – Green: The proposed development would not affect Green Belt villages;</li> <li>• Landscape with a strongly rural character – Amber: The landscape is rural (agricultural) but is on the urban edge. Opportunity to mitigate.</li> </ul> <p>Overall amber: although development of the site would negatively affect Green Belt purposes there would be opportunities to mitigate.</p> <p>UPDATE INNER GREEN BELT BOUNDARY STUDY 2015 – This report has confirmed that this area of the Green Belt (Sector 11) performs a key role in the setting of the south east of Cambridge, with the slopes of the distinctive Gog Magog Hills forming the backdrop to views out from and across Cambridge in this direction. The sector as a whole also prevents the continued sprawl of Cambridge to the south east, halting expansion in this direction and ensuring that the distance between the historic core and the edge of Cambridge does not extend further than it is at present. The study does, however, note that limited development on the relatively flat ground in the western parts of the sector, in both sub areas 11.1 and 11.2, in which GB1 and GB2 are located, could be undertaken without significant long-term harm to Green Belt purposes subject to the early establishment of a generous</p>
--	--	---

			<p>landscape edge to create an appropriate buffer and distinctive city edge between the development and the Cambridge Green Belt. 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 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 those of more localised importance.</li> </ul>
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 late prehistoric and Roman cropmarked sites known. A pre-development archaeological survey should be required.</p>
<b>CLIMATE CHANGE</b>			
Renewables	Will it support the use of renewable energy resources?		AMBER = Standard requirements for renewables would apply
Flood Risk	Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding, and account for all costs of flooding		<p>AMBER = Flood Zone 2 / medium risk</p> <p>Site is in flood zone 1, lowest risk of fluvial flooding. Fairly significant amount of surface water flooding towards the south of the site. Careful</p>

	(including the economic, environmental and social costs)?		mitigation required, which could impact on achievable site densities as greater level of green infrastructure required.
<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  No obvious constraints that prevent the site providing full onsite provision.
Distance: Outdoor Sport Facilities	How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?		GREEN = <1km or onsite provision  Nightingale Rec less than 1km ACF
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		RED = >800m  Nightingale Rec less than 1km ACF
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?		R =>800m  987m ACF from centre of site to Wulfstan Way
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  Doctors' surgery on Wulfstan Way just over 1km ACF
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 Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement / appropriate mitigation possible
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate		GREEN = Good scope for integration with existing communities / of sufficient scale to create a new community.




	with existing communities?		Good scope to integrate with existing communities through good design connectivity and appropriate community provision to aid integration, possibly in conjunction with site CC930 (GB1) to the north.
<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.  Site in Queen Edith's LSOA 7995: 3.99
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  The site is too small to support a new local centre. The nearest local centre is Wulfstan Way, but this is greater than 800m away. The development of the site is unlikely to have an impact on the existing hierarchy, but the site would have relatively poor access to local shopping.
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  0.4Km ACF from centre of site to Cambridge 013D (Addenbrooke's site)
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		G = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development
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  Improvements to utilities required. The developer will need to liaise with the relevant service provider(s) to determine the appropriate utility infrastructure provision.



Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education capacity?		<p>AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated</p> <p>Expect appropriate education provision to be made for. For smaller sites this is likely to be off site.</p>
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		<p>GREEN= Non-residential development / surplus school places</p> <p>Site is beyond 800m from nearest primary school but is large enough to provide its own facilities.</p>
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		<p>A = 1 to 3 km</p> <p>Netherhall is 1.3 km ACF</p>
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		<p>AMBER = Medium quality off-road path.</p> <p>Babraham Rd off-road facility could be widened up towards the Addenbrooke's roundabout to improve routes out towards Addenbrooke's and Long Rd. Routes from the north of the development would be via Worts' Causeway which has quite a high level of traffic in the evening peak. As above extending the access restriction to the evening peak could be considered.</p>
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		<p>RED = Service does not meet the requirements of a high quality public transport (HQPT)</p> <p>Site is more than 500m from a bus route. Service does not meet the requirements of HQPT.</p>
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.		<p>DARK GREEN = Score 19-25</p> <p>Total score 20</p>
Distance: bus stop / rail station			<p>G = Within 600m (4)</p> <p>483m ACF from centre of site to Cambridge, Babraham Road, Park and Ride</p>
Frequency of			GG = 10 minute frequency or better (6)

Public Transport			
Public transport journey time to City Centre			G = 21 to 30 minutes (4)
Distance for cycling to City Centre			GG = Up to 5km (6) 4.43km ACF
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		R = >800m  2701m ACF from centre of site to Great Shelford Station
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		<p>AMBER = Insufficient capacity / access. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>The site has direct access from Babraham Road, but third party land appears to separate the site from Worts' Causeway.</p> <p>This site is of a scale that would trigger the need for a Transportation Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan (TP), regardless of the need for a full Environmental Impact Assessment.</p> <p>S106 contributions and mitigation measures will be required where appropriate. Any Cambridge Area Transport Strategy or other plans will also need to be taken into account.</p> <p>A full Transport Assessment would be required for any development on this site and would need to model the impact on junction capacities on the local network. A Residential Travel plan would be also be required along with measures to link walking and cycling into the existing links. Any development would need to consider the existing bus gate on Worts' Causeway. The development surrounds Cherry Hinton Road / Limekiln Hill Road and these existing adopted public highways may require improvement / alterations to accommodate the additional traffic movements. The hospital roundabout is an accident cluster site, which will need to be considered along with the impact on Granhams Road / Babraham Road junction.</p>
Non-Car	Will it make the		AMBER = No impacts

Facilities	transport network safer for public transport, walking or cycling facilities?		
------------	--	--	--

<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Edge of Cambridge (Broad Location 7)</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> CCSC1005a	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b> N/A	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Cambridge South East - Land west of Limekiln Road and Cherry Hinton Road	
<b>Map:</b> 	
<b>Site description:</b> Arable open fields and chalk grassland, including Netherhall and Newbury Farms, and part of Netherhall School playing fields. The southern part of the site wraps around the Babraham Park and Ride site. Babraham Road forms the south western boundary and Limekiln Road and Cherry Hinton Road the eastern boundary.	
<b>Current use(s):</b> Agricultural land, farm buildings.	
<b>Proposed use(s):</b> Approximately 1,300 dwellings (including affordable housing), a new primary school, a local centre and associated infrastructure, landscaping and open space (including an area of landscaping / open space in the north eastern part of the site) as part of a sustainable urban extension to Cambridge, an extra 800 beyond the existing allocations (GB1 & GB2) on a site of 28 ha.	
<b>Site size (ha):</b> South Cambridgeshire: 0ha. Cambridge: 59.38 ha.	
<b>Potential residential capacity:</b> 950 dwellings (40dph)	

<b>LAND</b>		
PDL	Would development make use of previously developed	RED = Not on PDL

	land?		
Agricultural Land	Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?		RED = Significant loss (20 ha or more) of grades 1 and 2 land  Grade 2 = 25.56ha.
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded 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.  Despite this proposal not being adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area, there is a potential for an increase in traffic and static emissions that could affect local air quality. More information is required for this location, particularly details for air quality assessment and a low emission strategy.
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		GREEN = >1,000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14  Assessment required to assess likely major transport impact. Outside the Air Quality Management Area but air quality assessment required.
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  Noise issues – the road frontages will be the noisiest parts of the site. Traffic noise will need assessment. If the existing farms are to remain, noise from plant at the farm and possible commercial building to the west may affect proposed residential development. Some uses particularly industrial could affect existing residential. The impact of existing noise on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well being and providing a high quality living environment. However residential use is likely to be acceptable with careful noise mitigation. Noise assessment and potential noise mitigation needed. No adverse effects for residential use from light pollution or odour.
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) GREEN = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination

			A contamination assessment is required. The site has been used for agricultural purposes.
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		<p>GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation</p> <p>Pluvial (surface water flood risk) - There are small areas of high, medium and low surface water flood risk areas, which would need to be taken into consideration on site layout and may have an impact on the deliverable density.</p>
<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		<p>AMBER = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Site includes Netherhall Farm Meadow which is a valuable County Wildlife Site, and Worts' Causeway Protected Roadside verge. Meadow site potentially vulnerable if changes to existing management are proposed. Scope for some reconfiguration and mitigation. Potential to create chalk / neutral grassland and perhaps Green Infrastructure enhancement. Need to reduce developable site area to allow for appropriate mitigation.</p>
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)?		<p>AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>If Netherhall Farm Meadow is removed from the development site. Double hedgerow and verge along northern boundary with Worts' Causeway is of particular ecological value. As with other arable sites, this area is likely to support declining farmland bird species such as Grey Partridge and Corn Bunting.</p>
TPO	Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?		<p>AMBER = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Group Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (07/2007) is just outside the site on the south-west boundary of the site. Predevelopment tree survey required.</p>
Green Infrastructure	Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery of and		<p>GREEN = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure</p> <p>Part of the site already has permissive access</p>



	access to green infrastructure?		allowing access to the area of farmland identified in the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy 2011. Potential to be beneficial if limited development could deliver wider Green Infrastructure vision for the area. The vision is to link up the existing isolated sites with Wandlebury, Gog Magogs, Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve and the natural green space of the Clay Farm development.
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		<p>AMBER = negative impact on landscape character, incapable of mitigation.</p> <p>UPDATE INNER GREEN BELT BOUNDARY STUDY 2015 – While the report notes that the whole of sector 11 is assessed as supportive landscape, it also notes that limited development on the relatively flat ground in the western parts of the sector, in both sub areas 11.1 and 11.2, in which GB1 and GB2 are located, could be undertaken without significant long-term harm to Green Belt purposes subject to the early establishment of a generous landscape edge to create an appropriate buffer and distinctive city edge between the development and the Cambridge Green Belt.</p> <p>Development of this site, except the small parcel to the east of Netherhall Farm, east of Alwyne Road and south of Fulbourn Road would have a severe negative impact on the purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>The promoter proposes a larger site for development, extending GB1 and GB2 to the east. However, development would be limited to the flatter ground to the east and avoid the sloping ground leading to the foothills of the Gog Magog hills.</p>
Townscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on townscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>The setting of the City would be severely negatively impacted by development by compromising the openness of the area, interrupting views over the city and have a negative impact on setting. There are open views of the site and the City from the west and south. Existing clear views to historic and collegiate core of the City would be severely negatively impacted if development occurred</p>

			on the site. Development of this site, except the small parcel to the east of Netherhall Farm, east of Alwyne Road and south of Fulbourn Road would have a severe negative impact on the purposes of Green Belt.
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		<p>DARK RED: Very high and high impacts on Greenbelt purposes (very significant negative impact)</p> <p>Development of this site, except the small parcel to the east of Netherhall Farm, east of Alwyne Road and south of Fulbourn Road would have a severe negative impact on the purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>UPDATE INNER GREEN BOUNDARY STUDY 2015</p> <p>The study notes that sector 11 plays a key role in the setting of the south east of Cambridge, with the slopes of the distinctive Gog Magog Hills forming the backdrop to views out from and across Cambridge in this direction. It also prevents the continued sprawl of Cambridge to the south east, halting expansion in this direction and ensuring that the distance between the historic core and the edge of Cambridge does not extend further than it is at present.</p> <p>Any form of development extending onto the slopes of the Gog Magog Hills would substantially harm one of the key components of the setting of the city. No Green Belt release should be contemplated on the sloping or elevated landform in the eastern part of sub area 11.1.</p> <p>The setting of the city could be enhanced by appropriate planting to create a softer, greener urban edge. Limited development on the relatively flat ground in the western parts of sectors 11 (in both sub areas 11.1 and 11.2) could be undertaken without significant long-term harm to Green Belt purposes, subject to the early establishment of a generous landscape edge to create an appropriate buffer and distinctive city edge between the development and the Cambridge Green Belt.</p>
Heritage	Will it protect or enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest		<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 late prehistoric and Roman</p>



	(including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments)?		<p>cropmarked sites known. A predevelopment archaeological survey should be required.</p> <p>Netherhall Farm House and its outbuildings are all BLIs. If the site were to come forward, any development would have to be sympathetic to the scale and massing of the site to ensure that the special interest of the existing buildings was not lost. A predevelopment archaeological survey would be required.</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>Site is in flood zone 1, lowest risk of fluvial flooding. Significant site regarding surface water flooding as runoff contributes to surface water flooding of the existing built environment. Current scheme could potentially offer a solution and flood risk management benefit, but may impact on achievable densities as greater level of green infrastructure required.</p>
<b>HUMAN HEALTH AND WELL BEING</b>			
Open Space	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space?		<p>GREEN = Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite</p> <p>The promoter proposes investment in extra landscaped open space, taken from the wider land interests controlled by CEG.</p>
Distance: Outdoor Sport Facilities	How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?		<p>GREEN = &lt;1km or onsite provision</p> <p>Assume onsite provision as site of over 200 dwellings, which would be required to deliver on site facilities to meet policy.</p>
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		<p>GREEN = &lt;400m or onsite provision</p> <p>Assume onsite provision as site of over 200 dwellings, which would be required to deliver on site facilities to meet policy.</p>
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?		<p>G = &lt;400m</p> <p>The promoter proposes a local centre providing a range of local shops and services</p>

			accessible to new and existing residents and complementing existing local facilities elsewhere.
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?		G = <400m  Assume onsite provision as site of over 200 dwellings, which would be required to deliver on site facilities to meet policy.
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 Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement / appropriate mitigation possible
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?		GREEN = Good scope for integration with existing communities / of sufficient scale to create a new community.  Site should provide good opportunities to link with existing communities, with good urban design, good connectivity and appropriate community provision to aid integration.
<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.  Site in Queen Edith's LSOA 7995: 3.99
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
Employment -	Would development		G = No loss of employment land / allocation is


Land	result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		for employment development
Utilities	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?		<p>AMBER = Significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Improvements to utilities required. The developer will need to liaise with the relevant service provider/s to determine the appropriate utility infrastructure provision.</p>
Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education capacity?		<p>AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated</p> <p>Based on a development of 1,260 units, the County Council would require a new primary school of 420 places and early years facilities.</p> <p>A contribution towards secondary places will be required but until the level of development is clearer, we cannot identify the location of the school where the contribution will be spent.</p> <p>The promoter proposes a new primary school.</p>
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		<p>G = &lt;400m</p> <p>The promoter proposes a new primary school, provision assumed on site.</p>
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		<p>G = Within 1km (or site large enough to provide new)</p> <p>Netherhall School is adjacent to the site's north-eastern boundary.</p>
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		<p>AMBER = Medium quality off-road path.</p> <p>Babraham Rd off-road facility could be widened up towards the Addenbrooke's roundabout to improve routes out towards Addenbrooke's and Long Rd.</p> <p>Routes from the north of the development would be via Worts' Causeway. Although the link along Worts' Causeway would be quiet at morning peak if the rising bollards remain, the traffic volumes in the evening peak could be quite high on this road and no cycling provision. A solution to mitigate this could be to extent the access restriction to the evening as well as morning peak.</p>
HQPT	Is there High Quality		AMBER = service meets requirements of high

	Public Transport (at edge of site)?		<p>quality public transport in most but not all instances</p> <p>Whilst parts of the site are close to the Citi 1 and 3 services and Park and Ride, the advice from Cambridgeshire County Council is that the site itself is likely to achieve a 20 minute service.</p>
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.		<p>DARK GREEN = Score 19-25</p> <p>Total score 20</p>
Distance: bus stop / rail station			<p>G = Within 600m (4)</p> <p>543m to nearest bus stop ACF (Babraham Road, Park and Ride)</p>
Frequency of Public Transport			G = 20 minute frequency (4)
Public transport journey time to City Centre			G = 21 to 30 minutes (4)
Distance for cycling to City Centre			<p>GG = Up to 5km (6)</p> <p>9.6km ACF from centre of site to Cambridge</p>
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		<p>R = &gt;800m</p> <p>2,722m ACF from centre of site to Cambridge Station</p>
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		<p>AMBER = Insufficient capacity / access. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>A full Transport Assessment would be required for any development on this site and would need to model the impact on junction capacities on the local network. A Residential Travel plan would be also be required along with measures to link walking and cycling into the existing links. Any development would need to consider the existing bus gate on Worts' Causeway.</p> <p>The development surrounds Cherry Hinton Road / Limekiln Hill Road and these existing adopted public highways may require improvement / alterations to accommodate the additional traffic movements. The hospital roundabout is an accident cluster</p>

			<p>site, which will need to be considered along with the impact on Granhams Road / Babraham Road junction.</p> <p>S106 contributions and mitigation measures will be required where appropriate. Any Cambridge Area Transport Strategy or other plans will also need to be taken into account.</p> <p>This site has the potential advantage of dispersed trip-making patterns in relation to the Strategic Road Network (SRN), and the site is likely to be well related to central Cambridge for much of its trip-making. Given the above it is likely that a substantial proportion could be delivered without any adverse impact upon the SRN. A robust assessment would be required to determine what this proportion might realistically be.</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 CBC developments. While substantial sustainable improvements are identified for the A1307 and Cherry Hinton Road corridors through the City Deal Programme may provide some headroom, any TA 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>GREEN = Significant improvements to public transport, cycling, walking facilities</p> <p>Significant improvements to walking and cycling opportunities would be required. Public transport would require links to Babraham Park and Ride, and provision / improvements to key destinations in the city.</p> <p>Highways authority would require cycling improvements though the site, improved provision on Hills Road and Cherry Hinton Road.</p>

<b>Site Information</b>	<b>Grange Farm CC916</b>
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Edge of Cambridge (Broad Location 1)</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> CC916a	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b> CC916	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Grange Farm	

**Map:**



**Site description:** Land on the western edge of the city up to the M11. A series of large agricultural fields and recreation grounds, mostly surrounded by hedgerows and occasional hedgerow trees, giving an open appearance when viewed from the west.

**Current use(s):** Agriculture and recreation.

**Proposed use(s):** Residential 400-500 dwellings on Part A with strategic landscaping on Part B.

**Site size (ha):** 23.86 South Cambridgeshire:00.00 Cambridge: 23.86 (11.9 ha. for development)

**Potential residential capacity:** 477 dwellings (40 dph)

<b>LAND</b>			
PDL	Would development make use of previously developed land?	RED	RED = Not on PDL
Agricultural Land	Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?	GREEN	GREEN = Neutral. Development would not affect grade 1 and 2 land.  Majority of site is on Grade 3 land and the remainder is on urban land.



Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.
<b>POLLUTION</b>			
Air Quality	Would the development of the sites result in an adverse Impact / worsening of air quality?		<p>RED = Site lies near source of air pollution, or development could impact on air quality, significant adverse impacts.</p> <p>The site will have a significant adverse impact on air quality due to transport impact. An air quality assessment is essential.</p> <p>The promoter suggests the site will potentially generate significantly less traffic than new settlements which are assessed as amber or green.</p>
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		<p>AMBER = &lt;1,000m of an AQMA, M11 or A14</p> <p>Site less than 1,000 metres from M11. An air quality assessment is essential.</p>
Pollution	Are there potential odour, light, noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator (including compatibility with neighbouring uses)?		<p>RED = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>The site will be affected by noise from the M11. Part of the site will not be suitable for residential at all.</p> <p>Development of the remainder of the site will require a full noise survey and could merit an amber score. Design and mitigation measures required. Noise mitigation could involve landscaped bunds, physical barriers, site layout and use of specially designed dwellings.</p>
Contamination	Is there possible contamination on the site?		<p>AMBER = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development (potential to achieve benefits subject to appropriate mitigation).</p> <p>The site has previous potentially contaminative uses as a result of historic usage. Further contamination assessment is required.</p>
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality		GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation.

	of the water environment?		Not within SPZ1 or allocation.
<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		<p>AMBER = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>The promoter has provided an Ecology Appraisal.</p>
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)?		<p>AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>The promoter has provided an Ecology Appraisal.</p>
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?		<p>AMBER = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>The promoter suggests it is possible that enhanced footpath connections could be made between the existing rights of way through an appropriate scheme. This could provide circular routes connecting with existing footpaths 39/31a, 55/9 and the site. This would benefit the use of the retained Green Belt for recreation.</p>
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of		RED = Significant negative impact on landscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.



	landscape character?		<p>Development would compromise the openness of the area, interrupting views into the historic core, have a negative impact on setting and changing the soft green existing urban edge.</p> <p>UPDATE INNER GREEN BELT BOUNDARY STUDY 2015 – The M11 corridor is identified as being visually detracting and influencing the western boundary of the sector.</p> <p>The eastern half of this sub area, from the dog-leg in the boundary with West Cambridge eastwards, is considered to be Distinctive landscape due to the unique relationship of the rural landscape running right in to the distinctive core of the city.</p> <p>The western half of the sub area is considered to be Supportive landscape. It forms the rural landscape setting to Cambridge in views from the west and provides separation between the edge of Cambridge and the M11, which is a characteristic feature of the settlement edge to the west of Cambridge.</p>
Townscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on townscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>Development would compromise the openness of the area, interrupting views into the historic core, have a negative impact on setting and changing the soft green existing urban edge.</p> <p>UPDATE INNER GREEN BELT BOUNDARY STUDY 2015 – The M11 corridor is identified as being visually detracting and influencing the western boundary of the sector.</p> <p>The eastern half of this sub area, from the dog-leg in the boundary with West Cambridge eastwards, is considered to be Distinctive landscape due to the unique relationship of the rural landscape running right in to the distinctive core of the city.</p>

			<p>The western half of the sub area is considered to be Supportive landscape. It forms the rural landscape setting to Cambridge in views from the west and provides separation between the edge of Cambridge and the M11, which is a characteristic feature of the settlement edge to the west of Cambridge.</p>
Green Belt	<p>What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?</p>		<p>RED RED = Development of this site would have a significant negative impact on the purposes of Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To preserve the unique character of Cambridge – red: site would have a medium impact on compactness;</li> <li>• Coalescence – red: There would be an impact on coalescence by decreasing the distance between the City and Coton;</li> <li>• Setting of Cambridge – red: the setting of the City would be negatively impacted by development by compromising the openness of the area, interrupting views to historic core, have a negative impact on setting and changing the soft green existing urban edge;</li> <li>• Key views of Cambridge – red: there are open, sometimes elevated, views of the site from the west and south. Existing clear views to historic and collegiate core of the City would be negatively impacted if development occurred on the site;</li> <li>• Soft green edge – red: the existing high quality, rural, soft green edge would be negatively impacted if development occurred on the site;</li> <li>• Distinctive urban edge – green: the existing edge is green. There would be no impact on the distinctive urban edge;</li> <li>• Green corridors – red: There would be a loss of land in a recognised green corridor south of the Coton footpath;</li> <li>• Green Belt villages – red: there would be impact on distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Coton village;</li> <li>• Landscape with a strongly rural</li> </ul>

			<p>character – red: The landscape is strongly rural despite being on the urban edge, adjacent to West Cambridge and the M11. Development would have a negative impact.</p> <p>Overall conclusion = red red: development of this site would have a significant negative impact on the purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>UPDATE INNER GREEN BELT BOUNDARY STUDY 2015 – This sector plays a key role in the setting of the west of Cambridge, ensuring that the city remains compact and that the historic core remains large in comparison to the size of the city as a whole. It retains open countryside close to the centre of the city and prevents the sprawl of built development as far as the M11, retaining the distinctive separation between the edge of the city and the M11. This is in sharp contrast to the relationship of the city edge with the A14 to the north of Cambridge. Views towards Cambridge from the west are some of the most distinctive and characteristic available, with the rural landscape of the sector forming the foreground in those views. Sub area 3.2 exhibits less of these features due to its higher degree of visual screening. However, it remains important to the character of the approach to Cambridge along Barton Road.</p> <p>The promoter has undertaken a Landscape and Visual Assessment which includes a detailed assessment of the Green Belt Study 2015.</p>
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		<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>Land to the south of the site is located on the route of a Roman road running south west from Cambridge. Previous fieldwork in the area has confirmed the survival of significant remains of late prehistoric date. Further information</p>

	scheduled monuments)?		<p>would be necessary in advance of any planning application for this site.</p> <p>Site lies approximately 800m west of the Central Conservation Area.</p> <p>The promoter has provided an Archaeological Assessment which suggests the site is devoid of any significant archaeology or artefacts.</p>
<b>CLIMATE CHANGE</b>			
Renewables	Will it support the use of renewable energy resources?		AMBER = Standard requirements for renewables would apply
Flood Risk	Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding, and account for all costs of flooding (including the economic, environmental and social costs)?		<p>AMBER = Small amount of surface water flooding towards south of the site and where existing watercourses exist.</p> <p>Careful mitigation required which could impact on achievable site densities as greater level of green infrastructure required in that area.</p>
<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. The site is of sufficient size that it would provide outdoor sports facilities onsite.
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		GREEN. The site is of sufficient size that it would provide play space for children and teenagers onsite.
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?		AMBER. Site is over 800m from nearest local centre but it scores amber because it is capable of providing some local facilities.
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		R =>800m

	centre or GP service?		The promoter suggests the site is within 800m of GP service on the West Cambridge development, which would change the score from Red to Amber.
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).  The promoter suggests a scheme of 400-500 dwellings could potentially deliver local services and facilities such as a local shop and recreation areas.
Community Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement / appropriate mitigation possible
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing 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  0.4km from centre of site to South Cambridgeshire 007D (Marshalls - North of Newmarket Road)
Employment - Land	Would development result		G = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment

	in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		development
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 capacity?		AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		<p>GREEN= Non-residential development / surplus school places</p> <p>Site is beyond 800m from nearest primary school but is large enough to provide its own facilities.</p> <p>Just over 2km ACF from Newnham Croft</p>
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		<p>A = 1 to 3 km</p> <p>2.43km to Chesterton Community College</p>
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		<p>GREEN = Quiet residential street speed below 30mph, cycle lane with 1.5m minimum width, high quality off-road path e.g. cycleway adjacent to guided busway.</p> <p>Links to high quality off road (Coton Footpath). The path as it borders the site would need to be widened and lit to match the existing segregated eastern section of the path. Increased usage of the route via Burrell's Walk into the city will be an issue and an alternative route via Cranmer Rd or the Rugby Club path and West Road (and Queens Green) or Sidgwick Ave with associated cycle improvements will be essential as an alternative. The introduction of a vehicular access route across the Coton footpath will have a</p>


			major impact on the attractiveness of this route to cyclists.
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		<p>AMBER = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances</p> <p>The Citi 4 and Uni 4 bus routes run to the east and north of the site to Maddingley Park &amp; Ride. However, only about a third of the northern part site is within 400 metres of these bus routes and neither service meets the Local Plan (Policy 8/7) definition of high quality public transport.</p> <p>The promoter states - proposals have been put forward in the context of the City Deal for a new bus route from the A428 to connect to the City Centre. Submission made by St John's College that promote a route that comes off the A428, through the west Cambridge site and then potentially continuing into Grange Farm before emerging onto Grange Road. Such a route enhances the sustainability credentials of the site.</p>
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.		<p>DARK GREEN = Score 19-25</p> <p>Total score 22</p>
Distance: bus stop / rail station			<p>GG = Within 400m (6)</p> <p>373m ACF from centre of site to Cambridge, Charles Babbage Rd, Forster Court</p>
Frequency of Public Transport			G = 20 minute frequency (4)
Public transport journey time to City Centre			GG = 20 minutes or less (6)
Distance for cycling to City Centre			<p>GG = Up to 5km (6)</p> <p>1.88km ACF from the centre of the site to Cambridge Market.</p>
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		<p>R = &gt;800m</p> <p>3416m ACF from centre of site to Cambridge Station</p>

Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		<p>AMBER = Insufficient capacity / access. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>It is not clear how this site would be accessed by vehicular traffic. Major works would be required on the Clerk Maxwell Road Bridge if it was to be converted to a vehicular access as long as it could be demonstrated that the junction could accommodate the additional traffic.</p> <p>The Highway Authority has reinforced their comments concerning the potential site access constraints if this site is considered in isolation from Sites 921 to the south and the adjoining potential site within South Cambridgeshire Site SC232.</p> <p>Improvements to the existing cycle way that the runs along the edge of the site between Coton and Madingley Road would be required.</p> <p>The promoter's view is that Grange Farm is capable of coming forward as a separate land parcel.</p>
Non-Car Facilities	Will it make the transport network safer for public transport, walking or cycling facilities?		AMBER = No impacts



<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Edge of Cambridge (Broad Location 2)</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> CCSC1001a	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b> N/A	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land north of Barton Road and Grange Farm	

**Map:**



**Site description:** The site lies to the north of Barton Road on the western edge of Cambridge. The site adjoins residential development on the edge of Cambridge to the north and east and the M11 and its slip road and Coton Road lie to the west. The site is surrounded by agricultural land. The site, in the main, comprises a series of large exposed agricultural fields surrounding Laundry Farm, and recreation grounds on the north eastern part of the land south of Barton Road. Most of the fields are surrounded by low level hedgerow and occasional hedgerow trees, giving an open appearance, particularly from the M11, Coton Road and surrounding land further to the west, although the Barton Road frontage is well screened with tall hedgerow.

**Current use(s):** Agricultural.

**Proposed use(s):** Approximately 2,000 dwellings, supported by a Local Centre, school, open space (including relocated sports pitches for colleges), green infrastructure, cycle and footpath links to surrounding area; and access roads.

**Site size (ha):** South Cambridgeshire: 70.88 ha. Cambridge: 60.72 ha

**Potential residential capacity:** 2,106 dwellings (40 dph) (SCDC 1,134 dwellings, City 972 dwellings)

<b>LAND</b>		
PDL	Would development make use of previously	RED = Not on PDL

	developed land?		
Agricultural Land	Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?		<p>GREEN = Neutral. Development would not affect grade 1 and 2 land.</p> <p>Majority of site on Grade 3 land with a small amount of urban land and Grade 2 land.</p>
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		<p>GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.</p> <p>The adopted Core Strategy, Policy CS16, identifies Cambridge south as a Broad Location for a new Household Recycling Centre (HRC). This site falls within the broad location and catchment area for Cambridge South. Policy CS16 requires major developments to contribute to the provision of HRCs, consistent with the adopted RECAP Waste Management Guide. Contributions may be required in the form of land and/or capital payments. This outstanding infrastructure deficit for an HRC must be addressed, such infrastructure is a strategic priority in the NPPF.</p>
<b>POLLUTION</b>			
Air Quality	Would the development of the sites result in an adverse Impact / worsening of air quality?		<p>RED = Site lies near source of air pollution, or development could impact on air quality, significant adverse impacts</p> <p>Air quality issues – Less than 1,000m from the M11. There is a potential for significant increases in traffic emissions and static emissions that could affect local air quality, especially within Cambridge City. Extensive and detailed air quality assessments, in line with local policy and in liaison with Cambridge City Council, will be required to assess the impact of such a development at pre-application stage.</p>
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		<p>RED = Within or adjacent to an AQMA, M11 or A14</p> <p>Site adjacent / less than 1,000 metres from M11. An air quality assessment is essential</p>
Pollution	Are there potential Odour, light noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator (including compatibility with		<p>AMBER = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation</p> <p>Noise impacts - The west of the site bounds the M11 including M11 junction 12 / Barton Road roundabout and Barton Road intersects the site. There are high levels of ambient / diffuse traffic noise and other noise sources include Laundry Farm and</p>

	neighbouring uses)?		<p>the Animal Breeding Centre. Noise likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises. The impact of existing noise on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well being and providing a high quality living environment. Site similar to North West Cambridge and at least half the site nearest M11 and to lesser distance from Barton Road either side is likely to be NEC C (empty site) for night: PPG24 advice "Planning permission should not normally be granted. Where it is considered that permission should be given, for example because there are no alternative quieter sites available, conditions should be imposed to ensure a commensurate level of protection against noise". Residential could be acceptable with high level of mitigation. However before this site is allocated for residential development it is recommended that these noise threats / constraints are thoroughly investigated in accordance noise guidance to determine the suitability of the site for residential use. This site requires a full noise assessment including consideration of any noise attenuation measures such as noise barriers / berms and practical / technical feasibility / financial viability.</p> <p>In mitigation, proposers indicative masterplan includes separation of residential development from the Motorway. Other environmental conditions (e.g. fumes, vibration, dust) - possible malodour from Laundry Farm. Minor to moderate risk.</p>
Contamination	Is there possible contamination on the site?		<p>AMBER = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development (potential to achieve benefits subject to appropriate mitigation)</p> <p>Site has former potentially contaminative uses. A contamination assessment is required</p>
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation
<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species		AMBER = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site designated for nature

	and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		<p>conservation or recognised as containing protected species and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>The hedgerows to the east of the M11 are designated as a County Wildlife Site.</p>
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)?		<p>AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>The site noted that otters, Biodiversity features - A phase 1 habitat survey (2004) of part of water voles, badgers, foxes, deer, and a variety of birds use the site. It is also suitable for bats and reptiles. The Barton Road frontage contains a number of broad-leaved trees, and the remnants of an orchard. There are also a number of hedgerows, including the one that follows the District boundary and broadens into a tree belt. There are a number of wet ditches present, including the Bin Brook which runs along the Barton Road frontage, noted to be of high value due to the presence of water voles. The phase 1 study recommends retention of the semi-improved grassland and orchards, and to retain and enhance ditch habitat. If the site were allocated for development an updated survey would be required.</p> <p>With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the natural environment.</p>
TPO	Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?		<p>AMBER = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>There are two groups of protected trees near the M11 slip road in the western part of the site, and a group along the southern boundary of the site.</p>
Green Infrastructure	Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery of and access to green infrastructure?		<p>GREEN = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure</p> <p>Promoters indicative masterplan indicates 72ha of public open space and new habitat.</p>
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			

Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on landscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>The landscape is strongly rural despite being on the urban edge and adjacent to the M11. Development would have a negative impact. The existing high quality, rural, soft green edge would be negatively impacted if development occurred on the site. Development of this site would have a severe negative impact on the purposes of Green Belt.</p>
Townscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on townscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>The setting of the City would be negatively impacted by development by compromising the openness of the area, interrupting views of the historic city, have a negative impact on setting and changing the urban edge. There are open views of the site from the west and south. Existing clear views to historic and collegiate core of the City would be severely, negatively impacted if development occurred on the site.</p> <p>Development of this site would have a severe negative impact on the purposes of Green Belt.</p>
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		<p>DARK RED: Very high and high impacts on Greenbelt purposes (very significant negative impact)</p> <p>Development of this site would have a severe negative impact on the purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>UPDATE INNER GREEN BOUNDARY STUDY 2015</p> <p>The study notes that this sector (Sector 3) plays a key role in the setting of the west of Cambridge, ensuring that the city remains compact and that the historic core remains large in comparison to the size of the city as a whole. It retains open countryside close to the centre of the city and prevents the sprawl of built development as far as the M11, retaining the distinctive separation between the edge of the city and the M11. This is in sharp contrast to the relationship of the city edge with the A14 to the north of Cambridge. Views towards Cambridge from the west are some of the most distinctive</p>



			<p>and characteristic available, with the rural landscape of the sector forming the foreground in those views. Sub area 3.2 exhibits less of these features due to its higher degree of visual screening. However, it remains important to the character of the approach to Cambridge along Barton Road.</p> <p>It is unlikely that any development within this sector could be accommodated without substantial harm to Green Belt purposes. Development within sub areas 3.1 or 3.2 would remove the characteristic setting to the city, diminish both in reality and in perception, the presence of countryside close to the distinctive core of Cambridge and obstruct key views. Within sub area 3.2, development would also alter the characteristic approach into Cambridge along Barton Road. Within sub area 3.3, development would impact on the relationship with the distinctive townscape within the West Cambridge Conservation Area and would remove the closest area of countryside to the historic core. No Green Belt release should be contemplated in this sector.</p>
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>Site does not contain or adjoin listed buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings. The eastern end of Barton Road, lies within the West Cambridge Conservation area. The site is located on the route of a Roman road running south west from Cambridge.</p> <p>Previous fieldwork in the area has confirmed the survival of significant remains of late prehistoric date. Further information would be necessary in advance of any planning application for this site. Results of pre-determination evaluation to be submitted with any planning application to inform a planning decision.</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?		AMBER = Flood Zone 2 / medium risk

			<p>Fairly significant surface water flooding along watercourse corridor and towards Barton Road. Careful mitigation required which could impact on achievable site densities as greater level of green infrastructure required.</p> <p>Could provide a positive flood risk benefit for Bin Brook if undertaken in right way. Promoter's indicative masterplan proposes to only place water compatible uses in areas identified in Flood Zones 2 &amp; 3 on Barton Road frontage.</p>
<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
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		GREEN = <400m or onsite provision
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?		G = <400m Local centre proposed on-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?		A = 400 - 800m  Site is over 800m from nearest GP service and would merit a Red. It is however large enough to justify it being required to provide its own health facility and so scores Amber.
Key Local Facilities	Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops,		GREEN = New local facilities or improved existing facilities are proposed of significant benefit

	post offices, pubs etc?)		
Community Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement /appropriate mitigation possible
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing 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  0.3km from centre of site to South Cambridgeshire 007D (Marshalls - North of Newmarket Road)
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		GREEN = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development
Utilities	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications		AMBER = Significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation  Utility services (e.g. pylons) – power lines run across the south western corner of the land north of Barton Road.






	infrastructure and broadband?		<p>Electricity - Not supportable from existing network. Significant reinforcement and new network required.</p> <p>Mains water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</p> <p>Gas - Medium Pressure reinforcement would be required to support the full load.</p> <p>Mains sewerage - This proposed site straddles three WWTW catchments; Haslingfield WWTW and Coton WWTW - a revised consent for these WWTW will be required prior to being able to accommodate the full proposal. They can currently accommodate approximately 1,000 and 50 properties respectively. Cambridge WWTW - significant infrastructure upgrades will be required to the network to accommodate this proposal. An assessment will be required to determine the full impact of this site.</p>
Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education capacity?		<p>AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated</p> <p>On the site north of Barton Road, the County Council would expect appropriate on-site early years and primary education provision to be made.</p> <p>On-site Secondary provision may be required, but this would need to be addressed in terms of the total number of new dwellings proposed in the area.</p>
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		<p>G = &lt;400m</p> <p>Assume onsite provision.</p>

			1.7km to Newnham Croft
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		A = 1 to 3 km 2km to Parkside Community College
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		AMBER = Medium quality off-road path.
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		<p>AMBER = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances</p> <p>Barton Road currently does not benefit from HQPT. The Citi 4 and Uni 4 bus routes run to the east and north of the site to Madingley Park &amp; Ride. However, only a small part of the northern area of this site is within 400 metres of these bus routes and neither service meets the Local Plan (Policy 8/7) definition of high quality public transport. Improved services would be secured from this scale of development, but unlikely to meet HQPT.</p> <p>UPDATE: score changed from Red to Amber</p> <p>The promoter states - proposals have been put forward in the context of the City Deal for a new bus route from the A428 to connect to the City Centre. Submission made by St John's College that promote a route that comes off the A428, through the west Cambridge site and then potentially continuing into Grange Farm before emerging onto Grange Road. Such a route enhances the sustainability credentials of the site.</p>
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.		<p>DARK GREEN = Score 19-25</p> <p>Total Score = 20</p>
Distance: bus stop / rail station			<p>GG = Within 400m (6)</p> <p>A strategic development in this location would require new bus routes through the site, providing closer access to bus stops.</p>

			<p>Promoter proposes a bus route through the site.</p> <p>A development of this scale would result in new bus stops being provided. (Currently nearest stop is 480m to Newnham, Gough Way but this is served by the No.18 bus, which is an hourly service and not therefore considered to be HQPT)</p> <p>UPDATE: Score change from Amber to Green Green</p>
Frequency of Public Transport			R = Hourly service (2)
Public transport journey time to City Centre			<p>GG = 10 minute frequency or better (6)</p> <p>6 minutes (Newnham, Gough Way – Cambridge, Drummer Street)</p>
Distance for cycling to City Centre			<p>Up to 5km (6)</p> <p>2.2km ACF from the centre of the site to Cambridge Market.</p>
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		<p>R = &gt;800m</p> <p>3,409m ACF from centre of site to Cambridge Station</p>
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		<p>AMBER = Insufficient capacity / access. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>UPDATE: Access onto Barton Road A603 is feasible though the Highway Authority have not offered a view on their preferred location. The Highway Authority would either seek a contribution via a Section 106 Agreement or require the developer to construct an orbital cycleway of Cambridge link through from West Cambridge.</p> <p>The impact on the M11 junctions 12 and 13 along with the local network would need to be modelled. Any development would need to consider how it would interlink with the Cambridge North West development and the infrastructure that will be implemented.</p> <p>A full Transport Assessment and Residential Travel Plan would be required. This is a main Cambridge radial route for cyclists so any development would need to ensure that cyclists are fully taken into account. S106 contributions and mitigation measures will be required where</p>

			<p>appropriate.</p> <p>From the LHA point of view, the key capacity concerns would be in relation to the impact at the junctions of Newnham Road with Fen Causeway, the Trumpington Road mini roundabouts and the junction of Silver Street with Queens Road. Any TA would 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>This site is of a scale that would trigger the need for a Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan (TP), regardless of the need for a full Environmental Impact Assessment. These sites are likely to be closely related to the M11 at Junctions 12 &amp; 13, but are also very well related to the City Centre. As such they would warrant a robust transport assessment before the Highways Agency could come to a definitive view.</p>
Non-Car Facilities	Will it make the transport network safer for public transport, walking or cycling facilities?		<p>GREEN = Significant improvements to public transport, cycling, walking facilities</p> <p>Large development with potential for significant improvement to public transport, walking or cycling facilities. Public transport improvements would be needed to provide a high-quality services, as there is currently limited services to this area.</p> <p>Improved cycling provision would be required on Barton Road, and off road links to Newnham, West Cambridge and the Coton path.</p>

<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Rural Centre</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> SC313a	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b> H6 (I&O 2013 part 2)	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land north of Babraham Road, Sawston	
<b>Map:</b> 	
<b>Site description:</b> Arable fields to the east of the village, bounded by hedges to the north with the Dales Manor Business Park beyond. Site wraps around two semi-detached residential properties fronting onto Babraham Road. Adjoins SHLAA sites 154 and 258.	
<b>Current use(s):</b> Agricultural	
<b>Proposed use(s):</b> Residential	
<b>Site size (ha):</b> South Cambridgeshire: 3.64 ha.	
<b>Potential residential capacity:</b> 110 dwellings (40 dph)	

<b>LAND</b>			
PDL	Would development make use of previously developed land?		RED = Not on PDL
Agricultural Land	Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?		AMBER = Minor loss of grade 1 and 2 land  Minor loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2) - Grade 2.

Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.
<b>POLLUTION</b>			
Air Quality	Would the development of the sites result in an adverse Impact / worsening of air quality?		GREEN = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact.  Development unlikely to impact on air quality. Site lies in an area where air quality acceptable.
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		GREEN = >1,000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14
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)?		GREEN = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Development compatible with neighbouring uses.
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)  The site is adjacent to an old railway line which may have contaminated land. Potential for minor benefits through remediation of minor contamination.
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation  Development unlikely to affect water quality. The site within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3 which does not rule out development but may influence land use or require pollution control measures. Assumptions for a neutral impact are that appropriate standards and pollution control measures will be achieved through the development process and will mitigate any impact on groundwater.
<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for		GREEN = Does not contain, is not adjacent to designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species, or local area will be developed as



	nature conservation interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		greenspace. No or negligible impacts. No impact on protected sites and species (or impacts could be mitigated).
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)?		GREEN = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links.  Minor positive impact as there are some opportunities for enhancement through the provision of hedgerows.
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  Neutral impact (existing features retained, or appropriate mitigation possible). Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process.
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		GREEN = No impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local landscape character, or provide minor improvements)  Neutral impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local landscape character). Loss of land in Green Belt would have an adverse impact on Green Belt purposes. Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process. Development of this site has the potential to

			have a positive impact upon the landscape setting of Sawston provided the design makes a generous provision of land to ensure a soft green edge to the east.
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>Neutral impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local townscape character). Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process. Adjoins industrial estate to the west.</p>
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		AMBER = negative impact on Greenbelt purposes
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>GREEN = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, sites or features, and there is no impact to the setting</p> <p>Neutral impact (existing features retained, or appropriate mitigation possible).</p> <p>Archaeological potential will require further information but the assumption for a neutral impact is that it is likely appropriate mitigation can be achieved through the development process.</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>GREEN = Flood Zone 1 / low risk</p> <p>Flood Zone 1 and no drainage issues that cannot be appropriately addressed</p>
<b>HUMAN HEALTH AND WELL BEING</b>			
Open Space	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space?		<p>GREEN = Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite</p> <p>Neutral impact (existing features retained or appropriate mitigation).</p>
Distance: Outdoor Sport Facilities	How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?		<p>GREEN = &lt;1km or onsite provision</p> <p>0.4km ACF from centre of the site to playing field south of Babraham Road and west of</p>




			Lynton Way, Sawston.
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		AMBER = 400 -800m  421m ACF from centre of the site to land east of Saffron Road, Sawston.
Gypsy & Traveller	Will it provide for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?		AMBER = No Impact  No effect on pitch or plot provision.
Distance: District or Local Centre	How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?		R = >800m  Beyond 1,000m from nearest centre ACF (1,186m to Sawston, High Street)
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  1,768m ACF from centre of site to Sawston Medical Centre.
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).  No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development.
Community Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement / appropriate mitigation possible.  No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development.
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?		RED = Limited scope for integration with existing communities / isolated and/or separated by non-residential land uses  Separated from existing residential areas by business park
<b>ECONOMY</b>			
Deprivation (Cambridge)	Does it address pockets of income and employment deprivation particularly in		AMBER = Not within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.

	Abbey Ward and Kings Hedges? Would allocation result in development in deprived wards of Cambridge?		
Shopping	Will it protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres?		<p>GREEN = No effect or would support the vitality and viability of existing centres.</p> <p>Development would have no effect on vitality or viability of existing centres. The indicator is likely to apply particularly to sites which include retail, offices, or leisure uses.</p>
Employment - Accessibility	How far is the nearest main employment centre?		<p>AMBER = 1-3km</p> <p>1.9km ACF from centre of site to South Cambridgeshire 017D (Babraham Research Campus &amp; Wellcome Trust Genome Campus)</p>
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		G = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development.
Utilities	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?		<p>AMBER = Significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Minor Utilities Infrastructure improvements required, but constraints can be addressed. There is insufficient spare mains water capacity within the distribution zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. The sewerage network is at capacity and will require mitigation. Electricity supply is likely to require local and upstream reinforcement.</p>
Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education capacity?		<p>AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated</p> <p>A contribution towards additional places will be required. School capacity not sufficient, but significant issues can be adequately addressed.</p>
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		<p>A = 400 - 800m</p> <p>431m ACF from centre of site to Icknield Primary School, Sawston.</p>
Distance: Secondary	How far is the nearest secondary		A = 1 to 3 km

School	school?		1.4km ACF from centre of site to Sawston Village College.
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		AMBER = Medium quality off-road path.
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		AMBER = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances
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.		AMBER = Score 10-14 from 4 criteria below  Total Score of 12
Distance: bus stop / rail station			R = Within 1,000m (2)  619m to nearest bus stop ACF (Sawston, Babraham Road, Ashley Way)
Frequency of Public Transport			G = 20 minute frequency (4)  20 minute service (Citi 7)
Public transport journey time to City Centre			R = 41 to 50 minutes (2)  41 Minutes (Sawston, Churchfield Avenue to Cambridge, Emmanuel Street)
Distance for cycling to City Centre			A = 10km to 15 km (3)  13.5km ACF from centre of site to Cambridge
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		R = >800m  3,090m ACF from centre of the site to Whittlesford Station.
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		GREEN = No capacity / access constraints identified that cannot be fully mitigated.  No capacity constraints identified, safe access can be achieved.
Non-Car Facilities	Will it make the transport network safer for public transport, walking or cycling facilities?		AMBER = No impacts

<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Minor Rural Centre</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> SC340	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b> N/A	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land at Hallmark Hotel, Bar Hill	

**Map:**



**Site description:** The site is located on the north eastern side of Bar Hill and adjoins existing residential to the west. The site is bound on three sides by road infrastructure; the A14 and its off-slip to the north and east, and Crafts Way, which forms a ring road around Bar Hill, to the south west. To the south lies an 18 hole golf course.


The site is currently in use as a hotel, with associated car parking and grounds.

**Current use(s):** Hotel with associated car parking and grounds

**Proposed use(s):** Residential development comprising 41 units of mixed size and tenure

**Site size (ha):** South Cambridgeshire: 2.88 ha.

**Potential residential capacity:** 65 dwellings (30 dph)

<b>LAND</b>			
PDL	Would development make use of previously		AMBER = Partially on PDL The site is currently in use as a hotel with

	developed land?		associated areas of hardstanding, including car parking.
Agricultural Land	Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?		GREEN = Neutral. Development would not affect grade 1 and 2 land.
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.
<b>POLLUTION</b>			
Air Quality	Would the development of the sites result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?		RED = Site lies near source of air pollution, or development could impact on air quality, significant adverse impacts
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		RED = Within or adjacent to an AQMA, M11 or A14  The site is situated immediately adjacent to the A14 and the majority of the site lies within an AQMA.
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)?		RED = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation  Noise impacts - The north and east of the site bounds the A14, including A14 junction 29 roundabout. There are high levels of ambient / diffuse traffic noise. The impact of existing noise on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well being and providing a high quality living environment. Before this site is allocated for residential development it is recommended that these noise threats / constraints are thoroughly investigated in accordance noise guidance to determine the suitability of the site for residential use. This site requires a full noise assessment including consideration of any noise attenuation measures such as noise barriers / berms and practical / technical feasibility / financial viability.
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)
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation



<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		GREEN = Does not contain, is not adjacent to designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species, or local area will be developed as greenspace. No or negligible impacts
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)?		<p>AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>The hotel is set within extensive grounds, some of which may be lost to new development.</p>
TPO	Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?		<p>AMBER = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>There are several protected trees on site, including a band of elm trees across the middle of the site and several individual trees in clusters around the northern and western edges of the site.</p>
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
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		<p>GREEN = No impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local landscape character, or provide minor improvements)</p> <p>Development is likely to be compatible as the site is located within an area which is already relatively urbanised; currently in use for a hotel and bounded on three sides by roads.</p>
Townscape	Will it maintain and		AMBER = negative impact on townscape


	enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?		character, incapable of mitigation.  Minor negative impact (development conflicts with townscape character, minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation) - development of this site for housing would be contrary to the pattern of development in this village. Residential development is currently contained within Crafts Way, which acts as a natural boundary.
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		GREEN = No impact or Minor positive impact on Green Belt purposes
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)?		GREEN = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, sites or features, and there is no impact to the setting
<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?		AMBER = Flood Zone 2 / medium risk  The northern part of the site is at high risk of flooding from surface water. High means the area has a chance of flooding of greater than 1 in 30 (3.3%) in any year. Site would have to provide appropriate mitigation measures.
<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  0.67km ACF from centre of the site to Bar Hill Recreation Ground.
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		GREEN = <400m or onsite provision  171m ACF from centre of the site to land Between Acorn Avenue and Foxhollow
Gypsy &	Will it provide for		AMBER = No Impact

Traveller	the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?		
Distance: District or Local Centre	How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?		A = 400 - 800m  558m of nearest centre ACF (Bar Hill, Gladeside/Viking Way)
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?		A = 400 - 800m  580m ACF from centre of site to Bar Hill Health Centre, Bar Hill
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 Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement / appropriate mitigation possible
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?		RED = Limited scope for integration with existing communities / isolated and/or separated by non-residential land uses  Site surrounded on three sides by busy roads, including the A14 and northbound off-slip. Crafts Way, which acts as a ring road, separates the site from the existing built-up area of the village.
<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		GREEN = No effect or would support the vitality



	shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres?		and viability of existing centres
Employment - Accessibility	How far is the nearest main employment centre?		AMBER = 1-3km  2.1km ACF from centre of site to South Cambridgeshire 005C (Bar Hill - Industrial Estate and Tesco)
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		A = Some loss of employment land and job opportunities mitigated by alternative allocation in the area (< 50%).  The site is currently in use as a hotel.
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 capacity?		AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated  A contribution to provide additional places will be required. Bar Hill Primary School is close to capacity but may have the potential to expand. However this may be constrained by the school's liability to flood. Swavesey VC expansion of 150 places included in current capital programme, further expansion may be required depending on the level of growth
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		A = 400 - 800m  550m ACF from centre of site to Ball Hill Community Primary School
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		R = Greater than 3km  5km ACF from centre of site to Swavesey Village College
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		DARK RED = no cycling provision and traffic speeds >30mph with high vehicular traffic volume.  The site is bound by busy roads without crossings or cycle routes. However, significant improvements planned as a result of A14 scheme.

HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		AMBER = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances
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			GG = Within 400m (6)  90m to nearest bus stop ACF (Bar Hill, Crafts Way, Acorn Avenue
Frequency of Public Transport			G = 20 minute frequency (4)  Citi 5 (20min frequency) and Whippet 1A service (60min frequency) to Cambridge
Public transport journey time to City Centre			G = 21 to 30 minutes (4)  Bus service takes 26 minutes to get to Cambridge.
Distance for cycling to City Centre			G = 5km to 10km (4)  8.4km ACF from centre of site to Cambridge Station
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		R = >800m  10.1km ACF from centre of site to Cambridge Station
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		AMBER = Insufficient capacity / access. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.
Non-Car Facilities	Will it make the transport network safer for public transport, walking or cycling facilities?		AMBER = No impacts  Small site, unlikely to offer improvements to cycling infrastructure.

<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Minor Rural Centre</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> SC037a	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b>	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land at Fulbourn Old Drift (south of Cambridge Road and north of Shelford Road), Fulbourn	
<b>Map:</b>  <p>© Crown Copyright, Ordnance Survey SCDC Licence 100022500 (2016)</p>	
<p><b>Site description:</b> The site lies to the south of Cambridge Road and north of Shelford Road on the south western edge of Fulbourn. The site adjoins residential development to the east and surrounds a Listed windmill to the north. Agricultural land surrounds the site on all other sides. The site comprises a large area of agricultural land. There are hedgerows along most of the road frontages and along the edge of the residential development to the east, albeit patchy in places, and around the windmill. Otherwise the site is open to wider views across to the south and east. It is in an area of gently rolling countryside, on the top of a ridge, and very exposed to wider views.</p> <p>Note: this site adjoins site 245 to the north.</p>	
<b>Current use(s):</b> Agricultural	
<b>Proposed use(s):</b> Residential	
<b>Site size (ha):</b> South Cambridgeshire: 17.8 ha.	
<b>Potential residential capacity:</b> 268 dwellings (30 dph)	

<b>LAND</b>	
PDL	Would <span style="background-color: red; color: red;">          </span> RED = Not on PDL

	development make use of previously developed land?		
Agricultural Land	Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?		AMBER = Minor loss of grade 1 and 2 land  The whole site is Grade 2
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded 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.  Development could impact on air quality, with minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation. Despite this proposal not being adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area, it is of a significant size and therefore, there is a potential for an increase in traffic and static emissions that could affect local air quality. More information is required for this location, particularly details for air quality assessment and a low emission strategy.
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		GREEN = >1,000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14
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  Development compatible with neighbouring uses. Possible noise and malodour from nearby Highfield Farm and a Livery Yard etc. at Windmill View. Might be possible to coexist but possible off-site noise and odour impacts or statutory nuisances from farm and these have not been quantified so off-site mitigation may be required and no guarantee this can be secured, but overall in terms of adverse farm noise impact - low to medium risk. The north of the site is bounded by the busy Cambridge Road and to the south Shelford Road. Traffic noise will need assessment. However residential use is likely to be acceptable with careful noise mitigation.
Contamination	Is there possible		GREEN = Site not within or adjacent to an

	contamination on the site?		area with a history of contamination.  Development not on land likely to be contaminated.
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation  Development unlikely to affect water quality. The site within Groundwater Source Protection Zones 1, 2 and 3 which does not rule out development but may influence land use or require pollution control measures. Assumptions for a neutral impact are that appropriate standards and pollution control measures will be achieved through the development process and will mitigate any impact on groundwater.
<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		GREEN = Does not contain, is not adjacent to designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species, or local area will be developed as greenspace. No or negligible impacts.
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)?		GREEN = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links.  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,		AMBER = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation

	through delivery of and access to green infrastructure?		<p>Neutral impact (existing features retained, or appropriate mitigation possible).</p> <p>Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process.</p>
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on landscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>Significant Negative Impact (Development conflicts with landscape character, with significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation) - The landscape would be unable to accommodate development of the proposed type and scale in this location without very significant and adverse character change. The development conflicts directly with the Landscape Character.</p>
Townscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on townscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>Significant Negative Impact (Development conflicts with townscape character, with significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation) - The development's scale and location and would extend existing settlements in a way that would have a very significant adverse effect on existing settlements.</p>
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on Greenbelt purposes</p> <p>UPDATE INNER GREEN BOUNDARY STUDY 2015</p> <p>This sector (Sector 13, sub area 13.1) plays a key role in the setting of the south east of Cambridge, with the foothills of the Gog Magog Hills forming the backdrop to views out from and across Cambridge in this direction. The sector also prevents the continued sprawl of Cambridge to the south east, halting expansion in this direction and ensuring that the distance between the historic core and the edge of Cambridge does not extend further than it is at present. It plays a key role in the remaining separation between Cambridge and Fulbourn, as well as the setting of the windmill on Mill Hill and the Conservation</p>



			<p>Area at Fulbourn Hospital.</p> <p>This sector is all assessed to be Supportive landscape. The Gog Magog Hills are a distinctive feature in the settling of Cambridge in their own right, but they also form a backdrop to the city in views out to the surrounding landscape. They are the major component of the sense of place associated with the areas south east of Cambridge, influencing the perception of the city from this direction. In addition, the eastern end of the sector forms part of the setting to the village of Fulbourn and Fulbourn Hospital.</p> <p>Any form of development extending onto the slopes of the Gog Magog Hills would substantially harm one of the key components of the setting of the city.</p>
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>RED = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such sites, buildings and features, with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Significant Negative Impact on historic Assets (incapable of satisfactory mitigation) - the site surrounds the Grade II Listed windmill and would have a major adverse effect on its setting due to a loss of its significant countryside setting. Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area lies to the north west and Fulbourn Conservation Area further to the north. Adverse effect due to loss of important countryside setting to village and Conservation Areas and due to slope of land. Archaeological potential will require further information but the assumption for a neutral impact is that it is likely appropriate mitigation can be achieved through the development process.</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>GREEN = Flood Zone 1 / low risk</p> <p>Flood Zone 1 and no drainage issues that cannot be appropriately addressed</p>
<b>HUMAN HEALTH AND WELL BEING</b>			
Open Space	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically		GREEN = Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite


	accessible open space?		Development would create minor opportunities for new public open space as the promoter includes open space as part of the development.
Distance: Outdoor Sport Facilities	How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?		GREEN = <1km or onsite provision  Assume onsite provision as site of over 200 dwellings, which would be required to deliver on site facilities to meet policy.  1.5km ACF from centre of the site to Fulbourn Recreation Ground.
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		GREEN = <400m  Assume onsite provision as site of over 200 dwellings, which would be required to deliver on site facilities to meet policy.  869m ACF from centre of the site to land at Roberts Way, Fulbourn
Gypsy & Traveller	Will it provide for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?		AMBER = No Impact  No effect on pitch or plot provision.
Distance: District or Local Centre	How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?		G = <400m  Assume onsite provision as site of over 200 dwellings, which would be required to deliver on site facilities to meet policy.  Over 1,000m ACF from the centre of the site Fulbourn High Street -a cluster of services and facilities within the village.
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  928m ACF from centre of site to Fulbourn Health Centre.
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).  No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development.





Community Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		<p>GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement / appropriate mitigation possible.</p> <p>No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development.</p>
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?		<p>RED = Limited scope for integration with existing communities / isolated and/or separated by non-residential land uses</p> <p>The development scale and location of the site would create a large extension to the village which poorly relates to the existing built-up area.</p>
<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?		<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>
Shopping	Will it protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres?		<p>GREEN = No effect or would support the vitality and viability of existing centres.</p> <p>Development would have no effect on vitality or viability of existing centres. The assumption is that the local centre proposed will only be of a suitable scale to serve needs of new residents and will not impact on other centres.</p>
Employment - Accessibility	How far is the nearest main employment centre?		<p>AMBER = 1-3km</p> <p>1.2km ACF from centre of site to South Cambridgeshire 011B (Fulbourn, including Capital Park, Tesco &amp; Hospitals)</p>
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		<p>G = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development.</p>
Utilities	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure,		<p>GREEN = Existing infrastructure likely to be sufficient.</p> <p>Major utilities Infrastructure improvements required, but constraints can be addressed.</p>

	including communications infrastructure and broadband?		The electricity, mains water, gas and sewerage systems will need reinforcement to increase capacity.
Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education capacity?		AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated  Insufficient spare school capacity but potential for improvement to meet needs. Insufficient secondary and primary school places.
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		R = >800m  1,100m ACF from centre of site to Fulbourn Primary School.
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		R = Greater than 3km  6.4km ACF from centre of site to Sawston Village College.
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		AMBER = Medium quality off-road path.
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		GREEN = High quality public transport service
Sustainable Transport Score (SCDC)	Scoring mechanism has been developed to consider access to and quality of public transport, and cycling. Scores determined by the four criteria below.		AMBER = Score 10-14 from 4 criteria below  Total score of 14
Distance: bus stop / rail station			G = Within 600m (4)  578m ACF from the centre of the site to the nearest bus stop (Fulbourn, Cambridge Road, opp Windmill Lane)
Frequency of Public Transport			G = 20 minute frequency (4)
Public transport journey time to City Centre			R = 41 to 50 minutes (2)  50 Minutes from Fulbourn to Cambridge.
Distance for cycling to City Centre			G = 5km to 10km (4)  6.57km ACF from the centre of the site to Cambridge Market.
Distance:	How far is the site		R = >800m

Railway Station	from an existing or proposed train station?		4,928m ACF from centre of the site to Cambridge Station.
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		<p>AMBER = Insufficient capacity / access. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>Minor negative effects incapable of mitigation. Capacity constraints - The Highway Authority believes that access to local road network will potentially have capacity and safety constraints (e.g. Hospital Roundabout at Cherry Hinton is a cluster site). Cherry Hinton Road, Limekiln Hill Road and Granhams Road / Babraham Road junction likely to need improvements to accommodate development traffic.</p>
Non-Car Facilities	Will it make the transport network safer for public transport, walking or cycling facilities?		<p>GREEN = Significant improvements to public transport, cycling, walking facilities.</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 a significant improvement to public transport, walking or cycling facilities.</p>

<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Minor Rural Centre</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> SC038a	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b>	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land north of Cambridge Road, Fulbourn	
<b>Map:</b> 	
<b>Site description:</b> The site lies to the north of Cambridge Road and south of Fulbourn Old Drift, to the south west of Fulbourn. The Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals lie immediately to the north and west. Agricultural land surrounds the site to the east and south. The site comprises a large area of agricultural land. There is a dense hedgerow along the edge of the hospital site to the west and patchier, low lying hedgerows along the road frontages. The site is open to wider views across to the south and east in an area of gently rolling countryside.	
Note: this site adjoins sites 037 to the south and 109 to the east.	
<b>Current use(s):</b> Agricultural	
<b>Proposed use(s):</b> Employment – office and research and development uses as an extension to Capital Park	
<b>Site size (ha):</b> South Cambridgeshire: 11.08 ha.	
<b>Potential residential capacity:</b> N/A	

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

Land	development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?		Minor loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2) - site is all Grade 2 (11.08 ha.).
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.
<b>POLLUTION</b>			
Air Quality	Would the development of the sites result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?		GREEN = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact.  Development unlikely to impact on air quality. Site lies in an area where air quality acceptable.
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		GREEN = >1,000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14
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  Development compatible with neighbouring uses. The South of the site is bounded by the busy Cambridge Road and to the North Fulbourn Old Drift. Traffic noise will need assessment. There are also industrial / commercial type units to north at Ida Darwin but these are a low to moderate risk in terms of adverse noise and cooking odour impact as it is understood that the Ida site will be developed in near future.
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)  Potential for minor benefits through remediation of minor contamination. Site is adjacent to current industrial / commercial use and may need investigation.
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation  Development unlikely to affect water quality. The site within Groundwater Source Protection Zones 2 and 3 which does not rule out development but may influence land use or require pollution control measures. Assumptions for a neutral impact are that appropriate standards and pollution control measures will be achieved through the

			development process and will mitigate any impact on groundwater.
<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		GREEN = Does not contain, is not adjacent to designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species, or local area will be developed as greenspace. No or negligible impacts. No impact on protected sites and species (or impacts could be mitigated).
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  Neutral impact (existing features retained, or appropriate mitigation possible). Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process.
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		RED = Significant negative impact on landscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.  Significant Negative Impact (Development conflicts with landscape character, with significant negative impacts incapable of



			mitigation) - The landscape would be unable to accommodate development of the proposed type and scale in this location without very significant and adverse character change. The development conflicts directly with the Landscape Character.
Townscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on townscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>Significant Negative Impact (Development conflicts with townscape character, with significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation) - The development's scale and location and would extend existing settlements in a way that would have a very significant adverse effect on existing settlements. Although adjacent to the Fulbourn Hospital site, to the west, the site is removed from the western edge of Fulbourn. The proposed development would not, therefore, relate at all well to the built area of Fulbourn.</p>
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on Green Belt purposes</p> <p>UPDATE INNER GREEN BOUNDARY STUDY 2015</p> <p>This sector (Sector 13, sub area 13.2) plays a key role in the setting of the south east of Cambridge, with the foothills of the Gog Magog Hills forming the backdrop to views out from and across Cambridge in this direction. The sector also prevents the continued sprawl of Cambridge to the south east, halting expansion in this direction and ensuring that the distance between the historic core and the edge of Cambridge does not extend further than it is at present. It plays a key role in the remaining separation between Cambridge and Fulbourn, as well as the setting of the windmill on Mill Hill and the Conservation Area at Fulbourn Hospital.</p> <p>Any development within sub area 13.2 would compromise the separation between Fulbourn and Cambridge, and impact on the relationship with the Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area and the limited remaining separation between Fulbourn and Cambridge. No Green Belt release should be contemplated in this sub area.</p>


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>Minor Negative Impact on historic Assets (incapable of satisfactory mitigation) – The site forms an important part of the setting of the two Conservation Areas. However, with careful design it may be possible to mitigate any impact on the wider historic environment with a smaller scale of development.</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>GREEN = Flood Zone 1 / low risk</p> <p>Flood Zone 1 and no drainage issues that cannot be appropriately addressed.</p>
<b>HUMAN HEALTH AND WELL BEING</b>			
Open Space	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space?		<p>GREEN = Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite</p> <p>Development would create minor opportunities for new public open space as the promoter includes open space as part of the development.</p>
Distance: Outdoor Sport Facilities	How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?		<p>AMBER = 1-3km</p> <p>1.8km ACF from centre of the site to Teversham Recreation Ground.</p>
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		<p>AMBER = 400 - 800m</p> <p>663m ACF from centre of the site to land at Roberts Way, Fulbourn.</p>
Gypsy & Traveller	Will it provide for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?		<p>AMBER = No Impact</p> <p>No effect on pitch or plot provision.</p>
Distance: District or Local Centre	How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?		<p>R = &gt;800m</p> <p>Over 1,000m ACF from the centre of the site Fulbourn High Street -a cluster of services and facilities within the village.</p>
Distance: City Centre	How far is the site from edge of defined Cambridge		R = >800m





	City Centre?		
Distance: GP Service	How far is the nearest health centre or GP service?		R = >800m 1,392m ACF from centre of site to Fulbourn Health Centre.
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).  No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development.
Community Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement / appropriate mitigation possible.  No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development.
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?		RED = Limited scope for integration with existing communities / isolated and/or separated by non-residential land uses  Poorly related to the existing built-up part of the village, located some distance to the west. However, the site adjoins other employment at the Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals.
<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		GREEN = <1km or allocation is for or includes a significant element of

	employment centre?		employment or is for another non-residential use.  Site proposed for employment uses.  0.6km ACF from centre of site to South Cambridgeshire 011B (Fulbourn, including Capital Park, Tesco & Hospitals)
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		G = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development  Site proposed for employment uses.
Utilities	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?		GREEN = Existing infrastructure likely to be sufficient.  Major utilities Infrastructure improvements required, but constraints can be addressed. The electricity, mains water, gas and sewerage systems will need reinforcement to increase capacity.
Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education capacity?		GREEN= Non-residential development / surplus school places.
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		R = >800m  1,210m ACF from centre of site to Bewick Bridge Primary School, Cherry Hinton.
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		R = Greater than 3km  6.0km ACF from centre of site to Bottisham Village College.
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		AMBER = Medium quality off-road path.
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		GREEN = High quality public transport service
Sustainable Transport Score (SCDC)	Scoring mechanism has been developed to consider access to and quality of public transport, and cycling. Scores determined by the four criteria below.		GREEN = Score 15-19 from 4 criteria below  Total score of 16.
Distance: bus stop / rail			GG = Within 400m (6)

station			189m ACF from the centre of the site to the nearest bus stop.
Frequency of Public Transport			G = 20 minute frequency (4)
Public transport journey time to City Centre			R = 41 to 50 minutes (2)  50 Minutes from Fulbourn to Cambridge.
Distance for cycling to City Centre			G = 5km to 10km (4)  5.86km ACF from the centre of the site to Cambridge Market.
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		R = >800m  4,253m ACF from centre of the site to Cambridge Station.
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		GREEN = No capacity / access constraints identified that cannot be fully mitigated.
Non-Car Facilities	Will it make the transport network safer for public transport, walking or cycling facilities?		GREEN = Significant improvements to public transport, cycling, walking facilities.  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 a significant improvement to public transport, walking or cycling facilities.

<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Minor Rural Centre</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> SC327a	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b>	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land west of A10, Milton	
<b>Map:</b> 	
<b>Site description:</b> The site is located to the west of Milton, and adjoins the A10 to the east, the Milton Park & Ride site to the north, and Milton Landfill site and Household Waste Recycling Centre to the west and south.  The site is an agricultural field with drains running along the northern, eastern and southern boundaries. To the west of the site is a belt of trees that screens the site from the Household Waste Recycling Centre. There are intermittent trees and hedges along the eastern and southern boundaries, and a row of trees / hedges run north-south through the centre of the site.	
<b>Current use(s):</b> The site is currently in agricultural use.	
<b>Proposed use(s):</b> Employment / sui generis	
<b>Site size (ha):</b> South Cambridgeshire: 9.54 ha	
<b>Potential residential capacity:</b> N/A	

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

Land	development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?		Minor loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2) - small site but the majority of the site is Grade 2.
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.
<b>POLLUTION</b>			
Air Quality	Would the development of the sites result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?		<p>AMBER = Site lies near source of air pollution, or development could impact on air quality adverse impacts.</p> <p>Development could impact on air quality, with minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation. The site is located close to the Councils' Air Quality Management Area and the proposed development is of a significant size to have an impact on air quality. Air quality assessments will be required to assess the impact of this development along with provision of a Low Emissions Strategy.</p>
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		<p>AMBER = &lt;1,000m of an AQMA, M11 or A14</p> <p>792m ACF from edge of site to AQMA.</p> <p>272m ACF from edge of site to A14.</p>
Pollution	Are there potential Odour, light noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator (including compatibility with neighbouring uses)?		<p>RED = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Possible traffic noise from the A10 and A14, with prevailing winds are from the south west. Noise from neighbouring landfill / waste disposal / recycling site.</p> <p>Odour from the adjacent landfill site and Household Waste Recycling Centre would have a significant negative impact in terms of health and well-being and possible nuisance. An odour assessment will be required.</p>
Contamination	Is there possible contamination on the site?		<p>AMBER = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development (potential to achieve benefits subject to appropriate mitigation)</p> <p>Potential for minor benefits through remediation of minor contamination. The site is adjacent to a known landfill site, therefore investigation will be required</p>

Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		<p>GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation</p> <p>Development unlikely to affect water quality. Assumptions for a neutral impact are that appropriate standards and pollution control measures will be achieved through the development process, e.g. as part of Sustainable Drainage Systems (Suds).</p>
<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		<p>GREEN = Does not contain, is not adjacent to designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species, or local area will be developed as greenspace. No or negligible impacts. No impact on protected sites and species (or impacts could be mitigated).</p>
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)?		<p>AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>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>
TPO	Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?		<p>GREEN = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees</p>
Green Infrastructure	Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery of and access to green infrastructure?		<p>AMBER = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Neutral impact (existing features retained, or appropriate mitigation possible). Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process.</p>
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			



Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on landscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>Significant negative impact (development conflicts with landscape character, with significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation) - development of this site would result in considerable encroachment of built development into the open farmland to the north of the village.</p>
Townscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on townscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>Significant negative impact (development conflicts with townscape character, with significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation) - development of this site would result in built development in an area characterised by agricultural buildings and individual dwellings.</p>
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		RED = Significant negative impact on Greenbelt purposes
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>GREEN = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, sites or features, and there is no impact to the setting</p> <p>Neutral impact (existing features retained, or appropriate mitigation possible). Archaeological potential will require further information but the assumption for a neutral impact is that it is likely appropriate mitigation can be achieved through the development process.</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>GREEN = Flood Zone 1 / low risk</p> <p>Flood Zone 1 and no drainage issues that cannot be appropriately addressed</p>
<b>HUMAN HEALTH AND WELL BEING</b>			
Open Space	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open		GREEN = Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite

	space?		
Distance: Outdoor Sport Facilities	How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?		GREEN = <1km or onsite provision 0.4km ACF from centre of the site to Milton Recreation Ground.
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		GREEN = <400m or onsite provision 297m ACF from centre of the site to Milton Recreation Ground.
Gypsy & Traveller	Will it provide for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?		AMBER = No Impact  No effect on pitch or plot provision.
Distance: District or Local Centre	How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?		R = >800m 870m of nearest centre ACF (Milton, High Street)
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 889m ACF from centre of site to Milton Surgery.
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).  No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development. The proposal involves the loss of an area of the golf course but all other facilities are being retained.
Community Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement / appropriate mitigation possible.  No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development.
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?		RED = Limited scope for integration with existing communities / isolated and/or separated by non-residential land uses  Site separated from the village facilities and services by the busy A10.
<b>ECONOMY</b>			
Deprivation (Cambridge)	Does it address pockets of income		AMBER = Not within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within




	and employment deprivation particularly in Abbey Ward and Kings Hedges? Would allocation result in development in deprived wards of Cambridge?		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?		Development would have no effect on vitality or viability of existing centres.  The indicator is likely to apply particularly to sites which include retail, offices, or leisure uses.
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  Site proposed for employment / sui generis uses.  0.4km ACF from centre of site to South Cambridgeshire 007C (Cambridge Science Park and St Johns Innovation Centre)
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		G = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development  Site proposed for employment / sui generis uses.
Utilities	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?		GREEN = Existing infrastructure likely to be sufficient.  Minor utilities infrastructure improvements required, but constraints can be addressed. There is insufficient spare mains water capacity within the distribution zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. The sewerage network is close to capacity.
Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education capacity?		GREEN= Non-residential development / surplus school places.
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		A = 400 - 800m  736m ACF from centre of site to Milton C of E Primary School.
Distance:	How far is the		A = 1 to 3 km

Secondary School	nearest secondary school?		2.2km ACF from centre of site to Impington Village College.
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		RED = No cycling provision or a cycle lane less than 1.5m width with medium volume of traffic. Having to cross a busy junction with high cycle accident rate to access local facilities/school. Poor quality off road path.
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		GREEN = High quality public transport service
Sustainable Transport Score (SCDC)	Scoring mechanism has been developed to consider access to and quality of public transport, and cycling. Scores determined by the four criteria below.		DARK GREEN = Score 19-25  Total Score of 24
Distance: bus stop / rail station			GG = Within 400m (6)  292m to nearest bus stop (Milton, Park and Ride)
Frequency of Public Transport			GG = 10 minute frequency or better (6)  10 minute service (99 P&R service)
Public transport journey time to City Centre			GG = 20 minutes or less (6)  20 Minutes (Milton, Park and Ride to Cambridge, Emmanuel Street)
Distance for cycling to City Centre			GG = Up to 5km (6)  4.65km ACF to Cambridge City Centre
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		R = >800m  3,943m ACF from centre of the site to Waterbeach Station.
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		GREEN = No capacity / access constraints identified that cannot be fully mitigated.  No capacity constraints identified, safe access can be achieved.
Non-Car Facilities	Will it make the transport network safer for public transport, walking or cycling facilities?		AMBER = No impacts

<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Minor Rural Centre</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> SC071a	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b>	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land South of Hale Road, Swavesey	

**Map:**



**Site description:** The site lies to the south of Hale Road on the western edge of Swavesey. The site wraps around residential development to the east. There is a farm to the north with agricultural land. To the west lies open agricultural land. The site comprises a large area of agricultural land, which is open to the wider landscape, particularly to the west. The site is well hedged along the residential frontages and there is an area that has recently been planted with saplings along the western boundary. A patchy hedgerow runs along the Hale Road frontage.

Note: the site adjoins the remainder of site (Part B) and site 250 to the east.

**Current use(s):** Agricultural

**Proposed use(s):** Residential development

**Site size (ha):** South Cambridgeshire: Part A = 6.42 ha. Part B = 4.36 ha.

**Potential residential capacity:** 144 dwellings (30 dph)

<b>LAND</b>		
PDL	Would development make	RED = Not on PDL

	use of previously developed land?		
Agricultural Land	Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?		GREEN = Neutral. Development would not affect grade 1 and 2 land.
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.  Small part of the site within an area designated in the Minerals and Waste LDF but development would not have a negative impact.
<b>POLLUTION</b>			
Air Quality	Would the development of the sites result in an adverse Impact / worsening of air quality?		GREEN = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact.  Development unlikely to impact on air quality. Site lies in an area where air quality acceptable.
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		GREEN = >1,000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14
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  Development compatible with neighbouring uses. Some minor to moderate additional road traffic noise generation impact on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance. Some potential for traffic noise from A14, but should be possible to mitigate.
Contamination	Is there possible contamination on the site?		GREEN = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation
<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity?		GREEN = Does not contain, is not adjacent to designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species, or local area will be developed as greenspace. No or negligible impacts

	(Including International and locally designated sites)		
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)?		<p>AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>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>
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?		<p>AMBER = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Neutral impact (existing features retained, or appropriate mitigation possible). Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process. A footpath runs along the northern boundary of the site. Bridleways lie approximately 155m to the north east and 580m to the west</p>
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on landscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>Significant Negative Impact (Development conflicts with landscape character, with significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation) - Owing to the slightly sloping land any new development would be at a higher level than the existing village edge and probably more visible. The site is very open and rural in character and development on this site would be harmful to the character of the village. It would constitute substantial back land development, poorly related to the existing built-up part of the village.</p>



Townscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on townscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>Significant Negative Impact (Development conflicts with landscape character, with significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation) - Owing to the slightly sloping land any new development would be at a higher level than the existing village edge and probably more visible. It would constitute back land development. The majority of the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3, with the remaining land in a pocket to the north. It would be difficult to develop such a site and integrate it into the built form of the village.</p>
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		GREEN = No impact or Minor positive impact on Green Belt purposes
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>Minor Negative Impact on historic Assets (incapable of satisfactory mitigation) – site forms an important part of the wider setting of a Grade II Listed windmill to the west. Archaeological potential will require further information but the assumption for a neutral impact is that it is likely appropriate mitigation can be achieved through the development process.</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>RED = Flood Zone 3 / high risk</p> <p>Flood Zone 3 (or other form of flood risk incapable of appropriate mitigation). The majority of the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3, with the remaining land in a pocket to the north. It would be difficult to develop such a site and integrate it into the built form of the village.</p> <p>The promoter has undertaken a preliminary Flood Risk Scoping Assessment and considers the extent of the flood zones to be significantly less than indicated on the Environment Agency's flood maps. As such they consider the site should be considered as within Flood Zone</p>

			<p>1 or 2 and not 3, pending further investigation.</p> <p>An awarded watercourse runs through the site. There is a significant amount of high, medium and low surface water flood risk on Site A. (Site B has a small amount of high, medium and low surface water flood risk towards the north of the site.) Both sites would have to take appropriate mitigation measures for each type of flood risk which may impact considerably on the deliverable density and viability. Flood risk is a concern for this site.</p>
<b>HUMAN HEALTH AND WELL BEING</b>			
Open Space	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space?		<p>GREEN = Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite</p> <p>Neutral impact (existing features retained or appropriate mitigation). Assumption is standard requirements for open space would apply.</p>
Distance: Outdoor Sport Facilities	How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?		<p>GREEN = &lt;1km or onsite provision</p> <p>0.64KM ACF from centre of site to Swavesey Recreation Ground, Middle Watch</p>
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		<p>GREEN = &lt;400m or onsite provision</p> <p>313m ACF from centre of the site to land at Land east of Moat Way</p>
Gypsy & Traveller	Will it provide for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?		<p>AMBER = No Impact</p>
Distance: District or Local Centre	How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?		<p>A = 400 - 800m</p> <p>608m of nearest centre ACF (Swavesey, High Street)</p>
Distance: City Centre	How far is the site from edge of defined Cambridge City Centre?		<p>R = &gt;800m</p>
Distance: GP Service	How far is the nearest health centre or GP service?		<p>R = &gt;800m</p> <p>1,071m ACF from centre of site to Swavesey Surgery</p>
Key Local Facilities	Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs		<p>AMBER = No impact on facilities (or satisfactory mitigation proposed).</p> <p>No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development.</p>

	etc?)		
Community Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		<p>GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement / appropriate mitigation possible.</p> <p>No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development.</p>
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?		<p>RED = Limited scope for integration with existing communities / isolated and/or separated by non-residential land uses</p> <p>It would be difficult to develop such a site and integrate it into the built form of the village.</p>
<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?		<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>
Shopping	Will it protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres?		<p>GREEN = No effect or would support the vitality and viability of existing centres</p> <p>Development would have no effect on vitality or viability of existing centres. The indicator is likely to apply particularly to sites which include retail, offices, or leisure uses.</p>
Employment - Accessibility	How far is the nearest main employment centre?		<p>RED = &gt;3km</p> <p>5.5km ACF from centre of site to South Cambridgeshire 005C (Bar Hill - Industrial Estate and Tesco)</p>
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		<p>G = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development</p>
Utilities	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?		<p>AMBER = Significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Minor Utilities Infrastructure improvements required, but constraints can be addressed. Electricity is likely to require local and upstream reinforcement. There is insufficient spare mains water capacity within the distribution zone to</p>




			supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and will require investigation and possibly mitigation.
Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education capacity?		<p>AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated</p> <p>The new extension at Swavesey Primary School will take its capacity to 330 places. This capacity will be taken up by developments already in the pipeline in the village. Any further expansion of the school will be difficult to mitigate on the existing site due to site and planning constraints. Further extensions would be difficult and expensive to build. A new, expanded, replacement school would require a site of approximately 2 hectares and would cost approximately £10M.</p> <p>A contribution towards additional secondary places will be required. Swavesey VC expansion of 150 places included in current capital programme, further expansion may be required depending on the level of growth.</p> <p>Promoter proposes that additional land is available for a primary school / early years facility.</p>
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		<p>A = 400 - 800m</p> <p>568m ACF from centre of site to Swavesey Primary School</p> <p>Promoter proposes that additional land is available for a primary school / early years facility. This may change the score to Green.</p>
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		<p>G = Within 1km (or site large enough to provide new)</p> <p>0.4km ACF from centre of site to Swavesey Village College</p>
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		<p>RED = No cycling provision or a cycle lane less than 1.5m width with medium volume of traffic. Having to cross a busy junction with high cycle accident rate to access local facilities/school. Poor quality off road path.</p>
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		<p>RED = Service does not meet the requirements of a high quality public transport (HQPT)</p>
Sustainable Transport	Scoring mechanism has		<p>GREEN = Score 15-19 from 4 criteria below</p>

Score (SCDC)	been developed to consider access to and quality of public transport, and cycling. Scores determined by the four criteria below.		Total score of 13
Distance: bus stop / rail station			G = Within 600m (4)  424m to nearest bus stop ACF (Swavesey, Swavesey Village College, Grounds)
Frequency of Public Transport			A = Hourly service (2)
Public transport journey time to City Centre			G = 21 to 30 minutes (4)  23 minutes from Swavesey to St Ives.
Distance for cycling to City Centre			A = 10km to 15 km (3)  13.5km ACF from centre of site to Cambridge
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		R = >800m  1,2844m ACF from centre of site to Huntingdon Station
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		GREEN = No capacity / access constraints identified that cannot be fully mitigated  Although the site does not adjoin the road frontage, the promoter states that access to the site can be provided to the south-west of the Laragh Homes Development directly onto Fen Drayton Road. An initial highway assessment has indicated that there is sufficient capacity in local highway network and that appropriate visibility splays can be achieved.  No capacity constraints identified, safe access can be achieved. The Highways Agency comment that most of the sites identified within this group are small in-fills, closely associated with existing settlements. It is realistic to assume that a substantial proportion of such sites could be accommodated in the short to medium term but it would be difficult to see more than a quarter of the identified capacity being deliverable.
Non-Car Facilities	Will it make the transport network safer for public transport, walking or cycling facilities?		AMBER = No impacts

<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Group Village</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> SC098a	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b> N/A	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land to the east of Cherry Hinton Road, Teversham	

**Map:**



**Site description:** The site lies to the south of Pembroke Way and east of Cherry Hinton Road, on the southern edge of Teversham. The site adjoins residential development to the north and south, and agricultural land to the east. The western edge is constrained by Cherry Hinton Road, beyond which, further to the west lies Cambridge Airport. To the south the site is bound by Gazelle way. The site comprises agricultural land and the northern part is enclosed by hedgerow, whilst to the south of a dense tree belt, which runs across the middle of the site, it becomes more exposed.

**Current use(s):** Agricultural

**Proposed use(s):** Residential

**Site size (ha):** South Cambridgeshire: 17.9 ha.

**Potential residential capacity:** 269 dwellings (30 dph)

<b>LAND</b>	
PDL	Would development make use of previously developed
	RED = Not on PDL

	land?		
Agricultural Land	Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?		AMBER = Minor loss of grade 1 and 2 land
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.  Part of the site falls within the Waste Consultation Area.
<b>POLLUTION</b>			
Air Quality	Would the development of the sites result in an adverse Impact / worsening of air quality?		GREEN = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact.
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		GREEN = >1,000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14
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  Noise issues - The West of the site is adjacent to Cherry Hinton Road and Marshalls Airport. Air and Traffic noise will need assessment in accordance with PPG 24 and associated guidance. The impact of existing noise on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and wellbeing and providing a high quality living environment. However residential use is likely to be acceptable with careful noise mitigation. Noise likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises. Therefore no objection in principle.
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)  Adjoins Cambridge Airport. A contaminated Land Assessment will be required as a condition of any planning application.
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation

<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		GREEN = Does not contain, is not adjacent to designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species, or local area will be developed as greenspace. No or negligible impacts
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)?		<p>AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Chalkland landscapes support species and habitats characterised by scattered chalk grassland, beechwood plantations on dry hill tops, willow and alder in wetter valleys, scrub of hawthorn and blackthorn with ivy or bramble beneath. Spring-fed fens, mires and marshy ground with reed, sedge and hemp agrimony occur along with small chalk rivers supporting watercrowfoots and pondweeds with reed sweet-grass at the margins with bullhead fish and occasional brown trout and water vole. Large open arable fields may support rare arable plants such as grass poly or Venus's looking-glass. Brown hare and typical farmland birds, such as linnet, yellow hammer and corn bunting also occur. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design.</p> <p>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>
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		AMBER = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation

	green infrastructure?		
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on landscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes Teversham as lying 3 miles east of Cambridge, bordered by arable fields and with Cambridge Airport immediately to the west. This linear village has now been developed in depth, with several housing estates on its western side. The majority of the village edges abut open fields, but Manor Farm to the south and Allen's Farm to the north, provide a softer more enclosed boundary, with smaller fields and mature hedgerows. The landscape to the east is flat, comprising Teversham Fen. The parish church is at the northern end of the village in a wooded setting. The fields to the west separate Teversham from Cambridge.</p> <p>Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Teversham. The site forms part of the setting of the SAM, Conservation Area and a Grade II Listed Building, but with careful design it should be possible to mitigate impact of development within Site 099 with landscape screening on southern edge.</p>
Townscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on townscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes Teversham as lying 3 miles east of Cambridge, bordered by arable fields and with Cambridge Airport immediately to the west. This linear village has now been developed in depth, with several housing estates on its western side. The majority of the village edges abut open fields, but Manor Farm to the south and Allen's Farm to the north, provide a softer more enclosed boundary, with smaller fields and mature hedgerows. The landscape to the east is flat, comprising Teversham Fen. The parish church is at the northern end of the village in a wooded setting. The fields to the west separate Teversham from</p>



			<p>Cambridge.</p> <p>Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Teversham. The site forms part of the setting of the SAM, Conservation Area and a Grade II Listed Building, but with careful design it should be possible to mitigate impact of development within Site 099 with landscape screening on southern edge.</p>
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on Greenbelt purposes</p> <p>UPDATE INNER GREEN BOUNDARY STUDY 2015</p> <p>This sector plays a key role in the setting of the east of Cambridge, ensuring that Cambridge does not coalesce with Teversham or Fulbourn. It retains open countryside close to the edge of the city and provides visual relief from the urban edge. This sector prevents further sprawl of built development to the east of the city, ensuring that the distance between the historic core and the edge of Cambridge does not extend further than it is at present. Sub area 14.2 also plays a role in the setting of the Conservation Area at Fulbourn Hospital.</p> <p>It is unlikely that any development within this sector could be accommodated without substantial harm to Green Belt purposes. Any form of development would affect the separation between Cambridge and both Teversham and Fulbourn, as well as between the two necklace villages. It would also affect the rural setting of the villages. Development within sub area 14.2 would also impact on the relationship with the Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area. No Green Belt release should be contemplated in this sector.</p>
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		<p>RED = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such sites, buildings and features, with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Conservation Area – The Teversham Conservation Area lies 146m to the north. Adverse effect due to loss of important countryside setting on approach.</p> <p>Listed Buildings – Grade II Listed Manor</p>



	scheduled monuments)?		<p>Farmhouse, Fulbourn Road lies 290m to the south east. Major adverse effect on functional countryside setting of Manor Farmhouse and SAM.</p> <p>Non-statutory archaeological site - The site is located in the historic core of the village with evidence for medieval settlement to the north and a designated medieval moat to the east (SAM 33278). There is also evidence for Roman activity in the vicinity. Further information would be necessary in advance of any planning application for this site.</p> <p>The site forms part of the setting of the SAM, Conservation Area and a Grade II Listed Building, but with careful design it should be possible to mitigate impact of development within Site 099 with landscape screening on southern edge.</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?		GREEN = Flood Zone 1 / low risk
<b>HUMAN HEALTH AND WELL BEING</b>			
Open Space	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space?		<p>GREEN = Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite</p> <p>Neutral impact (existing features retained or appropriate mitigation). Assumption is standard requirements for open space would apply.</p>
Distance: Outdoor Sport Facilities	How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?		<p>GREEN = &lt;1km or onsite provision</p> <p>0.73KM ACF from centre of site to Teversham Recreation Ground</p>
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		<p>GREEN = &lt;400m or onsite provision</p> <p>289m ACF from centre of the site to land at Land south of Pembroke Way</p>
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		<p>A = 400 - 800m</p> <p>541m of nearest centre ACF (Teversham,</p>

	centre?		High Street)
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  2,753m ACF from centre of site to Fulbourn Health Centre
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).  No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development.
Community Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement / appropriate mitigation possible.  No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development.
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?		RED = Limited scope for integration with existing communities / isolated and/or separated by non-residential land uses  The site would form a linear development along Cherry Hinton Road, effectively joining Teversham and Cherry Hinton, coalescing the two settlements.
<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		GREEN = No effect or would support the vitality and viability of existing centres

	local centres?		
Employment - Accessibility	How far is the nearest main employment centre?		AMBER = 1-3km  1.4km ACF from centre of site to South Cambridgeshire 011B (Fulbourn, including Capital Park, Tesco & Hospitals)
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		G = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development
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 capacity?		AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated  Contributions will be required. The development of this site for around 450 dwellings could generate a need for a number of early years places and a maximum of 160 primary school places and 113 secondary places. Any mitigation will depend on other developments in the vicinity and is linked to whether a new secondary school can be established on the east side of the city.
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		GREEN: Site is beyond 726m from nearest primary school but is large enough to provide its own facilities.
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		R = Greater than 3km  7.2km ACF from centre of site to Impington Village College
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		AMBER = Medium quality off-road path.  Local link (off-road) alongside Airport Way / Cherry Hinton Road to west of site.
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		AMBER = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances
Sustainable Transport Score (SCDC)	Scoring mechanism has been developed to consider access to		DARK GREEN = Score 19-25  Total score = 21

	and quality of public transport, and cycling. Scores determined by the four criteria below.		
Distance: bus stop / rail station			GG = Within 400m (6)  377m to nearest bus stop ACF (Teversham, Cherry Hinton Road, opp Marshalls Close)
Frequency of Public Transport			GG = 10 minute frequency or better (6)
Public transport journey time to City Centre			A = 31 to 40 minutes (3)  Citi 1 from Gazelle way takes 34 minutes to Drummer street, Central Cambridge.
Distance for cycling to City Centre			GG = Up to 5km (6)  4.7km ACF from centre of site to Cambridge
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		R = >800m  3,453m from centre of site to Cambridge Station
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		RED = Insufficient capacity/ access. Negative effects incapable of appropriate mitigation.  Regarding sites in the Fen Ditton / Fulbourn et al / Gt Wilbraham / Teversham area (estimated capacity of 10,922 dwellings on 25 sites) the Highways Agency comment that sites at the southern end of this group are likely to be well integrated with Cambridge though clearly there could be some additional pressure on M11 and A14. Sites around Fen Ditton are more likely to generate pressure on the A14 corridor, particularly to and from employment along the northern fringe of Cambridge.  The Highway Authority has concerns about the suitability of Cherry Hinton Road to serve development of this size and about traffic impact on Cherry Hinton High street.
Non-Car Facilities	Will it make the transport network safer for public transport, walking or cycling facilities?		AMBER = No impacts

<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Group Village</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> SC025a	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b> N/A	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land south of Bourn Bridge Road, Little Abington	

**Map:**



**Site description:** The site is on the western edge of Little Abington south of Bourn Bridge Road. To the north is open countryside up to and beyond the A1307. To the west is the A11(T) with large arable fields beyond. To the east is residential. South is an area of woodland adjacent to the River Granta and beyond is the Granta Park employment area.

There is a further SHLAA site to the north – Site 24 and to the south east – Site 26.

**Current use(s):** Arable land

**Proposed use(s):** 50 dwellings

**Site size (ha):** South Cambridgeshire: 2.5 ha.

**Potential residential capacity:** 57 dwellings (30dph)

<b>LAND</b>		
PDL	Would development make use of previously developed land?	RED = Not on PDL

Agricultural Land	Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?		AMBER = Minor loss of grade 1 and 2 land
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.
<b>POLLUTION</b>			
Air Quality	Would the development of the sites result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?		GREEN = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact.
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		GREEN = >1,000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14
Pollution	Are there potential Odour, light noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator (including compatibility with neighbouring uses)?		<p>AMBER = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation.</p> <p>The site is close to Granta Park with medium to large sized industrial / commercial units / uses.</p> <p>Officers are currently investigating ongoing industrial noise associated with The Welding Institute at Granta Park (welding research &amp; development) that is considered a statutory nuisance to existing residents in West Field and Church Lane Little Abington. The Institute are currently considering expensive and substantial noise mitigation measures to abate the existing noise nuisance which is particularly complex as it involves low frequency noise which is very difficult to mitigate. The proposals would bring residential closer to these noise sources and whilst mitigation may abate a noise nuisance to existing it may still be a problem if noise sensitive premises were closer. Noise is paramount material considerations in terms of health and well being and providing a high quality living environment.</p> <p>It is uncertain whether mitigation measures on the proposed development site alone can provide an acceptable ambient noise environment. Noise insulation / mitigation abatement measures could be required off-site at the industrial units but there is uncertain as to whether these would be effective. Such</p>



			<p>mitigation measures are likely to require the full cooperation of the business operators and section 106 planning / obligation requirements may be required and there are no guarantees that these can be secured. Without mitigation any detrimental economic impact on existing businesses should also be considered prior to allocation.</p> <p>Environmental Health currently object to this site and before any consideration is given to allocating this site for residential development it is recommended that this noise constraints are thoroughly investigated and duly considered / addressed including consideration of mitigation by undertaking noise impact / risk assessments in accordance with PPG 24 Planning and Noise and associated guidance in close liaison with The Welding Institute.</p> <p>Road Transport Noise A11 - The site is in close proximity to the A11. However it is likely that such a transport source can be abated to an acceptable level with careful mitigation: combination of appropriate distance separation, building orientation / positioning / design, internal habitable room layout, noise mitigation /attenuation and building noise insulation measures. Possible noise barrier / earth berm may be required. Noise may influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises.</p> <p>Other environmental conditions (e.g. fumes, vibration, dust).</p>
Contamination	Is there possible contamination on the site?		GREEN = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation
<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and		<p>GREEN = Does not contain, is not adjacent to designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species, or local area will be developed as greenspace. No or negligible impacts</p> <p>A County Wildlife Site follows the course of the River Granta.</p>



	locally designated sites)		
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)?		<p>AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Biodiversity features/ Chalklands – These support species and habitats characterised by scattered chalk grassland, beechwood plantations on dry hill tops, willow and alder in wetter valleys, scrub of hawthorn and blackthorn with ivy or bramble beneath. Spring-fed fens, mires and marshy ground with reed, sedge and hemp agrimony occur along with small chalk rivers supporting watercrowfoots and pondweeds with reed sweet-grass at the margins with bullhead fish and occasional brown trout and water vole. Large open arable fields may support rare arable plants such as grass poly or Venus's looking-glass. Brown hare and typical farmland birds, such as linnet, yellow hammer and corn bunting also occur. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design.</p>
TPO	Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?		<p>AMBER = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Along the eastern boundary of the site adjoining the rear gardens of West Field there is a group of protected trees. In the parkland between Little Abington church and the river there are groups of protected trees – this parkland adjoins the south - eastern boundary of the site.</p>
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
LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on landscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>Great and Little Abington are two villages separated only by the River Granta. They are set in the chalkland landscape of South Cambridgeshire with rolling hills framing the settlements. The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (SCVS) 1998 describes the landscape setting along the valley of the River</p>

			<p>Granta on approaching the villages as flat enclosed arable fields between the A11 (T), Cambridge Road and the dismantled railway. These fields abut the western edge of the village. By the river itself the land is more wooded and enclosed. The cricket ground and recreation ground combine to form a rural gap between the two settlements.</p> <p>The views of the villages from the approaches are mainly screened, both by hedgerows alongside the woods and also due to the mature trees and hedgerows around the settlement.</p> <p>The two villages form almost a complete crescent around the enclosed rural setting of the River Granta, creating an intimate and rural village setting.</p> <p>The site is within one of the flat enclosed arable fields to the west of Little Abington. The SCVCS identifies this as being a well defined but harsh edge to the village abutting houses – this well-defined edge is listed as a key attribute. The houses that abut the site have large gardens with well established hedges and some protected trees along their boundaries with the site. Views into the site are screened by these.</p> <p>To the south east of the site is woodland (Sluice Wood) which extends south to the River Granta and follows the southern boundary of the houses in West Field. This wooded area links with the protected trees in the parkland between Little Abington Church and the river. The SCVCS identifies this as a soft rural village edge with the River Granta and groups of woodland combining to create an intimate enclosed landscape.</p> <p>Along Bourn Bridge Road there is no physical boundary so there are uninterrupted views south across the site towards the wooded valley of the River Granta. There are open views from the site looking north across adjacent large arable fields.</p> <p>Development of this site would have a major adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Little Abington because it would be the loss of land which creates an approach to the village with a rural character and would impact on the setting of a number of listed buildings including the Parish Churches of Little Abington and Great Abington as well as Great Abington</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>Hall which are all Grade II*. There would be loss of open landscape, which forms part of the Repton designed landscape to Abington Hall which incorporated the Churches.</p>
Townscape	<p>Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?</p>		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on townscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>Great and Little Abington are two villages separated only by the River Granta. They are set in the chalkland landscape of South Cambridgeshire with rolling hills framing the settlements. The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (SCVS) 1998 describes the landscape setting along the valley of the River Granta on approaching the villages as flat enclosed arable fields between the A11 (T), Cambridge Road and the dismantled railway. These fields abut the western edge of the village. By the river itself the land is more wooded and enclosed. The cricket ground and recreation ground combine to form a rural gap between the two settlements.</p> <p>The views of the villages from the approaches are mainly screened, both by hedgerows alongside the woods and also due to the mature trees and hedgerows around the settlement.</p> <p>The two villages form almost a complete crescent around the enclosed rural setting of the River Granta, creating an intimate and rural village setting.</p> <p>The site is within one of the flat enclosed arable fields to the west of Little Abington. The SCVCS identifies this as being a well defined but harsh edge to the village abutting houses – this well-defined edge is listed as a key attribute. The houses that abut the site have large gardens with well established hedges and some protected trees along their boundaries with the site. Views into the site are screened by these.</p> <p>To the south east of the site is woodland (Sluice Wood) which extends south to the River Granta and follows the southern boundary of the houses in West Field. This wooded area links with the protected trees in the parkland between Little Abington Church and the river. The SCVCS identifies this as a soft rural village edge with the River Granta and groups of woodland combining to create an intimate enclosed landscape.</p>

			<p>Along Bourn Bridge Road there is no physical boundary so there are uninterrupted views south across the site towards the wooded valley of the River Granta. There are open views from the site looking north across adjacent large arable fields.</p> <p>Development of this site would have a major adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Little Abington because it would be the loss of land which creates an approach to the village with a rural character and would impact on the setting of a number of listed buildings including the Parish Churches of Little Abington and Great Abington as well as Great Abington Hall which are all Grade II*. There would be loss of open landscape, which forms part of the Repton designed landscape to Abington Hall which incorporated the Churches.</p>
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		GREEN = No impact or Minor positive impact on Green Belt purposes
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>RED = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such sites, buildings and features, with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Conservation Area – lies to the south-east of the site. Major adverse effect on the setting of the CA due to the loss of the rural approach to the CA and of the open landscape, North Avenue and the wooded shelter belt forming part of the Repton designed landscape to Abington Hall at the core of the CA.</p> <p>Listed Buildings – To the north west of the site is The Temple café and restaurant – a Grade II listed building on the opposite side of Bourn Bridge Road – Major adverse effect on setting of Temple Farm due to loss of rural context. Little Abington church is a Grade II* listed building is to the south east of the site. Abington Hall is a Grade II* building within the Granta Park area south of the site – Major adverse effect on setting of group of buildings comprising Abington Hall and Parish Churches of Little Abington and Great Abington (Grade II*) due to the loss of open landscape, North Avenue and the wooded shelter belt forming part of the Repton designed landscape to Abington Hall which incorporated the Churches.</p> <p>Non-statutory archaeological site - Round</p>

			barrows and long barrows are known to the north and within this area. The area is also the site of the Babraham Water Meadows, constructed in the 16th century. We would object to the development of this site. It would not be possible to mitigate impacts on the earthworks associated with the medieval village because the County Archaeology Team has not indicated that this is achievable but instead have said that they would object to the development of the site.
CLIMATE CHANGE			
Renewables	Will it support the use of renewable energy resources?		AMBER = Standard requirements for renewables would apply
Flood Risk	Is site at flood risk?		GREEN = Flood Zone 1 / low risk  Flood Zone 1 and low risk of flooding from surface water.
HUMAN HEALTH AND WELL BEING			
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  0.75km ACF from centre of site to Great Abington Recreation Ground
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		RED = >800m  818m ACF from centre of the site to land at Great Abington Recreation Ground, High Street
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?		A = 400 - 800m  584m of nearest centre ACF (Little Abington, Church Close)
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  3,988m ACF from centre of site to Sawston Health Centre
Key Local Facilities	Will it improve quality and range of key local		AMBER = No impact on facilities (or satisfactory mitigation proposed).


	services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?)		No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development.
Community Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement / appropriate mitigation possible  No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development.
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?		AMBER = Adequate scope for integration with existing communities
<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  0.9km ACF from centre of site to South Cambridgeshire 017C (Granta Park)
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		G = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development
Utilities	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and		AMBER = Significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation

	infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?		
Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education capacity?		AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated  There is no school at Little Abington. Primary pupils attend Great Abington Primary School. School capacity not sufficient, but significant issues can be adequately addressed
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		R = >800m  932m ACF from centre of site to Great Abington Primary School
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		R = Greater than 3km  3.9km ACF from centre of site to Linton Village College
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		RED = No cycling provision or a cycle lane less than 1.5m width with medium volume of traffic. Having to cross a busy junction with high cycle accident rate to access local facilities/school. Poor quality off road path.
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		RED = Service does not meet the requirements of a high quality public transport (HQPT)
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 = 15
Distance: bus stop / rail station			GG = Within 400m (6)  347m to nearest bus stop ACF (Little Abington, Cambridge Road, No 37)
Frequency of Public Transport			A = 30 minute frequency (3)
Public transport journey time to City Centre			A = 31 to 40 minutes (3)
Distance for cycling to City Centre			A = 10km to 15 km (3)  11.8km ACF from centre of site to Cambridge
Distance:	How far is the site		R = >800m



Railway Station	from an existing or proposed train station?		4,714m ACF from centre of site to Whittlesford Station
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		<p>AMBER = Insufficient capacity / access. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>Regarding sites in Balsham / Castle Camps / Great Abington / Linton / Sawston area (estimated capacity 5513 dwellings on 22 sites) the Highway Agency comment that this group is made up predominantly of smaller in-fill or extension sites in and around smaller settlements. While some additional impacts could be felt on the SRN, particularly the M11 corridor, this group is perhaps less likely to threaten the efficient operation of the strategic road network (SRN).</p> <p>The Highway Authority has severe concerns with regards to the accident record of the A1307 and therefore before the proposed scheme comes forward a detailed analysis of access points onto the A1307 and A11 will need to be completed.</p> <p>For car journeys towards Cambridge vehicles are likely to use the A1307 passing through the busy A11 / A1307 junction close to the site.</p>
Non-Car Facilities	Will it make the transport network safer for public transport, walking or cycling facilities?		<p>AMBER = No impacts</p> <p>Small site, unlikely to offer significant improvements to sustainable infrastructure.</p> <p>As part of the A1307 study, being conducted by the City Deal team bus priority improvements on the corridor are being considered as one of the high level concepts. Concepts are anticipated to tie in with the Granta Park site to the north of this site and therefore provide a sustainable transport option should a HQPT solution of this nature come forward.</p>

### **Appendix 3 - Revised site proforma resulting from Councils' assessment of objections to scoring**

<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>New Settlement</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> SC057 & 238	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b> 5 (I&O 2012)	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Bourn Airfield, Bourn	
<b>Map:</b> 	
<b>Site description:</b> The site lies to the west of the settlements of Highfields and Caldecote, immediately south of the A428 trunk road (linking Cambridge with Bedford), to the north of the small settlement of Bourn, and to the east of the new settlement of Cambourne. By virtue of the historic use of the site as an airfield it is essentially devoid of natural vegetation and accordingly is very open in nature. The only developed parts on the site comprise aircraft hangers, industrial buildings and outside storage areas.	
<b>Current use(s):</b> Civil Aviation Authority Licensed Airfield for pilot training and private aircraft / Storage / Market / Agricultural	
<b>Proposed use(s):</b> New Village to the east of Cambourne with 3,000-3,500 dwellings, employment, retail, commercial uses, outdoor, outdoor recreation and park & ride	
<b>Site size (ha):</b> South Cambridgeshire: 151.1 ha. (including 9.4ha. for ThyssenKrupp employment site)	
<b>Potential residential capacity:</b> 3,500 dwellings	

<b>LAND</b>			
PDL	Would development make use of previously developed land?	AMBER = Partially on PDL	The site includes the runways and some aircraft hangers, industrial buildings and outside storage areas. The rest of the site is in agricultural use and therefore not PDL. Approximately one third of site PDL.

Agricultural Land	Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?		<p>RED = Significant loss (20 ha. or more) of grades 1 and 2 land</p> <p>Majority of site is Grade 2.</p> <p>UPDATE 2016: The promoter has undertaken a survey which shows a smaller area (less than 20 ha.) falls within Grades 1 and 2. If this is the case it would reduce the score from Red to Amber (Minor loss of grade 1 and 2 land).</p> <p>Bus priority measures and cycling and pedestrian improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge, planned to secure wider benefits would also be required to serve this site. This may require agricultural land if offline routes are identified.</p>
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.
<b>POLLUTION</b>			
Air Quality	Would the development of the sites result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?		<p>AMBER = Site lies near source of air pollution, or development could impact on air quality adverse impacts</p> <p>Despite this proposal not being adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area, it is of a significant size and therefore, there is a potential for an increase in traffic and static emissions that could affect local air quality. More information is required for this location, particularly details for air quality assessment and a low emission strategy.</p> <p>Bus priority measures and cycling and pedestrian improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge, planned to secure wider benefits would also be required to serve this site, are anticipated to have significant positive impacts in terms of air quality.</p>
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		GREEN = >1,000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14
Pollution	Are there potential Odour, light noise and vibration problems if the site		<p>AMBER = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation</p> <p>Noise issues - Environmental Health</p>

	is developed, as a receptor or generator (including compatibility with neighbouring uses)?		concerns about the site in 2012 relate to the former ThyssenKrupp manufacturing processes on the site. Note that the site is not currently in active use. The replacement of the existing industrial type uses with lower noise impact employment development more compatible with residential as required by the local plan policy proposed, with additional noise mitigation as appropriate and consideration of measures to mitigate traffic noise impacts from the A428 on future residential would address these concerns, through master planning and detailed design.
Contamination	Is there possible contamination on the site?		<p>AMBER = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development</p> <p>This site is previously an airfield and may have contaminated land. It will require investigation. Potential for minor benefits through remediation of minor contamination.</p>
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		<p>GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation</p> <p>Assumptions for a neutral impact are that appropriate standards and pollution control measures will be achieved through the development process, e.g. as part of Sustainable Drainage Systems (Suds).</p>
<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		<p>AMBER = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Adjoins Bucket Hill Plantation County Wildlife Site.</p> <p>Segregated bus priority measure between the junction of the A428/A1303 and the M11, planned to secure wider benefits would also be required to serve this site, may affect ancient woodland and BAP priority habitats. If works were able to be carried out on line this might alleviate the adverse effects.</p>
Biodiversity	Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance		AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation

	native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets, and maintain connectivity between green infrastructure))?		<p>Assumptions are that existing features that warrant retention can be retained or appropriate mitigation will be achieved through the development process. Greatest impact likely to be as a result of losing grassland habitats currently found within the airfield strips. Great crested newts are known to be in the vicinity and may also be adversely affected.</p> <p>Segregated bus priority measure between the junction of the A428/A1303 and the M11, planned to secure wider benefits as well as this site, may affect ancient woodland and BAP priority habitats. If works were able to be carried out on line this might alleviate the adverse effects.</p>
TPO	Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?		<p>AMBER = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>TPO present in hedge lines throughout the site with a significant woodland in the south east boundary (just off site).</p>
Green Infrastructure	Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery of and access to green infrastructure?		<p>GREEN = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure Opportunities for new green infrastructure within the wider AAP area.</p>
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		<p>GREEN = No impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local landscape character, or provide minor improvements)</p> <p>Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process.</p> <p>Bus priority measures and cycling and pedestrian improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge, planned to secure wider benefits would also be required to serve this site. The segregated bus priority measure between the junction of the A428/A1303 and the M11 may affect the Greenbelt. If works were able to be carried out on line this might alleviate some of the adverse effects.</p>
Townscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and		<p>GREEN = No impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local townscape character, or provide minor</p>

	distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?		<p>improvements)</p> <p>Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process.</p> <p>Bus priority measures and cycling and pedestrian improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge, planned to secure wider benefits would also be required to serve this site. The segregated bus priority measure between the junction of the A428/A1303 and the M11 may affect the Greenbelt. If works were able to be carried out on line this might alleviate some of the adverse effects.</p>
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		<p>GREEN = No impact or Minor positive impact on Green Belt purposes</p> <p>Bus priority measures and cycling and pedestrian improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge, planned to secure wider benefits would also be required to serve this site. The segregated bus priority measure between the junction of the A428/A1303 and the M11 may affect the Greenbelt. If works were able to be carried out on line this might alleviate some of the adverse effects.</p>
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>Setting of listed buildings to west and south west of site would be adversely affected by development. Archaeological potential will require further information but the assumption for a neutral impact is that it is likely appropriate mitigation can be achieved through the development process.</p> <p>Bus priority measures and cycling and pedestrian improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge, planned to secure wider benefits would also be required to serve this site. The segregated bus priority measure between the junction of the A428/A1303 and the M11 may affect the American Cemetery, a registered park and garden. If works were able to be carried out on line or an alternative alignment this might alleviate the adverse effects.</p>



<b>CLIMATE CHANGE</b>			
Renewables	Will it support the use of renewable energy resources?		<p>GREEN = Development would create additional opportunities for renewable energy.</p> <p>Development would create minor additional opportunities for renewable energy. A new settlement of this scale would be expected to include additional renewable energy options</p>
Flood Risk	Is site at flood risk?		<p>GREEN = Flood Zone 1 / low risk</p> <p>Flood Zone 1 and no drainage issues that cannot be appropriately addressed.</p>
<b>HUMAN HEALTH AND WELL BEING</b>			
Open Space	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space?		<p>GREEN = Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite</p> <p>Development would create opportunities for new public open space, including through delivery of green infrastructure.</p>
Distance: Outdoor Sport Facilities	How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?		<p>GREEN = &lt;1km</p> <p>Assumed provision on site</p>
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		<p>GREEN = &lt;400m</p> <p>Assumed provision on site</p>
Gypsy & Traveller	Will it provide for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?		<p>AMBER = No Impact</p>
Distance: District or Local Centre	How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?		<p>G = &lt;400m</p> <p>New village centre would be required. (Centre point of site beyond 1,000m of nearest existing centre)</p>
Distance: City Centre	How far is the site from edge of defined Cambridge City Centre?		<p>R = &gt;800m</p>
Distance: GP Service	How far is the nearest health centre or GP service?		<p>G = &lt;400m</p> <p>Assumed provision on site</p>
Key Local Facilities	Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including		<p>GREEN = New local facilities or improved existing facilities are proposed of significant benefit</p> <p>New settlement therefore would expect to</p>


	health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?)		be self sufficient and sustainable. Promoter has indicated that the settlement will be a mixed use sustainable community.
Community Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		<p>GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement / appropriate mitigation possible</p> <p>New local community / village hall or improved existing facility is proposed of minor benefit (and is viable and sustainable). The promoter has indicated that the new settlement will be self sufficient and sustainable.</p>
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?		<p>GREEN = No effect or would support the vitality and viability of existing centres</p> <p>Development would have no effect on vitality or viability of existing centres. The new settlement is proposed as being a self sufficient sustainable community.</p>
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
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		<p>DARK GREEN= Development would significantly enhance employment opportunities</p> <p>It is proposed that the new settlement be a mixed-use community therefore this would mitigate the loss of employment as a result of developing the airfield site. In addition the adjoining industrial site is proposed to be</p>

			redeveloped with employment uses compatible with the adjoining site would enable the new village to include a significant element of employment.
Utilities	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?		<p>AMBER = Significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Major utilities Infrastructure improvements required, but constraints can be addressed. There is insufficient spare mains water capacity within the distribution zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. The sewage network is at capacity.</p>
Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education capacity?		AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		<p>G = &lt;400m</p> <p>Assumed provision on site.</p>
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		<p>G = Within 1km (or site large enough to provide new)</p> <p>Assumed new secondary school provision on-site.</p>
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		<p>AMBER = Medium quality off-road path.</p> <p>TSCSC identifies an aim to create high quality pedestrian and cycling facilities alongside public transport improvements.</p> <p>The City Deal A428 public transport corridor scheme includes potential cycle improvements as part of the scheme (currently the subject of consultation), varying from off-road route options to more limited improvements such as cycle use of bus lanes. The City Deal programme includes the provision of a high quality cycle and pedestrian link between Cambourne and Cambridge, irrespective of whether this is provided through the A428 public transport scheme. Scored as amber, but potential for higher scores subject to the outcome of the City Deal scheme.</p>
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		<p>AMBER = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances</p> <p>TSCSC refers to services of at least 15 minute frequency. Potential for improved</p>

			<p>services in longer term.</p> <p>The City Deal A428 public transport corridor scheme includes bus priority and bus infrastructure improvements to improve journey time reliability (currently the subject of consultation).</p>
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.		<p>GREEN = Score 15-19 from 4 criteria below</p> <p>Total score of 17</p> <p>UPDATE: Score changed from 13 to 17 to reflect revised Public transport journey time to City Centre score.</p>
Distance: bus stop / rail station			<p>GG = Within 400m (6)</p> <p>Mitigation would include a segregated bus link through the development, providing good access to public transport. New public transport routes through the site to provide accessible services. (scoring revised for consistency with other major sites with new public transport provision)</p> <p>(Currently 820m ACF from the centre of the site to nearest bus stop).</p>
Frequency of Public Transport			<p>G = 20 minute frequency (4)</p> <p>TSCSC requires creation of a High Quality Public Transport corridor linking the new village to Cambridge.</p> <p>HQPT corridor would create bus service frequency of 15 minutes or better.</p> <p>(Currently Citi 4 - 20 minute frequency)</p>
Public transport journey time to City Centre			<p>G = 21 to 30 minutes (4)</p> <p>Potential Journey time improvements identified by the A428 Cambourne to Cambridge Corridor Study would reduce journey time to below 30 mins (currently 33 mins from existing bus stop).</p> <p>UPDATE: Change of score from Amber to Green</p>
Distance for cycling to City Centre			<p>A = 10km to 15 km (3)</p> <p>10.81km ACF from the centre of the site to Cambridge Market.</p>
Distance:	How far is the site		R = >800m

Railway Station	from an existing or proposed train station?		12,221m ACF from centre of the site to Shepreth Station.
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		<p>AMBER = Insufficient capacity / access. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>UPDATE: No capacity constraints identified specifically in regard to the site access, safe access can be achieved. The development will need two points of access. The promoter has stated that the transport strategy will include innovative public transport proposals. A428 Caxton to Blackcat is identified in the Road Investment Strategy: Investment Plan - Department for Transport (December 2014)</p> <p>A full Transport Assessment and Residential Travel Plan would be required. Highway Authority has highlighted the A1303 Madingley Road corridor into Cambridge has capacity problems (especially at M11 Junction 13). Also Park and Ride at Madingley Road capacity may need upgrading. This development will also have an impact on the A1198/A428 Caxton Gibbet roundabout which already experiences congestion, also on the A428 single carriageway section between St Neots and Caxton Gibbet.</p> <p>Detailed mitigation measures and the identification of appropriate financial contributions and obligations under Section 106 will be identified based on the appraisal of the Transport Assessment for the site and will need to take account and facilitate the delivery of schemes identified through the City Deal Programme for the A428 and Madingley Road corridors.</p>
Non-Car Facilities	Will it make the transport network safer for public transport, walking or cycling facilities?		<p>GREEN = Significant improvements to public transport, cycling, walking facilities</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. Opportunities to contribute to wider improvements on the A428 corridor.</p> <p>UPDATE: The County Council consolidated and confirmed its approach towards development on the St Neots and Cambourne to Cambridge Transport</p>

			<p>Corridor in its Transport Strategy 2013 which provides for a development at Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield and which models the transport impacts of development proposals. The measures include: an outer Park and Ride site, extensive bus priority and bus infrastructure improvements including on the A428 and A1303 and extending as far as Queens Road in Cambridge, and within and between the new developments, bus priority measures at the A428/A1198 roundabout, cycling infrastructure including links to Cambridge and measures to mitigate traffic impacts on local villages</p>
--	--	--	---

<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>New Settlement</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> SC265 REVISED DEVELOPER PROPOSAL	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b> N/A	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land to the north of the A428, Cambourne	
<b>Map:</b> 	
<p><b>Site description:</b> Larger site than SC265, includes land between Knapwell Road and Brockley Road, north of the old St. Neots Road.</p> <p>The area is fairly open and rolling, and is cut by the valleys of several small streams. Land falls from the south towards Knapwell to the north. The main settlement of Cambourne lies directly to the south of the site, separated from it by the A428, the old St Neots Road and areas of maturing structure planting and woodland.</p> <p>The site can be accessed via the Old St Neots Road, including the roundabout junction with the A428 and Knapwell Road. Several farm accesses provide access at present. Three public footpaths run south to north from the Old St Neots road towards Knapwell.</p> <p>Within the site area are three farms: Lawn Farm on the western boundary, Coldharbour Farm in the centre, and Knapwell Wood Farm on the eastern edge. Farm complexes at Lawn Farm and Coldharbour Farm fall within the site. The group of farm buildings at Knapwell Wood Farm lie adjacent to the site's eastern boundary.</p> <p>The site contains many mature trees and hedgerows, linking areas of mature woodland. Large mature roadside trees are a feature of Knapwell Road to the east of the site. The field pattern of medium to large scale fields are bounded by mature hedgerows and hedgerows and large hedgerow trees, mainly Oak and Ash. The area contains many small areas of mature woodland, often in the valley bottoms of small streams which cut through the site.</p> <p><b>Current use(s):</b> The site consists of agricultural land, Lawn Farm and Coldharbour Farm.</p>	



<b>Proposed use(s):</b> Promoters propose 3,500 homes that integrate with Cambourne using new footpath / cycleway links over the A428, employment, retail, leisure and community facilities accessible from Cambourne that complement existing facilities and services. A network of green routes with access to landscaped parkland.
<b>Site size (ha):</b> South Cambridgeshire: 271.65 ha.
<b>Potential residential capacity:</b> 3,500 dwellings

<b>LAND</b>			
PDL	Would development make use of previously developed land?		RED = Not on PDL  The site includes 2 farm complexes creating a very small area of previously developed land.
Agricultural Land	Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?		RED = Significant loss (20 ha or more) of grades 1 and 2 land  Significant loss (20 hectares or more) of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2) - the whole site is Grade 2  Bus priority measures and cycling and pedestrian improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge, planned to secure wider benefits would also be required to serve this site. This may require agricultural land if offline routes are identified.
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded 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 Development could impact on air quality, with minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation.  The site is of a significant size and there is the potential for an increase in traffic and static emissions that could affect local air quality.  Bus priority measures and cycling and pedestrian improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge, planned to secure wider benefits would also be required to serve this site, are anticipated to have significant positive impacts in terms of air quality.
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA,		GREEN = >1,000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14

	the M11 or the A14?		
Pollution	Are there potential Odour, light noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator (including compatibility with neighbouring uses)?		<p>RED = Significant adverse impacts</p> <p>Significant negative impacts to or as a result of the development that are incapable of mitigation. The site is close to commercial and industrial units and the Motocross site, and offsite mitigation is likely to be required. Some possible noise and vibration from A428 which should be possible to mitigate.</p> <p>UPDATE 2016: The promoter proposes to relocate the motocross as part of the proposals for the site; this would improve the score from Red to Amber (Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation).</p>
Contamination	Is there possible contamination on the site?		GREEN = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		<p>GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation</p> <p>Development unlikely to effect water quality. Assumptions for a neutral impact are that appropriate standards and pollution control measures will be achieved through the development process, e.g. as part of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).</p>
<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		<p>AMBER = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Minor negative impact on protected sites and species. The site is adjacent to Knapwell Roadside Verge CWS and Knapwell Wood CWS. Brockley End Meadow CWS lies 540m to the west of the site. Elsworth Wood SSSI lies approximately 530m to the west of the site.</p> <p>Segregated bus priority measure between the junction of the A428/A1303 and the M11, planned to secure wider benefits would also be required to serve this site,, may affect ancient woodland and BAP priority habitats. If works were able to be carried out on line this might alleviate some of the adverse effects.</p>
Biodiversity	Would development		AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or

	reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets, and maintain connectivity between green infrastructure)?		<p>network links but capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Minor negative impact as loss of farmland and severance of hedgerows. Some opportunities for habitat enhancement.</p> <p>Segregated bus priority measure between the junction of the A428/A1303 and the M11, planned to secure wider benefits would also be required to serve this site,, may affect ancient woodland and BAP priority habitats. If works were able to be carried out on line this might alleviate some of the adverse effects.</p>
TPO	Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?		<p>AMBER = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>There are a considerable number of trees with Tree Preservation Orders within the site area, including Knapwell Wood.</p>
Green Infrastructure	Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery of and access to green infrastructure?		<p>GREEN = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure</p> <p>(Score changed from Amber to Green)</p> <p>With the larger site, proposer suggests delivery of a network of green routes with access to landscaped parkland. Retain and enhance Elsworth Wood SSSI &amp; RSPB Farm. Creation of a web of new multi-functional Green Infrastructure, including a country park.</p>
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on landscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>Significant negative impact (development conflicts with landscape character, with significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation) - due to its elevation and open character, development on this site would form a new built skyline when viewed from local villages and roads. The scale of the development and types of buildings proposed would be very difficult to integrate into the local landscape. The deeply rural approach to Knapwell would be urbanised and the village itself completely dominated by the development, and the detailed and layered landscape to the north of the site would become obscured by the development.</p>

			<p>Bus priority measures and cycling and pedestrian improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge, planned to secure wider benefits would also be required to serve this site. The segregated bus priority measure between the junction of the A428/A1303 and the M11 may affect the Greenbelt. If works were able to be carried out on line this might alleviate some of the adverse effects.</p>
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>Neutral impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local townscape character). Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process.</p> <p>Bus priority measures and cycling and pedestrian improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge, planned to secure wider benefits would also be required to serve this site. The segregated bus priority measure between the junction of the A428/A1303 and the M11 may affect the Greenbelt. If works were able to be carried out on line this might alleviate some of the adverse effects.</p>
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		<p>GREEN = No impact or Minor positive impact on Green Belt purposes</p> <p>Bus priority measures and cycling and pedestrian improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge, planned to secure wider benefits would also be required to serve this site. The segregated bus priority measure between the junction of the A428/A1303 and the M11 may affect the Greenbelt. If works were able to be carried out on line this might alleviate some of the adverse effects.</p>
Heritage	Will it protect or enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation		<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>Neutral impact (existing features retained, or appropriate mitigation possible). The site will have an impact on the setting of the</p>

	areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments)?		<p>listed buildings at New Inn Farm. Archaeological potential will require further information but the assumption for a neutral impact is that it is likely appropriate mitigation can be achieved through the development process.</p> <p>Bus priority measures and cycling and pedestrian improvements between Cambourne and Cambridge, planned to secure wider benefits would also be required to serve this site. The segregated bus priority measure between the junction of the A428/A1303 and the M11 may affect the American Cemetery, a registered park and garden. If works were able to be carried out on line or an alternative alignment this might alleviate the adverse effects.</p>
<b>CLIMATE CHANGE</b>			
Renewables	Will it support the use of renewable energy resources?		<p>AMBER = Standard requirements for renewables would apply</p> <p>Development could create minor additional opportunities for renewable energy.</p>
Flood Risk	Is site at flood risk?		<p>GREEN = Flood Zone 1 / low risk</p> <p>Flood Zone 1 and no drainage issues that cannot be appropriately addressed.</p>
<b>HUMAN HEALTH AND WELL BEING</b>			
Open Space	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space?		<p>GREEN = Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite</p> <p>Development would create minor opportunities for new public open space.</p>
Distance: Outdoor Sport Facilities	How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?		<p>GREEN =&lt;1km</p> <p>Assumed provision on site.</p>
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		<p>GREEN =&lt;400m</p> <p>Assumed provision on-site</p>
Gypsy & Traveller	Will it provide for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?		<p>AMBER = No Impact</p>
Distance: District or Local Centre	How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?		<p>G = &lt;400m</p> <p>Centre point of site beyond 1000m of nearest existing centre.</p>

			New local centre developed as part of 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?		G = <400m  Existing site at Cambourne over 800m Promoter proposes medical facilities on-site, Would result in a green score.  UPDATE: Score changed from Red to Green to reflect on-site provision.
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?)		GREEN = New local facilities or improved existing facilities are proposed of significant benefit  New local facilities or improved existing facilities are proposed of significant benefit. The development proposes employment, retail and leisure uses.
Community Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement /appropriate mitigation possible  New local community facilities or improved existing facility is proposed of minor benefit (and is viable and sustainable
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?		RED = Limited scope for integration with existing communities / isolated and/or separated by non-residential land uses  It will be difficult to view this development an extension of Cambourne given the separation by the A428, other roads and structural landscaping to the south.
<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		GREEN = No effect or would support the vitality and viability of existing centres  The assumption is that any additional retail


	vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres?		proposed will only be of a suitable scale to serve the needs of new residents and will not impact on other 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
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		GREEN = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development  Promoter proposes a range of employment uses, including 'start-up/incubator' units;
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 but constraints capable of appropriate mitigation  Major utilities infrastructure improvements required, but constraints can be addressed.  Development of this site is not supportable from the existing electricity network, therefore significant reinforcement and new network required. There is insufficient spare capacity within the distribution zone to supply the total number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites with the zone were to be developed.  The WwTW is operating close to capacity and therefore has limited capacity to accommodate this site.  The sewerage network is approaching capacity.
Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education capacity?		AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated  School capacity not sufficient, but significant issues can be adequately addressed.
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		G = <400m  Assume provision on site
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		G = Within 1km (or site large enough to provide new)  Potential to provide new secondary school, or be served by existing Cambourne site, depending whether this development would take place in combination with others. Promoter proposes new secondary school on-site.



TRANSPORT			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		<p>AMBER = Medium quality off-road path.</p> <p>TSCSC identifies an aim to create high quality pedestrian and cycling facilities alongside public transport improvements. The Madingley Road / A428 Cambourne to Cambridge Corridor Study Draft Interim Report 2015 supporting the City Deal Scheme identifies potential for cycling improvements, ranging from cycle use of new bus lanes to cycling facilities alongside offline routes. Scored as amber, but potential for higher scores subject to the outcome of the City Deal scheme. Potential for connection with wider A428 corridor improvements.</p> <p>Ensuring adequate access to Cambourne town centre would be a key issue that would need to be addressed, given the potential severance effect of the A428.</p> <p>The City Deal A428 public transport corridor scheme includes potential cycle improvements as part of the scheme, varying from off-road route options to more limited improvements. The City Deal programme includes the provision of a high quality cycle and pedestrian link between Cambourne and Cambridge, irrespective of whether this is provided through the A428 public transport scheme.</p>
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		<p>AMBER = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances</p> <p>Potential for higher frequencies in combination with other sites, but uncertainty how this would relate to the existing village or other potential developments with regard to frequency from this site or impact on other sites.</p>
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.		<p>GREEN = Score 15-19 from 4 criteria below</p> <p>Total score 16</p> <p>UPDATE: Score changed from Amber to Green to reflect revised score for Distance: bus stop / rail station.</p>
Distance: bus stop / rail			GG = Within 400m (6)

station			<p>UPDATE: Score changed from Amber to Dark Green</p> <p>Development of this scale would require new dedicated bus routes through the site. Promoter identifies potential for circular routes in combination with a Cambourne West development.</p> <p>(Currently 1,205m ACF from the centre of the site to the nearest bus stop (Citi 4 service) (---)).</p>
Frequency of Public Transport			<p>G = 20 minute frequency (4)</p> <p>UPDATE: Potential for higher frequencies in combination with other sites, but uncertainty how this would relate to the existing village or other potential developments with regard to frequency from this site or impact on other sites.</p> <p>A 15 minute frequency or better (this is identified in the TSCSC related to the A428 corridor and sites in the submitted Local Plan).</p> <p>(Currently Citi 4 - 20 minute Frequency (+))</p>
Public transport journey time to City Centre			<p>A = 31 to 40 minutes (3)</p> <p>35 minutes from bus stop to the centre of Cambridge.</p> <p>UPDATE: Potential to achieve journey time benefits from City Deal A428 scheme, but uncertainty how this would relate to the existing village or other potential developments with regard to journey time from this site or impact on other sites.</p>
Distance for cycling to City Centre			<p>A = 10km to 15 km (3)</p> <p>10.21km ACF from the centre of the site to St. Ives Market.</p> <p>12.68km ACF from the centre of the site to Cambridge Market.</p>
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		<p>R = &gt;800m</p> <p>12,634m ACF from centre of the site to St Neots Station.</p>
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		<p>AMBER = Insufficient capacity / access. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>Development would have a direct impact on</p>

			<p>A428 with potential capacity issues at the Cambourne Junction and on the corridor between Cambridge and St. Neots / Bedford, particularly junctions at either end of this section.</p> <p>UPDATE: A428 Caxton to Blackcat is identified in the Road Investment Strategy: Investment Plan - Department for Transport (December 2014). A full Transport Assessment and Residential Travel Plan would be required. Highway Authority has highlighted the A1303 Madingley Road corridor into Cambridge has capacity problems (especially at M11 Junction 13). Also Park and Ride at Madingley Road capacity may need upgrading. This development will also have an impact on the A1198/A428 Caxton Gibbet roundabout which already experiences congestion, also on the A428 single carriageway section between St Neots and Caxton Gibbet.</p> <p>Detailed mitigation measures and the identification of appropriate financial contributions and obligations under Section 106 will be identified based on the appraisal of the Transport Assessment for the site and will need to take account and facilitate the delivery of schemes identified through the City Deal Programme for the A428 and Madingley Road corridors.</p>
Non-Car Facilities	Will it make the transport network safer for public transport, walking or cycling facilities?		<p>AMBER = No impacts</p> <p>There are opportunities 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>

<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Edge of Cambridge (Broad Location 2)</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> CCSC1001	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b> N/A	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land north of Barton Road (Developer Proposal)	
<b>Map:</b> 	
<p><b>Site description:</b> The site lies to the north of Barton Road on the western edge of Cambridge. The site adjoins residential development on the edge of Cambridge to the east and the M11 and its slip road and Cotton Road lie to the west. The site is surrounded by agricultural land. The site, in the main, comprises a series of large exposed agricultural fields surrounding Laundry Farm, and recreation grounds on the north eastern part of the land south of Barton Road. Most of the fields are surrounded by low level hedgerow and occasional hedgerow trees, giving an open appearance, particularly from the M11, Cotton Road and surrounding land further to the west, although the Barton Road frontage is well screened with tall hedgerow.</p>	
<p><b>Current use(s):</b> Agricultural.</p>	
<p><b>Proposed use(s):</b> Approximately 1,500 dwellings, supported by a Local Centre, school, open space (including relocated sports pitches for colleges), green infrastructure, cycle and footpath links to surrounding area; and access roads.</p>	
<p><b>Site size (ha):</b> South Cambridgeshire: 164.11 ha. (total for whole sites) Cambridge: 156.96 ha (total for whole sites)</p> <p>NOTE: The site is smaller than the totality of all of the 4 sites combined, as only parts of some sites are included.</p>	
<p><b>Potential residential capacity:</b> 1,500 dwellings</p>	

<b>LAND</b>			
PDL	Would development make use of previously developed land?		RED = Not on PDL
Agricultural Land	Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?		<p>GREEN = Neutral. Development would not affect grade 1 and 2 land.</p> <p>Majority of site on Grade 3 land with a small amount of urban land and Grade 2 land.</p>
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		<p>GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.</p> <p>The adopted Core Strategy, Policy CS16, identifies Cambridge south as a Broad Location for a new Household Recycling Centre (HRC). This site falls within the broad location and catchment area for Cambridge South. Policy CS16 requires major developments to contribute to the provision of HRCs, consistent with the adopted RECAP Waste Management Guide. Contributions may be required in the form of land and/or capital payments. This outstanding infrastructure deficit for an HRC must be addressed, such infrastructure is a strategic priority in the NPPF.</p>
<b>POLLUTION</b>			
Air Quality	Would the development of the sites result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?		<p>RED = Site lies near source of air pollution, or development could impact on air quality, significant adverse impacts</p> <p>Air quality issues – Less than 1,000m from the M11. There is a potential for significant increases in traffic emissions and static emissions that could affect local air quality, especially within Cambridge City. Extensive and detailed air quality assessments, in line with local policy and in liaison with Cambridge City Council, will be required to assess the impact of such a development at pre-application stage.</p>
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		<p>RED = Within or adjacent to an AQMA, M11 or A14</p> <p>Site less than 1,000 metres from M11. An air quality assessment is essential</p>
Pollution	Are there potential Odour, light noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a		<p>AMBER = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation</p> <p>Noise impacts - The west of the site bounds the M11 including M11 junction 12 / Barton</p>

	receptor or generator (including compatibility with neighbouring uses)?		<p>Road roundabout and Barton Road intersects the site. There are high levels of ambient / diffuse traffic noise and other noise sources include Laundry Farm and the Animal Breeding Centre. Noise likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises. The impact of existing noise on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well being and providing a high quality living environment. Site similar to North West Cambridge and at least half the site nearest M11 and to lesser distance from Barton Road either side is likely to be NEC C (empty site) for night: PPG24 advice "Planning permission should not normally be granted. Where it is considered that permission should be given, for example because there are no alternative quieter sites available, conditions should be imposed to ensure a commensurate level of protection against noise". Residential could be acceptable with high level of mitigation. However before this site is allocated for residential development it is recommended that these noise threats / constraints are thoroughly investigated in accordance noise guidance to determine the suitability of the site for residential use. This site requires a full noise assessment including consideration of any noise attenuation measures such as noise barriers / berms and practical / technical feasibility / financial viability.</p> <p>In mitigation, proposers indicative masterplan includes separation of residential development from the Motorway. Other environmental conditions (e.g. fumes, vibration, dust) - possible malodour from Laundry Farm. Minor to moderate risk.</p>
Contamination	Is there possible contamination on the site?		<p>AMBER = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development (potential to achieve benefits subject to appropriate mitigation)</p> <p>Site has former potentially contaminative uses. A contamination assessment is required</p>
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		<p>GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation</p>

<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		<p>AMBER = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>The hedgerows to the east of the M11 are designated as a County Wildlife Site.</p>
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)?		<p>AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>The site noted that otters, Biodiversity features - A phase 1 habitat survey (2004) of part of water voles, badgers, foxes, deer, and a variety of birds use the site. It is also suitable for bats and reptiles. The Barton Road frontage contains a number of broad-leaved trees, and the remnants of an orchard. There are also a number of hedgerows, including the one that follows the District boundary and broadens into a tree belt. There are a number of wet ditches present, including the Bin Brook which runs along the Barton Road frontage, noted to be of high value due to the presence of water voles. The phase 1 study recommends retention of the semi-improved grassland and orchards, and to retain and enhance ditch habitat. If the site were allocated for development an updated survey would be required.</p> <p>With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the natural environment.</p>
TPO	Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?		<p>AMBER = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>There are two groups of protected trees near the M11 slip road in the western part of the site, and a group along the southern boundary of the site.</p>
Green Infrastructure	Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery of and access to		<p>GREEN = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure</p> <p>Promoters indicative masterplan indicates 72ha of public open space and new habitat.</p>



	green infrastructure?		
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on landscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>The landscape is strongly rural despite being on the urban edge and adjacent to the M11. Development would have a negative impact. The existing high quality, rural, soft green edge would be negatively impacted if development occurred on the site. Development of this site would have a severe negative impact on the purposes of Green Belt.</p>
Townscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on townscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>The setting of the City would be negatively impacted by development by compromising the openness of the area, interrupting views of the historic city, have a negative impact on setting and changing the urban edge. There are open views of the site from the west and south. Existing clear views to historic and collegiate core of the City would be severely, negatively impacted if development occurred on the site.</p> <p>Development of this site would have a severe negative impact on the purposes of Green Belt.</p>
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		<p>DARK RED: Very high and high impacts on Greenbelt purposes (very significant negative impact)</p> <p>Development of this site would have a severe negative impact on the purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>UPDATE INNER GREEN BOUNDARY STUDY 2015</p> <p>The study notes that this sector (Sector 3) plays a key role in the setting of the west of Cambridge, ensuring that the city remains compact and that the historic core remains large in comparison to the size of the city as a whole. It retains open countryside close to the centre of the city and prevents the sprawl of built development as far as the M11, retaining the distinctive separation between the edge of the city and the M11.</p>

			<p>This is in sharp contrast to the relationship of the city edge with the A14 to the north of Cambridge. Views towards Cambridge from the west are some of the most distinctive and characteristic available, with the rural landscape of the sector forming the foreground in those views. Sub area 3.2 exhibits less of these features due to its higher degree of visual screening. However, it remains important to the character of the approach to Cambridge along Barton Road.</p> <p>It is unlikely that any development within this sector could be accommodated without substantial harm to Green Belt purposes. Development within sub areas 3.1 or 3.2 would remove the characteristic setting to the city, diminish both in reality and in perception, the presence of countryside close to the distinctive core of Cambridge and obstruct key views. Within sub area 3.2, development would also alter the characteristic approach into Cambridge along Barton Road. Within sub area 3.3, development would impact on the relationship with the distinctive townscape within the West Cambridge Conservation Area and would remove the closest area of countryside to the historic core. No Green Belt release should be contemplated in this sector.</p>
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>Site does not contain or adjoin listed buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings. The eastern end of Barton Road, lies within the West Cambridge Conservation area. The site is located on the route of a Roman road running south west from Cambridge.</p> <p>Previous fieldwork in the area has confirmed the survival of significant remains of late prehistoric date. Further information would be necessary in advance of any planning application for this site. Results of pre-determination evaluation to be submitted with any planning application to inform a planning decision.</p>
<b>CLIMATE CHANGE</b>			
Renewables	Will it support the		AMBER = Standard requirements for

	use of renewable energy resources?		renewables would apply
Flood Risk	Is site at flood risk?		<p>AMBER = Flood Zone 2 / medium risk</p> <p>Fairly significant surface water flooding along watercourse corridor and towards Barton Road. Careful mitigation required which could impact on achievable site densities as greater level of green infrastructure required.</p> <p>Could provide a positive flood risk benefit for Bin Brook if undertaken in right way. Promoters indicative masterplan proposes to only place water compatible uses in areas identified in Flood Zones 2 &amp; 3 on Barton Road frontage.</p>
<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
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		GREEN = <400m or onsite provision
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?		<p>G = &lt;400m</p> <p>Local centre proposed on-site.</p>
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?		<p>A = 400 - 800m</p> <p>Site is over 800m from nearest GP service and would merit a Red. It is however large enough to justify it being required to provide its own health facility and so scores Amber</p>
Key Local Facilities	Will it improve quality and range of key local		GREEN = New local facilities or improved existing facilities are proposed of significant benefit

	services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?)		
Community Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement /appropriate mitigation possible
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing 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
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		GREEN = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development
Utilities	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications		AMBER = Significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation  Utility services (e.g. pylons) – power lines run across the south western corner of the land north of Barton Road.

	infrastructure and broadband?		<p>Electricity - Not supportable from existing network. Significant reinforcement and new network required.</p> <p>Mains water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</p> <p>Gas - Medium Pressure reinforcement would be required to support the full load.</p> <p>Mains sewerage - This proposed site straddles three WWTW catchments; Haslingfield WWTW and Coton WWTW - a revised consent for these WWTW will be required prior to being able to accommodate the full proposal. They can currently accommodate approximately 1,000 and 50 properties respectively. Cambridge WWTW - significant infrastructure upgrades will be required to the network to accommodate this proposal. An assessment will be required to determine the full impact of this site.</p>
Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education capacity?		<p>AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated</p> <p>UPDATE: The development of the sites north and south of Barton Road for a combined 2,500 dwellings could generate a need for 313 early years places and a maximum of 875 (4FE) primary school places and 625 (4FE) secondary places.</p> <p>On this site north of Barton Road, the County Council would therefore expect appropriate on-site early years and primary education provision to be made.</p> <p>On-site Secondary provision may be</p>

			required, but this would need to be addressed in terms of the total number of new dwellings proposed in the area. If in combination with the site to the south of Barton road there would be a requirement for 4 FE which could be provided in the form of a new school.
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		G = <400m  Assume onsite provision.
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		A = 1 to 3 km
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		GREEN = Quiet residential street speed below 30mph, cycle lane with 1.5m minimum width, high quality off-road path e.g. cycleway adjacent to guided busway.  UPDATE 2016: Score changed from Amber to Green to reflect the potential for cycle access to quiet residential streets, as shown on the Cambridge Cycle Map.
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		AMBER = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances  Barton Road currently does not benefit from HQPT. More frequent services nearby services on the Madingley Road corridor. Improved services would be secured form this scale of development, but unlikely to meet HQPT.  UPDATE: score changed from Red to Amber
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.		DARK GREEN = Score 19-25  Total Score = 22
Distance: bus stop / rail station			GG = Within 400m (6)  Newnham, Gough Way A strategic development in this location would require new bus routes through the site, providing closer access to bus stops. Promoter proposes a bus route through the site.


			<p>A development of this scale would result in new bus stops being provided. (Currently nearest stop Newnham, Gough Way)</p> <p>UPDATE: Score change from Amber to Dark Green</p>
Frequency of Public Transport			<p>A = 30 minute frequency (3)</p> <p>UPDATE 2016: Note that higher frequency services are available outside the site (including at Grange Road).</p>
Public transport journey time to City Centre			<p>20 minutes or less (6)</p> <p>6 minutes (Newnham, Gough Way – Cambridge, Drummer Street)</p>
Distance for cycling to City Centre			<p>Up to 5km (6)</p> <p>2.1km ACF</p>
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		<p>R = &gt;800m</p>
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		<p>AMBER = Insufficient capacity / access. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>UPDATE: Access onto Barton Road A603 is feasible though the Highway Authority haven't offered a view on their preferred location. The Highway Authority would either seek a contribution via a Section 106 Agreement or require the developer to construct an orbital cycleway of Cambridge link through from West Cambridge.</p> <p>The impact on the M11 junctions 12 and 13 along with the local network would need to be modelled. Any development would need to consider how it would interlink with the Cambridge North West development and the infrastructure that will be implemented.</p> <p>A full Transport Assessment and Residential Travel Plan would be required. This is a main Cambridge radial route for cyclists so any development would need to ensure that cyclists are fully taken into account. S106 contributions and mitigation measures will be required where appropriate.</p> <p>From the LHA point of view, the key capacity concerns would be in relation to</p>



			<p>the impact at the junctions of Newnham Road with Fen Causeway, the Trumpington Road mini roundabouts and the junction of Silver Street with Queens Road. Any TA would 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>This site is of a scale that would trigger the need for a Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan (TP), regardless of the need for a full Environmental Impact Assessment. These sites are likely to be closely related to the M11 at Junctions 12 &amp; 13, but are also very well related to the City Centre. As such they would warrant a robust transport assessment before the Highways Agency could come to a definitive view.</p>
Non-Car Facilities	Will it make the transport network safer for public transport, walking or cycling facilities?		<p>GREEN = Significant improvements to public transport, cycling, walking facilities</p> <p>Large development with potential for significant improvement to public transport, walking or cycling facilities. Public transport improvements would be needed to provide a high-quality services, as there is currently limited services to this area.</p> <p>Improved cycling provision would be required on Barton Road, and off road links to Newnham, west Cambridge and the Cotton path.</p>

<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Edge of Cambridge (Broad Location 1)</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> CCSC1002	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b> N/A	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land south of Barton Road (Developer Proposal)	

**Map:**



**Site description:** The site lies to the south of Barton Road on the western edge of Cambridge. The site is surrounded by agricultural land. The site, in the main, comprises a series of large exposed agricultural fields. Most of the fields are surrounded by low level hedgerow and occasional hedgerow trees, giving an open appearance, particularly from the M11, Coton Road and surrounding land further to the west, although the Barton Road frontage is well screened with tall hedgerow.

**Current use(s):** Agricultural.

**Proposed use(s):** Residential development.

NOTE: Promoter seeks safeguarding of land for development beyond the plan period.

**Site size (ha):** South Cambridgeshire: 58.45 ha. Cambridge: 0

**Potential residential capacity:** 1,000 dwellings

<b>LAND</b>		
PDL	Would development make use of previously developed	RED = Not on PDL

	land?		
Agricultural Land	Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?		<p>GREEN = Neutral. Development would not affect grade 1 and 2 land.</p> <p>Majority of site on Grade 3 land with a small amount of urban land.</p>
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		<p>GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.</p> <p>The adopted Core Strategy, Policy CS16, identifies Cambridge south as a Broad Location for a new Household Recycling Centre (HRC). This site falls within the broad location and catchment area for Cambridge South. Policy CS16 requires major developments to contribute to the provision of HRCs, consistent with the adopted RECAP Waste Management Guide. Contributions may be required in the form of land and / or capital payments. This outstanding infrastructure deficit for an HRC must be addressed, such infrastructure is a strategic priority in the NPPF.</p>
<b>POLLUTION</b>			
Air Quality	Would the development of the sites result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?		<p>RED = Site lies near source of air pollution, or development could impact on air quality, significant adverse impacts</p> <p>Air quality issues – Less than 1000m from the M11. There is a potential for significant increases in traffic emissions and static emissions that could affect local air quality, especially within Cambridge City. Extensive and detailed air quality assessments, in line with local policy and in liaison with Cambridge City Council, will be required to assess the impact of such a development at pre-application stage.</p>
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		<p>RED = Within or adjacent to an AQMA, M11 or A14</p> <p>Site less than 1,000 metres from M11. An air quality assessment is essential</p> <p>UPDATE 2016: Note the promoter intends to locate built development away from the M11.</p>
Pollution	Are there potential Odour, light noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a		<p>AMBER = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation</p> <p>Noise impacts - The west of the site bounds the M11 including M11 junction 12 / Barton</p>

	receptor or generator (including compatibility with neighbouring uses)?		<p>Road roundabout and Barton Road intersects the site. There are high levels of ambient / diffuse traffic noise and other noise sources include Laundry Farm and the Animal Breeding Centre. Noise likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises. The impact of existing noise on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well being and providing a high quality living environment. Site similar to North West Cambridge and at least half the site nearest M11 and to lesser distance from Barton Road either side is likely to be NEC C (empty site) for night: PPG24 advice "Planning permission should not normally be granted. Where it is considered that permission should be given, for example because there are no alternative quieter sites available, conditions should be imposed to ensure a commensurate level of protection against noise". Residential could be acceptable with high level of mitigation. However before this site is allocated for residential development it is recommended that these noise threats / constraints are thoroughly investigated in accordance noise guidance to determine the suitability of the site for residential use. This site requires a full noise assessment including consideration of any noise attenuation measures such as noise barriers / berms and practical / technical feasibility / financial viability.</p> <p>There is potential to provide appropriate separation and mitigation form the motorway on this large site.</p>
Contamination	Is there possible contamination on the site?		<p>AMBER = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development (potential to achieve benefits subject to appropriate mitigation)</p> <p>Site has former potentially contaminative uses, and adjoins an area of filled land. A contamination assessment is required</p>
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		<p>GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation</p>
<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated	Will it conserve		<p>AMBER = Contains or is adjacent to an</p>

Sites	protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		<p>existing site designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Site is adjacent to Barton Road pool County Wildlife Site, designated because it is a Grade C site in the JNCC Invertebrate Site Register supporting the nationally Notable B Musk Beetle (<i>Aromia moschata</i>)</p>
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)?		<p>AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>The site noted that otters, Biodiversity features - A phase 1 habitat survey (2004) of part of water voles, badgers, foxes, deer, and a variety of birds use the site. It is also suitable for bats and reptiles. The Barton Road frontage contains a number of broad-leaved trees, and the remnants of an orchard. There are also a number of hedgerows, including the one that follows the District boundary and broadens into a tree belt. There are a number of wet ditches present, including the Bin Brook which runs along the Barton Road frontage, noted to be of high value due to the presence of water voles. The phase 1 study recommends retention of the semi-improved grassland and orchards, and to retain and enhance ditch habitat. If the site were allocated for development an updated survey would be required.</p> <p>With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the natural environment.</p>
TPO	Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?		<p>AMBER = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>There are protected trees along the southern boundary of the site.</p>
Green Infrastructure	Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery of and access to green infrastructure?		<p>GREEN = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure</p> <p>Site could deliver significant green infrastructure, but scale is uncertain.</p>
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			

Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on landscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>The landscape is strongly rural despite being on the urban edge and adjacent to the M11. Development would have a negative impact. The existing high quality, rural, soft green edge would be negatively impacted if development occurred on the site.</p> <p>Development of this site would have a severe negative impact on the purposes of Green Belt.</p>
Townscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on townscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>The setting of the City would be negatively impacted by development by compromising the openness of the area, interrupting views of the historic city, have a negative impact on setting and changing the urban edge. There are open views of the site from the west and south. Existing clear views to historic and collegiate core of the City would be severely, negatively impacted if development occurred on the site.</p> <p>Development of this site would have a severe negative impact on the purposes of Green Belt.</p>
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		<p>DARK RED: Very high and high impacts on Greenbelt purposes (very significant negative impact)</p> <p>Development of this site would have a severe negative impact on the purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>UPDATE INNER GREEN BOUNDARY STUDY 2015</p> <p>The study notes that this sector (Sector 4) plays a key role in the setting of the west and south west of Cambridge, ensuring that the city remains compact and that the historic core remains large in comparison to the size of the city as a whole. It retains open countryside close to the centre of the city and prevents the sprawl of built development towards the M11, retaining the distinctive separation between the edge of the city and the M11 in contrast to the relationship with the A14 to the north of Cambridge. It also retains the key</p>



			<p>separation between Cambridge and Grantchester, as a necklace village. Views towards Cambridge from the west are some of the most distinctive and characteristic available. Sub area 4.3 exhibits less of these features due to the presence of a concentration of sports facilities and enclosure by strong vegetation. The river corridor forms one of the key green corridors into the heart of the city and is an important route into Cambridge for pedestrians, cyclists and river users.</p> <p>It is unlikely that any development within this sector could be accommodated without substantial harm to Green Belt purposes. Any proposed development would severely compromise the separation between Cambridge and Grantchester. Development within sub area 1 would alter the characteristic approach into Cambridge along the River Cam and would disrupt the special qualities of one of the most important green corridors into the city. Within sub area 4.2, development would remove the characteristic rural setting to the city and obstruct key views, as well as potentially altering the characteristic approach into Cambridge along Barton Road. Sub area 4.3, although less rural in character, is an important area of green, open land extending close to the distinctive core of Cambridge; development in this sub area would potentially alter the Barton Road approach to the city and would have the potential to detract from the character and qualities of the Cam corridor in sub area 4.1. No Green Belt release should be contemplated in this sector.</p>
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>Site does not contain or adjoin listed buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings. The land south of Barton Road lies approximately 120m to the south west of the West Cambridge Conservation Area. The site is located on the route of a Roman road running south west from Cambridge. Previous fieldwork in the area has confirmed the survival of significant remains of late prehistoric date. Further information would be necessary in</p>



			<p>advance of any planning application for this site.</p> <p>Results of pre-determination evaluation to be submitted with any planning application to inform a planning decision</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>Located in Flood Zone 1. However, fairly significant surface water flooding along watercourse corridor and towards Barton Road. Careful mitigation required which could impact on achievable site densities as greater level of green infrastructure required.</p> <p>Could provide a positive flood risk benefit for Bin Brook if undertaken in right way.</p>
<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
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		GREEN = <400m or onsite provision
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?		<p>G = &lt;400m</p> <p>Assumed provision of local centre on site (Newnham around 1600m)</p>
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?		<p>A = 400 - 800m</p> <p>Site is over 800m from nearest GP service and would merit a Red. It is however large</p>


			enough to justify it being required to provide its own health facility and so scores Amber
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?)		GREEN = New local facilities or improved existing facilities are proposed of significant benefit
Community Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement / appropriate mitigation possible
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing 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
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		GREEN = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development
Utilities	Will it improve the level of investment		AMBER = Significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate

	in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?		<p>mitigation</p> <p>Utility services (e.g. pylons) – power lines run across the south western corner of the land north of Barton Road.</p> <p>Electricity - Not supportable from existing network. Significant reinforcement and new network required.</p> <p>Mains water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</p> <p>Gas - Medium Pressure reinforcement would be required to support the full load.</p> <p>Mains sewerage - This proposed site straddles three WWTW catchments; Haslingfield WWTW and Coton WWTW - a revised consent for these WWTW will be required prior to being able to accommodate the full proposal. They can currently accommodate approximately 1,000 and 50 properties respectively. Cambridge WWTW - significant infrastructure upgrades will be required to the network to accommodate this proposal. An assessment will be required to determine the full impact of this site.</p>
Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education capacity?		<p>AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated</p> <p>UPDATE: On this site south of Barton Road, the County Council would therefore expect appropriate on-site early years and primary education provision to be made</p> <p>On-site Secondary provision may be required, but this would need to be addressed in terms of the total number of new dwellings proposed in the area. If in</p>

			combination with the site to the north of Barton road there would be a requirement for 4 FE which could be provided in the form of a new school.
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		G = <400m Assume onsite provision.
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		A = 1 to 3 km
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		AMBER = Medium quality off-road path.  Existing part along Barton Road. Potential for improvement.
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		AMBER = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances  Barton Road currently does not benefit from HQPT.  With appropriate mitigation secured from the 1000 home development, a high quality 20min frequency service could be achievable.  UPDATE: Score changed form RED to AMBER
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.		DARK GREEN = Score 19-25  Total Score = 22  UPDATE: Score changed from Amber to Dark Green to reflect revised score for Distance: bus stop / rail station.
Distance: bus stop / rail station			GG = Within 400m (6)  Newnham, Gough Way A strategic development in this location would require new bus routes through the site, providing closer access to bus stops. (Currently nearest stop Newnham, Gough Way)  UPDATE: Score changed from Amber to Dark Green.
Frequency of Public Transport			A = 30 minute frequency (3)
Public transport			20 minutes or less (6)

journey time to City Centre			6 minutes (Newnham, Gough Way – Cambridge, Drummer Street)
Distance for cycling to City Centre			Up to 5km (6) 2.1km ACF
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		R = >800m
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		<p>AMBER = Insufficient capacity / access. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>UPDATE: Access onto Barton Road A603 is feasible though the Highway Authority haven't offered a view on their preferred location. The Highway Authority would either seek a contribution via a Section 106 Agreement or require the developer to construct an orbital cycleway of Cambridge link through from West Cambridge.</p> <p>The impact on the M11 junctions 12 and 13 along with the local network would need to be modelled. Any development would need to consider how it would interlink with the Cambridge North West development and the infrastructure that will be implemented.</p> <p>A full Transport Assessment and Residential Travel Plan would be required. This is a main Cambridge radial route for cyclists so any development would need to ensure that cyclists are fully taken into account. S106 contributions and mitigation measures will be required where appropriate.</p> <p>From the LHA point of view, the key capacity concerns would be in relation to the impact at the junctions of Newnham Road with Fen Causeway, the Trumpington Road mini roundabouts and the junction of Silver Street with Queens Road. Any TA would 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>This site is of a scale that would trigger the need for a Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan (TP), regardless of the need for a full Environmental Impact Assessment. These sites are likely to be closely related to</p>

			the M11 at Junctions 12 & 13, but are also very well related to the City Centre. As such they would warrant a robust transport assessment before the Highways Agency could come to a definitive view.
Non-Car Facilities	Will it make the transport network safer for public transport, walking or cycling facilities?		<p>GREEN = Significant improvements to public transport, cycling, walking facilities</p> <p>Large development with potential for significant improvement to public transport, walking or cycling facilities.</p>

<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Edge of Cambridge (Broad Location 5)</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> CCSC1004	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b> N/A	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land to the south of Addenbrooke's Road, Cambridge (Developer Proposal)	
<b>Map:</b> 	
<p><b>Site description:</b> The site comprises a number of large agricultural fields, situated to the south of the Addenbrooke's Road, east of the M11, north and west of Great Shelford, and north of the River Cam and the Cambridge – London Kings Cross railway line. Situated within flat, open landscape, it is mostly low-lying arable land with a number of hedges within the site. There are long views between the edge of Cambridge and the surrounding necklace villages to the south. The boundaries to residential properties to the east are well vegetated and the River Cam occupies a shallow, well treed valley bounded by pasture land. The northern and western boundaries are much more open, comprising sparse shrubs and few scattered shrubs and trees.</p>	
<b>Current use(s):</b> Agricultural.	
<p><b>Proposed use(s):</b> The promoters propose an employment-led mixed-use development comprising a 85,000 sqm Science Park and 1,250 homes, incorporating new local centre, primary school and open space.</p> <p>An area of Green Belt to be retained to the south to prevent coalescence between the urban edge of Cambridge and the main part of Great Shelford. New open space and habitat creation, including access to the river. Enhancements to the River Rhee Wildlife Corridor.</p>	
<b>Site size (ha):</b> South Cambridgeshire: 145 ha. Cambridge: 45 ha.	
<b>Potential residential capacity:</b> 1,250 dwellings	



<b>LAND</b>			
PDL	Would development make use of previously developed land?		RED = Not on PDL
Agricultural Land	Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?		RED = Significant loss (20 ha or more) of grades 1 and 2 land  Classification Grade 1, 2, 3a) – Grade 2.
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.  The adopted Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, Policy CS16, identifies Cambridge south as a Broad Location for a new Household Recycling Centre (HRC). This site falls within this broad location. Policy CS16 requires major developments to contribute to the provision of HRCs, consistent with the adopted RECAP Waste Management Guide. Contributions may be required in the form of land and / or capital payments. This outstanding infrastructure deficit for an HRC must be addressed, such infrastructure is a strategic priority in the NPPF.  This site does not fall within a Minerals Safeguarding Area; a WWTW or Transport Zone Safeguarding Area; or a Minerals or 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.  Despite this proposal not being adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area, it is potentially of a significant size and therefore, there is a potential for an increase in traffic and static emissions that could affect local air quality. More information is required for this location, particularly details for air quality assessment and a low emission strategy.
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		RED = Within or adjacent to an AQMA, M11 or A14  The submitted site is adjacent to the M11. Given the size of the site however parts of it are beyond 1,000m from the M11. If built

			<p>development were to be restricted to parts of the site the assessment could change to A Amber (within 1,000m of the M11), or G Green (beyond 1,000m of the M11).</p> <p>UPDATE 2016: Note the promoter intends to restrict development within 1,000m of the AQMA.</p>
Pollution	Are there potential Odour, light noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator (including compatibility with neighbouring uses)?		<p>AMBER = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation</p> <p>There are high levels of ambient / diffuse traffic noise and other noise sources including a railway line and a rugby / social club. Noise is likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises. The site is similar to North West Cambridge and part of the site nearest M11 and to a lesser distance from Addenbrooke's Road is likely to be NEC C (empty site) for night: PPG24 advice is "Planning permission should not normally be granted. Where it is considered that permission should be given, for example because there are no alternative quieter sites available, conditions should be imposed to ensure a commensurate level of protection against noise". Residential could be acceptable with high level of transport noise mitigation: combination of appropriate distance separation, careful orientation / positioning / design / internal layout of buildings, noise insulation scheme and extensive noise attenuation measures to mitigate traffic noise (single aspect, limited height, sealed non-openable windows on the façade facing M11 / other significant noise sources, acoustically treated alternative ventilation, no open amenity spaces such as balconies / gardens). This site requires a full noise assessment including consideration of noise from the rugby club / social club and of any noise attenuation / mitigation measures such as noise barriers / berms and of practical / technical feasibility and financial viability. Residents of parts of the site may experience impacts from road lighting and headlights.</p> <p>Existing rugby club floodlighting would need careful design but can be conditioned.</p>
Contamination	Is there possible contamination on the site?		<p>GREEN = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination</p>

			There are no known former industrial activities on or in close proximity to the site.
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation  Not within SPZ1
<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		GREEN = Does not contain, is not adjacent to designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species, or local area will be developed as greenspace. No or negligible impacts  River Cam on the southern boundary of the site is a County Wildlife site but local area would be retained as greenspace.  Tree Preservation Orders – groups of protected trees within the site close to the edge of Great Shelford opposite Bridge Close in the south east corner. Several TPOs on the edge of the site within the village framework of Great Shelford, including several trees on the northwest side of the driveway to 11 Cambridge Road.
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)?		GREEN = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links  The promoter of site submitted Phase 1 Habitat and Ecological Scoping Survey (2009) for the wider site found that there are some significant ecological features, such as the River Cam and water meadows, which should be recognised in the future design of the development, but did not consider there to be any unusual features that subject to suitable mitigation measures would preclude development. It recorded 25 species of birds (10 on conservation lists) and a badger sett on site. Great Crested Newts were recorded outside the site but no reptiles, otters, water voles or brown hares were recorded. Further survey work is recommended, including for bats and hedgehogs.
TPO	Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?		AMBER = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation  Tree Preservation Orders – groups of protected trees within the site close to the edge of Great Shelford opposite Bridge

			Close in the south east corner. Several TPOs on the edge of the site within the village framework of Great Shelford, including several trees on the northwest side of the driveway to 11 Cambridge Road.
Green Infrastructure	Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery of and access to green infrastructure?		<p>GREEN = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure</p> <p>The developers proposal includes a substantial area of parkland alongside the River Cam.</p>
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on landscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>Development would extend the urban edge down the slope to meet, or close to, the M11 corridor. The soft green edge could not be mitigated or replaced adequately to mitigate the M11 boundary. The landscape is strongly rural. The newly defined urban edge of Addenbrooke's Road, Trumpington Meadows and the landscape buffer area between it and the M11 should be preserved. A large development could not be adequately mitigated in such a highly visible location. The development site is open and highly visible from areas to the west, south and southwest. There would be adverse impact on the purposes of Green Belt in terms of openness, coalescence and setting of the City.</p>
Townscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on townscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>Distant from the city centre, the site would form a major southward extension to the city well beyond its current physical limits. It would thus negatively impact on the compact nature of the City. This extensive development on higher open ground abutting the M11 would be highly visible, particularly from the west and would significantly reduce the landscape buffer to the west of the city. The development would have a significant adverse impact on the setting of the City. This extensive development on higher open ground would be highly visible, particularly from the west where it forms part of the green foreground to the city. The</p>

			development site is open and highly visible from areas to the west, south and southeast. There would be adverse impact on the purposes of Green Belt in terms of openness, coalescence and setting of the City.
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on Greenbelt purposes</p> <p>The development site is open and highly visible from areas to the west, south and southeast. There would be adverse impact on the purposes of Green Belt in terms of openness, coalescence and setting of the City.</p> <p>UPDATE INNER GREEN BOUNDARY STUDY 2015</p> <p>The study notes that this sector (Sector 8.1) plays a key role in the setting of the south of Cambridge, ensuring that the expansion of the city does not continue unchecked and that the historic core remains large in comparison to the size of the city as a whole. It retains open countryside close to the expanding edge of the city and prevents the sprawl of built development as far as the M11, retaining the distinctive separation between the edge of the city and the M11 in contrast to the relationship with the A14 to the north of Cambridge. A distinctive gateway to the city is being created at Trumpington Meadows and Glebe Farm. Sub area 8.1 is also key in the separation between the edge of Cambridge and the necklace villages of Great Shelford, Hauxton and Little Shelford.</p> <p>It is unlikely that any development within the majority of this sector could be accommodated without substantial harm to the Green Belt purposes. Any form of development within sub area 8.1 would reduce the distinctive separation between the edge of the city and the M11 and would affect the well designed and distinctive gateway to the city that is being created at Glebe Farm / Trumpington Meadows. It would also significantly encroach on the separation between Cambridge and the necklace villages of Great Shelford, Hauxton and Little Shelford. No Green Belt release should be contemplated in sub area 8.1.</p>
Heritage	Will it protect or		AMBER = Site contains, is adjacent to, or

	enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments)?		<p>within the setting of such sites, buildings and features, with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>A Scheduled Monument of national importance (SAM58 Neolithic to Roman settlement) is located in the south west corner of the site adjoining the M11 and the River Cam. County Archaeologists would object to the development of this site. Two further Scheduled Monuments lie approximately 200m south of the site. The promoter proposes a buffer zone to protect the SAM and on a site of this size it should be possible to provide appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>The Grade I Listed Church of St Mary, Little Shelford lies approximately 540m to the south and Church of St Edmund, Hauxton approximately 950m south west. Grade II* Listed Church of All Saints and Rectory Farm House in Little Shelford and Little Shelford Manor, lie approximately 450-600m to the south. There are various Grade II Listed buildings within the Great and Little Shelford and Hauxton Conservation Areas. The promoter's conceptual development framework includes a substantial area of Green Belt and parkland in the southern part of the site. With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the wider historic environment.</p> <p>Great and Little Shelford Conservation Areas lie approximately 150-200m to the south. Hauxton Conservation Area lies approximately 530m to the south west. The promoter's Archaeological Desktop Assessment indicates that there are ten sites and find-spots inside the site including a large part of SAM 58. A further 37 locations are recorded in the 500m Study Area including SAMs 57 and 73, as well as crop marks and a possible Saxon cemetery.</p> <p>Archaeology would not prevent development over the majority of the site but would prevent it on and in the vicinity of the SAM and could constrain it elsewhere.</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>GREEN = Flood Zone 1 / low risk</p> <p>The location lies entirely within Flood Risk Zone 1 (the lowest level of risk). Site subject to minor surface water flood risk but capable of mitigation.</p>
<b>HUMAN HEALTH AND WELL BEING</b>			
Open Space	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space?		<p>GREEN = Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite</p> <p>Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite. The developer's proposal includes a substantial area of parkland alongside the River Cam.</p>
Distance: Outdoor Sport Facilities	How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?		GREEN = <1km or onsite provision
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		GREEN = <400m or onsite provision
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?		<p>G = &lt;400m</p> <p>1.62km ACF – Great Shelford. A site of this scale could be expected to provide its own District or Local centre.</p>
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?		<p>G = &lt;400m</p> <p>1.57km ACF – Great Shelford A site of this scale could be expected to provide its own health centre / GP service.</p>
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?)		<p>AMBER = No impact on facilities (or satisfactory mitigation proposed).</p> <p>Site of sufficient scale to provide its own local services and facilities.</p>



Community Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement / appropriate mitigation possible
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing 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  The promoter proposes a 85,000 sqm Science Park.
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		GG = Development would significantly enhance employment opportunities  The promoter proposes a 85,000 sqm Science Park.
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  Improved utility infrastructure is likely to be required as follows.  Electricity - Not supportable from existing network. Significant reinforcement and new network required.


			<p>Mains Water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</p> <p>Gas - Significant reinforcement would be required to support the full load, potentially a new High Pressure offtake.</p> <p>Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the Cambridge WWTW to accommodate this development site. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre-development assessment will be required to ascertain the specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the developer.</p>
Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education capacity?		<p>AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated</p> <p>UPDATE: Great and Little Shelford have one Primary School and Stapleford has one Primary School, both with a PAN of 40 and school capacity of 280, and lies within the catchment of Sawston Village College with a PAN of 230 and school capacity of 1,150. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there was a deficit of 6 primary places in Great and Little Shelford and surplus of 8 primary places in Stapleford taking account of planned development, and a surplus of 74 secondary places at Sawston VC taking account of planned development across the village college catchment area.</p> <p>There are also new schools within the Cambridge Southern Fringe and Clay Farm developments.</p>

			<p>The development of this site for 1,250 dwellings could generate a need for 157 early years places and a maximum of 437 primary school places and 313 secondary places.</p> <p>After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or provision of new schools.</p> <p>A site of this scale could be expected to provide its own primary school(s).</p>
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		<p>G = &lt;400m</p> <p>1.39km ACF – Hauxton Primary School.</p> <p>A site of this scale could be expected to provide its own primary school(s). Provision assumed on site.</p>
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		<p>A = 1 to 3 km</p> <p>1.57km ACF – Parkside Federation Proposed School Clay Farm</p>
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		<p>AMBER = Medium quality off-road path.</p> <p>Currently there are either narrow cycle lanes or a very narrow shared footway along Shelford Road. The site would currently score RED.</p> <p>Significant improvements to support walking and cycling would be required. To address the severance provided by Addenbrooke's Road and the A1309. A link to Shelford should be provided using the accommodation bridge over the railway.</p> <p>The precise geographic extent of this site is not known. If it is possible to link through the site direct onto Addenbrooke's Road (at its junction with Glebe Farm Drive) this would mean the site has adequate cycle links for onward travel towards the city centre and/or Cambridge Biomedical Campus.</p> <p>While it is agreed that the A1309 cycle lanes are not the same standard as the lanes currently being introduced on several radial routes into Cambridge, these could be</p>

			<p>upgraded as part of the s106 for the development, On balance AMBER is recommended for this category.</p> <p>(Updated from Red to Amber)</p>
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		<p>AMBER = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances</p> <p>Currently no HQPT to the site. Development of the full site would require internal bus route.</p>
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.		<p>DARK GREEN = Score 19-25</p> <p>Total score of 20</p>
Distance: bus stop / rail station			<p>GG = Within 400m (6)</p> <p>675m to nearest bus stop. Score would improve if a bus service were to be provided through the site.</p>
Frequency of Public Transport			<p>G = 20 minute frequency (4)</p> <p>20 minute service (Citi 7). Potential for higher frequency serving the site. It is unlikely that a development of this size would be able to support a bus service with a frequency that is greater than every 20 minutes.</p>
Public transport journey time to City Centre			<p>G = 21 to 30 minutes (4)</p> <p>Potential improvement to journey time if linked to Guideway via Trumpington.</p>
Distance for cycling to City Centre			<p>GG = Up to 5km (6)</p>
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		<p>R = &gt;800m</p> <p>Potential for new railway station to serve Addenbrooke's and Biomedical Campus which would provide for at least an Amber score.</p>
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		<p>AMBER = Insufficient capacity / access. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>UPDATE: The M11, A1309 and the Addenbrooke's link road combine to provide significant severance for walking and</p>

			<p>cycling trips to off-site destinations, including the public transport and employment nodes at Trumpington Park and Ride and Addenbrooke's. These provide a significant barrier to making this site attractive in terms of sustainable transport.</p> <p>Transportation Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan (TP) required to look at trip impact on surrounding area including junction modelling to assess capacity issues.</p> <p>Highways Agency comment that sites clustered around M11 J11 while being fairly well integrated with Cambridge are likely to result in some additional pressure on the M11 corridor, though this is probably mitigable (subject to a suitable assessment).</p> <p>Proposer identifies Vehicular access from Hauxton Road midway between M11 roundabout and Addenbrooke's Access Road, and vehicular access from A1301 Cambridge Road / Shelford Road between /allotment gardens and Trinity Lane. Also proposes inbound traffic only from M11 roundabout into the site, however County Council do not consider this a suitable option.</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 southern fringe residential and CBC developments. As such, while significant infrastructure has already been introduced in this quadrant (AAR, M11 junction improvement works, CGB, CGB cycle track), any TA 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>GREEN = Significant improvements to public transport, cycling, walking facilities</p> <p>The links to Trumpington and the guideway are poor and it will be difficult to provide a formal crossing to the off-road path along Addenbrooke's Rd and to the crossing of Hauxton Road. A route linking directly to Shelford using the existing accommodation bridge over the railway should be pursued</p>

			<p>as part of development of the site.</p> <p>Promoter states that site would deliver high quality footpaths and cycleways, and public transport routes linking to Trumpington Park and Ride.</p>
--	--	--	---

<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Edge of Cambridge (Broad Location 9)</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> CCSC1006	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b> N/A	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land at Fen Ditton (Developer Proposal)	
<b>Map:</b> 	
<p><b>Site description:</b> The site is located on both sides of Horningsea Road, north of High Ditch Road and south of the A14, on the north eastern edge of Fen Ditton. Fleam Dyke and a former railway line lie in the south east of the site. The site comprises several large agricultural fields, divided by patchy low level hedgerows. Further open agricultural land surrounds the site to the north west, north, east and south east, and the site is very visible from higher ground, including from Horningsea Road from the north.</p> <p>Promoters proposal identifies housing parcels on land west of Horningsea Road, and part of the area adjoining Horningsea Road to the north west of the village, on approximately 25 hectares of land.</p>	
<b>Current use(s):</b> Agricultural	
<p><b>Proposed use(s):</b> Residential led mixed-use development for between 400 and 500 homes on land to the north west and north east of Fen Ditton. Maintain Green Belt buffer between proposed development and the A14. Opportunities for Green Infrastructure. Promoter refers to potential location for a secondary school.</p>	
<p><b>Site size (ha):</b> South Cambridgeshire: 74.99 ha.</p> <p>NOTE: The site is smaller than the totality of all of the 3 sites combined, as only part of Site SC160 is included.</p>	
<b>Potential residential capacity:</b> 400 to 500 dwellings (proposed by promoter)	



<b>LAND</b>			
PDL	Would development make use of previously developed land?		RED = Not on PDL
Agricultural Land	Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?		RED = Significant loss (20 ha or more) of grades 1 and 2 land  Majority of the site is Grade 2, the rest Grade 3.
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.  This site does not fall within a Minerals Safeguarding Area; a WWTW or Transport Zone Safeguarding Area; or a Minerals or 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.  Adjoins the A14. This proposal is located close to the Councils' Air Quality Management Area and is of a significant size. Extensive and detailed air quality assessments will be required to assess the cumulative impacts of this and other proposed developments within the locality on air quality along with provision of a Low Emissions Strategy. This information will be required prior to further comment.
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		RED = Within or adjacent to an AQMA, M11 or A14  UPDATE 2016: Note the promoter is proposing development on a smaller site, which is not adjacent to the AQMA, but is within 1,000m.
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  Significant Road Transport noise. The east of the site bounds the A14 and there is a high level of ambient / diffuse traffic noise. The impact of existing noise on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well being and providing a high quality living environment. Noise likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises.

			<p>Residential could be acceptable with high level of mitigation: combination of appropriate distance separation, careful orientation / positioning / design / internal layout of buildings, noise insulation scheme and extensive noise attenuation measures to mitigate traffic noise (single aspect, limited height, sealed non-openable windows on façade facing A14, acoustically treated alternative ventilation, no open amenity spaces such as balconies / gardens). Noise berms / barriers?.</p> <p>The promoter proposes maintaining Green Belt buffer between proposed development and the A14, and identifies housing parcels several hundred metres from the A14, providing opportunities for mitigation.</p> <p><b>NOISE: Recreation &amp; Commercial</b> The West of the site will be immediately adjacent to Fen Ditton Primary School &amp; Sports Grounds. Such a short distance separation between recreation and residential is unlikely to be in accordance with SCDCs Open Space SPD. Minor to moderate noise related issues from recreation uses. Potential noise nuisance from School e.g. plant &amp; equipment and classroom uses which should be considered prior to allocation. Noise not quantified but could be mitigated off site if an issue by s106 but requires full cooperation of school etc. Site should not be allocated until these issues have been considered and mitigation options feasibility etc considered.</p> <p><b>Noise: Generation Off-site</b> Some minor to moderate additional off-site road traffic noise generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance. Possible to mitigate but may require s106 agreements.</p>
Contamination	Is there possible contamination on the site?		<p>AMBER = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development (potential to achieve benefits subject to appropriate mitigation)</p> <p>Former railway across site, requires assessment, can be conditioned.</p> <p>UPDATE 2016: The promoter is proposing</p>

			development on a smaller site, which the former railway does not cross. This would change the score from Amber to Green (Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination).
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation
<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		GREEN = Does not contain, is not adjacent to designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species, or local area will be developed as greenspace. No or negligible impacts
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)?		<p>AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Fenland landscapes support species and habitats characterised by intensive agriculture due to the high quality soil. This has restricted biodiversity in some parts. However, drains, hedges and field margins provide refuge for species such as barn owl, corn bunting and skylark. Washlands provide temporary areas of flooded grassland that are important for plants such as the marsh foxtail, tufted hair-grass and narrow-leaved water dropwort. Important numbers of wintering wildfowl maybe found on flooded fields. The network of drainage ditches in places still retain water voles with otters occasionally found into the fens where suitable fish stocks are found. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design.</p>
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?		<p>GREEN = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure</p> <p>A site of this scale will have significant opportunities for the delivery of green infrastructure.</p>
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on landscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>Development would introduce significant urban forms into the foreground setting and affect supporting landscape. Development would significantly affect Key views to Cambridge from the north and east. Large scale development on this site would represent a major eastwards extension and form a new skyline blocking views to Fen Ditton Village and Cambridge beyond and would introduce a very significant extension of urban form. It would change the setting and key views from the east and north.</p>
Townscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?		<p>RED = Significant negative impact on townscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>Significant development of the site would be hugely out of scale with Fen Ditton village, would add significant urban areas to the north and east, it would create an urban gateway to the village, reduce the function of separation between Fen Ditton and Cambridge and block views to the village centre from the north and east. Limited development may be possible to some central and western areas of the site. Development would not physically link Fen Ditton with Cambridge but visually would significantly reduce the value of existing separation. The scale of potential development could overwhelm the village of Fen Ditton.</p>
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		<p>DARK RED: Very high and high impacts on Greenbelt purposes (very significant negative impact)</p> <p>Significant development of the site would urbanise approaches to Fen Ditton and Cambridge and form an urban skyline viewed from the north and east.</p> <p>UPDATE INNER GREEN BOUNDARY</p>

			<p><b>STUDY 2015</b></p> <p>The study notes that these sector (Sectors 18.2 and 19.1) play a key role in the setting of the north east of Cambridge, and the approach to both Fen Ditton and Cambridge along the B1047 from the north.</p> <p>Sub area 18.2 provides separation between the village and the A14, as well as between the future allocated edge of Cambridge and the A14, retaining a rural setting to the city when viewed from the strategic route. Sector 18.2 also forms the rural setting of Fen Ditton to the east and is important in maintaining the small scale, slightly dispersed linear form of the village, which is an important component of its character.</p> <p>Sector 19 forms the rural setting of Fen Ditton to the north and west and is important in maintaining the small scale, slightly dispersed linear form of the village, which is an important component of its character. The river corridor forms a key green corridor into the heart of the city and is an important route into Cambridge for pedestrians, cyclists and river users.</p> <p>It is unlikely that any development within sectors 18 and 19 could be accommodated without harm to Green Belt purposes. Development within sub area 18.2 would affect the rural setting, form and character of the village. Development within sub area 19.1 would affect the characteristic setting to Fen Ditton and the rural approach towards Cambridge.</p> <p>No Green Belt release should be contemplated in these sectors.</p>
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>RED = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such sites, buildings and features, with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>The site will not impact on any Scheduled Ancient Monument or historic park or garden. There are several Grade II Listed buildings along High Ditch Road to the south, including numbers 6, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23 and 25; the closest is approximately 30m to the south. The south western part of the site adjoins the Fen Ditton Conservation</p>

			<p>Area. The Fen Ditton Conservation Area Appraisal (2006) describes Fen Ditton as an essentially linear village which has resulted in a very narrow, serpentine form with an almost complete absence of backland development, the only exceptions being a few modern houses. The village has an unmistakably rural feel with its grass verges, large trees and its bucolic riverside setting. The high proportion of good quality buildings and spaces means that the streetscene and townscape is of exceptional quality even though the scale is modest.</p> <p>The agricultural character of the village is very important especially at the eastern end of the village, along High Ditch Road, where (converted) barns line the road and there are views of the fine groups of farm buildings. The linear nature of much of the village also means that views out into the open fields surrounding Fen Ditton can be seen from many parts of the village.</p> <p>Development would have a significant adverse impact on townscape and the landscape setting of the village. The LP2004 Inspector considered that the main built-up area of the village has been left behind once north of High Ditch Road. Development of this very large agricultural site will be very visible from the wider landscape and would be completely out of scale with the existing village. The site forms an important part of the setting of the Conservation Area, and several Grade II* and II Listed Buildings. It would not be possible to mitigate impacts on the historic environment because backland development would result in the loss of the green rural backdrop and is out of character with the linear settlement pattern. There is evidence for extensive prehistoric and Roman activity in the area, including a Roman settlement known from cropmarks to the north. The site is also located to the north of the route of the Fleam Dyke, an earthwork boundary of Saxon date. Further information would be necessary in advance of any planning application for this site.</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?		GREEN = Flood Zone 1 / low risk  Site subject to minor surface water flood risk but capable of mitigation.
<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
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		GREEN = <400m or onsite provision
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?		A = 400 - 800m  Around 500m to Fen Ditton village centre.
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  Over 1km to Barnwell Road Health Centre
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 Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community		GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement / appropriate mitigation possible



	activities?		
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?		<p>RED = Limited scope for integration with existing communities / isolated and/or separated by non-residential land uses</p> <p>Development on this scale could not be successfully integrated into Fen Ditton.</p>
<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?		GREEN = Within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Local Super Output Areas (LSOA) within Cambridge
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?		AMBER = 1-3km
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		GREEN = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development
Utilities	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?		<p>AMBER = Significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Electricity - Not supportable from existing network. Significant reinforcement and new network required.</p> <p>Mains water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of</p>

			<p>proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and/or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</p> <p>Gas – Fen Ditton has mains gas supply and the site is likely to be able to be accommodated with minimal disruption or system reinforcement.</p> <p>Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the WWTW to accommodate this development site. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre-development assessment will be required to ascertain the specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the developer.</p>
Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education capacity?		<p>AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated Fen Ditton has one Primary School with a PAN of 25 and school capacity of 175, and lies within the catchment of Bottisham Village College. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there was a surplus of 10 primary places in Fen Ditton taking account of planned development in Fen Ditton.</p> <p>After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or provision of new schools.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to the village primary school and potential exists for development to add to school capacity either directly via provision of a new school or by provision of additional playing fields, or play space.</p>
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		<p>G = &lt;400m</p> <p>0.40km ACF – Fen Ditton Community Primary School</p> <p>A development of this scale would be expected to provide an additional primary</p>


			school or expanded local provision.
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		R = Greater than 3km  3.54km ACF – Manor Community College km.
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		AMBER = Medium quality off-road path.  There is no provision for cyclists at the southern end of Horningsea Road.  While there is a short section of Horningsea Road just north of the junction with Fen Ditton High Street that does not have any off-road cycle path, this development could potentially link into Green End via Field Lane as an alternative means of providing access towards Cambridge (i.e. via Church Street / Fen Ditton High Street then onto the Wadloes Footpath and NCN route) As such recommend change to AMBER (Change form Red to Amber)
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		AMBER = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances  Over 400m from HQPT.
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.		DARK GREEN = Score 19-25
Distance: bus stop / rail station			G = Within 600m (4)  674m ACF to nearest bus stop (Citi 3 service).  UPDATE: Depending on the layout of the site there is the possibility that Citi 3 buses could be extended up into the site. Recommend changing to Green. (Change from Amber to Green)
Frequency of Public Transport			G = 20 minute frequency (4)
Public transport journey time to City Centre			GG = 20 minutes or less (6)  20 minute journey time. (Cambridge, Fison Road – Cambridge, Emmanuel Street).

Distance for cycling to City Centre			GG = Up to 5km (6) 3.22km ACF
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		R = >800m 1.59km ACF – Science Park Station
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		<p>AMBER = Insufficient capacity / access. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>UPDATE: A junction located on High Ditch / Horningsea Road would be acceptable to the Highway Authority. The proposed site is acceptable in principle subject to detailed design. The Highway Authority would like to highlight the close proximity of the primary school to this development. In the Highway Authority's opinion a significant level of infrastructure will be required to encourage more sustainable transport links which; such infrastructure will extend beyond the confines of the site. Regarding sites in the Fen Ditton / Fulbourn et al / Gt Wilbraham / Teversham area (estimated capacity of 10,922 dwellings on 25 sites) the Highways Agency comment that sites at the southern end of this group are likely to be well integrated with Cambridge though clearly there could be some additional pressure on M11 and A14. Sites around Fen Ditton are more likely to generate pressure on the A14 corridor, particularly to and from employment along the northern fringe of Cambridge.</p> <p>Mindful of the substantial improvement in quality and capacity of sustainable transport networks that will be delivered by the City Deal Programme (Chisholm Trail, Ditton Meadows Cycle Bridge, Newmarket Road Corridor) it is considered that this could potentially off-set the additional vehicular impact on the LHA that would be generated by a site in this location, however any TA 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>There is no provision for cyclists at the southern end of Horningsea Road. There may be some potential for improvements associated with the site.</p>



<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Rural Centre</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> SC112	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b> 14 (I&O 2012)	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land r/o 49-71 Impington Lane, Impington	

**Map:**



**Site description:** The site is situated north of Impington Lane on the northern edge of Impington. A small part of the site, between two residential properties, is within the village framework whilst the remainder of the site is within the Green Belt. The site is former horticultural land to the rear of linear residential properties, surrounded on the outer edges by hedgerow.



Note: The site adjoins site 114 to the east.

**Current use(s):** Redundant horticultural land

**Proposed use(s):** 30-46 dwellings together with public open space.

**Site size (ha):** South Cambridgeshire: 1.82 ha.

**Potential residential capacity:** 20 dwellings (30 dph)

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

	best and most versatile agricultural land?		agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2) - small site but all Grade 2.
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.
<b>POLLUTION</b>			
Air Quality	Would the development of the sites result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?		GREEN = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact.  Development unlikely to impact on air quality. Site lies in an area where air quality acceptable.
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		GREEN = >1,000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14
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)?		GREEN = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Development compatible with neighbouring uses. Some minor to moderate additional road traffic noise generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance..
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).  Part of the site was formerly used as a nursery and may have contaminated land. Potential for minor benefits through remediation of minor contamination.
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation  Assumptions for a neutral impact are that appropriate standards and pollution control measures will be achieved through the development process, e.g. as part of Sustainable Drainage Systems (Suds).
<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation		GREEN = Does not contain, is not adjacent to designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species, or local area will be developed as greenspace. No or negligible impacts



	interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		
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)?		<p>AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>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>
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?		<p>AMBER = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>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>
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		<p>AMBER = negative impact on landscape character, incapable of mitigation.</p> <p>Minor Negative Impact (Development conflicts with landscape character, minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation) - The site is in an area characterised as fragmented linear and close development, surrounded by enclosed farmland and paddocks, which create a transition between village edge and open fields. Development of this site would lose the soft village edge, pastoral and rural in character, between the built development and larger agricultural landscape, in an area of prominent landscape.</p>
Townscape	Will it maintain and enhance the		AMBER = negative impact on townscape character, incapable of mitigation.

	diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?		Minor Negative Impact (development conflicts with townscape character, minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation) - The character of this part of the village is linear, with long rear gardens. Development of this site would create a large area of residential development in a cul-de-sac, which would alter the character of this largely ribbon settlement. significant opportunities for townscape enhancement
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		AMBER = negative impact on Greenbelt purposes
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)?		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  Minor Negative Impact on historic Assets (incapable of satisfactory mitigation). The site forms an important part of the setting of two Conservation Areas, but it may be possible to accommodate a smaller development. Archaeological potential will require further information but the assumption for a neutral impact is that it is likely appropriate mitigation can be achieved through the development process.
<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?		GREEN = Flood Zone 1 / low risk  Most of the site is Flood Zone 1 and a small part of the site in the north western corner within flood zones 2 and 3. There are no drainage issues that cannot be appropriately addressed.  UPDATE 2016: The whole of the site allocated within the Submission Local Plan (as shown on the map) is located within Flood Zone 1. The promoter submitted a larger site, which included land to the rear of Merrington Place, part of which is within Flood Zones 2 and 3.
<b>HUMAN HEALTH AND WELL BEING</b>			
Open Space	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically		AMBER = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation


	accessible open space?		Development would create minor opportunities for new public open space as the promoter proposes provision of open space as part of the development.
Distance: Outdoor Sport Facilities	How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?		GREEN = <1km or onsite provision  0.9km ACF from centre of the site to Histon & Impington Recreation Ground.
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		GREEN = <400m or onsite provision  370m ACF from centre of the site to The Village Green, Histon.
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?		A = 400 - 800m  587m ACF to a point on High Street (Histon) which is surrounded by a large number of services and facilities.
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?		A = 400 - 800m  699m ACF from centre of site to Surgery, Histon.
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).  Provision of open space as part of the development.
Community Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement / appropriate mitigation possible  No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development.
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing		AMBER = Adequate scope for integration with existing communities



	communities?		
<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.  Development would have no effect on vitality or viability of existing centres. The indicator is likely to apply particularly to sites which include retail, offices, or leisure uses.
Employment - Accessibility	How far is the nearest main employment centre?		AMBER = 1-3km  1.9km ACF from centre of site to South Cambridgeshire 006D (Histon, including Vision Park)
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		G = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development
Utilities	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?		GREEN = Existing infrastructure likely to be sufficient.  Minor Utilities Infrastructure improvements required, but constraints can be addressed. There is insufficient spare mains water capacity within the distribution zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and will require investigation and possibly mitigation.
Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education capacity?		AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated  Insufficient spare school capacity but potential for improvement to meet needs. Insufficient secondary school capacity.
Distance: Primary	How far is the nearest primary		A = 400 - 800m

School	school?		447m ACF from centre of site to Histon Junior School.
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		G = Within 1km (or site large enough to provide new)  0.5km ACF from centre of site to Impington Village College.
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		AMBER = Medium quality off-road path.  The cycle facilities between Histon & Impington and Cambridge comprise a mix of on- and off-road provision, of variable quality. This is a heavily trafficked route with a mix of traffic speeds. Provision or contribution from this site would result in minor improvement to cycling facilities.
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		AMBER = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances
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.		DARK GREEN = Score 19-25  Total score of 20
Distance: bus stop / rail station			GG = Within 400m (6)  156m ACF from the centre of the site to the nearest bus stop (Citi 8).
Frequency of Public Transport			G = 20 minute frequency (4)
Public transport journey time to City Centre			GG = 20 minutes or less (6)  17 Minutes from Impington to Cambridge.
Distance for cycling to City Centre			G = 5km to 10km (4)  5.08km ACF from the centre of the site to Cambridge Market.
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		R = >800m  5,797m ACF from centre of the site to Waterbeach Station.
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		GREEN = No capacity / access constraints identified that cannot be fully mitigated.  No capacity constraints identified, safe access can be achieved. A junction located

			on to Impington Lane would be acceptable to the Highway Authority, the proposed site is acceptable in principle subject to detailed design.
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>



<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Rural Centre</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> SC114	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b>	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land north of Impington Lane, Impington	
<b>Map:</b>  <p>© Crown Copyright, Ordnance Survey SCDC Licence 100022500 (2015)</p>	
<b>Site description:</b> The site is situated north of Impington Lane on the northern edge of Impington. The site is to the rear of a single dwelling to the rear of linear residential development on Impington Lane. It is shrub land and improved grassland, with an agricultural building in the south eastern part of the site, and completely enclosed by hedgerow.	
<b>Note:</b> The site adjoins site 112 to the west.	
<b>Current use(s):</b> Shrub Land and improved grassland	
<b>Proposed use(s):</b> 32 dwellings with public open space	
<b>Site size (ha):</b> South Cambridgeshire: 1.77 ha	
<b>Potential residential capacity:</b> 5 dwellings (30 dph)	

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



	best and most versatile agricultural land?		agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2) - small site but all Grade 2.
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.
<b>POLLUTION</b>			
Air Quality	Would the development of the sites result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?		GREEN = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact.  Development unlikely to impact on air quality. Site lies in an area where air quality acceptable.
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		GREEN = >1,000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14
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)?		GREEN = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  Development compatible with neighbouring uses. Some minor to moderate additional road traffic noise generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance.
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)  Possible agricultural building on site, which may have contaminated land. Potential for minor benefits through remediation of minor contamination.
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation  Assumptions for a neutral impact are that appropriate standards and pollution control measures will be achieved through the development process, e.g. as part of Sustainable Drainage Systems (Suds).
<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation		GREEN = Does not contain, is not adjacent to designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species, or local area will be developed as greenspace. No or negligible impacts

	interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		
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)?		<p>AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>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>
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?		<p>AMBER = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Neutral impact (existing features retained, or appropriate mitigation possible). Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process.</p>
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		<p>AMBER = negative impact on landscape character, incapable of mitigation.</p> <p>Minor Negative Impact (Development conflicts with landscape character, minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation) - The site is in an area characterised as fragmented linear and close development, surrounded by enclosed farmland and paddocks, which create a transition between village edge and open fields. Development of this site would lose the soft village edge, pastoral and rural in character, between the built development and larger agricultural landscape, in an area of prominent landscape.</p>

Townscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?		<p>AMBER = negative impact on townscape character, incapable of mitigation.</p> <p>Minor Negative Impact (development conflicts with townscape character, minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation) - The character of this part of the village is linear, with long rear gardens. Development of this site would create a large area of residential development in a cul-de-sac, which would alter the character of this largely ribbon settlement.</p>
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		AMBER = negative impact on Greenbelt purposes
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>Minor Negative Impact (development conflicts with townscape character, minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation) - The character of this part of the village is linear, with long rear gardens. Development of this site would create a large area of residential development in a cul-de-sac, which would alter the character of this largely ribbon settlement.</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>GREEN = Flood Zone 1 / low risk.</p> <p>Most of the site is Flood Zone 1 and a small part of the site in the north western corner within flood zones 2 and 3. There are no drainage issues that cannot be appropriately addressed.</p> <p>UPDATE 2016: The whole of the site allocated within the Submission Local Plan (as shown on the map) is located within Flood Zone 1. The promoter submitted a larger site, which included land to the rear of Merrington Place, part of which is within Flood Zones 2 and 3.</p>
<b>HUMAN HEALTH AND WELL BEING</b>			
Open Space	Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically		GREEN = Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite


	accessible open space?		Development would create minor opportunities for new public open space as the promoter proposes provision of open space as part of the development.
Distance: Outdoor Sport Facilities	How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?		GREEN = <1km or onsite provision  0.9km ACF from centre of the site to Histon & Impington Recreation Ground.
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		AMBER = 400 - 800m  476m ACF from centre of the site to The Village Green, Histon.
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?		A = 400 - 800m  694m ACF to a point on High Street (Histon) which is surrounded by a large number of services and facilities.
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?		G = <400m  281m ACF from centre of site to Surgery, Histon.
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).  Provision of open space as part of the development.
Community Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement /appropriate mitigation possible  No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development.
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?		AMBER = Adequate scope for integration with existing communities



<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?		<p>GREEN = No effect or would support the vitality and viability of existing centres.</p> <p>Development would have no effect on vitality or viability of existing centres. The indicator is likely to apply particularly to sites which include retail, offices, or leisure uses.</p>
Employment - Accessibility	How far is the nearest main employment centre?		<p>AMBER = 1-3km</p> <p>1.4km ACF from centre of site to South Cambridgeshire 006D (Histon, including Vision Park)</p>
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		G = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development
Utilities	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?		<p>GREEN = Existing infrastructure likely to be sufficient.</p> <p>Minor Utilities Infrastructure improvements required, but constraints can be addressed. There is insufficient spare mains water capacity within the distribution zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and will require investigation and possibly mitigation.</p>
Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education capacity?		<p>AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated</p> <p>Insufficient spare school capacity but potential for improvement to meet needs. Insufficient secondary school capacity.</p>
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		<p>A = 400 - 800m</p> <p>551m ACF from centre of site to Histon</p>

			Junior School.
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		G = Within 1km (or site large enough to provide new)  0.5km ACF from centre of site to Impington Village College.
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		AMBER = Medium quality off-road path.  The cycle facilities between Histon & Impington and Cambridge comprise a mix of on- and off-road provision, of variable quality. This is a heavily trafficked route with a mix of traffic speeds. Provision or contribution from this site would result in minor improvement to cycling facilities.
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge of site)?		AMBER = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances
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.		DARK GREEN = Score 19-25  Total score of 20
Distance: bus stop / rail station			GG = Within 400m (6)  246m ACF from the centre of the site to the nearest bus stop.
Frequency of Public Transport			G = 20 minute frequency (4)
Public transport journey time to City Centre			GG = 20 minutes or less (6)  17 Minutes from Impington to Cambridge.
Distance for cycling to City Centre			G = 5km to 10km (4)  5.05km ACF from the centre of the site to Cambridge Market.
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		R = >800m  5,703m ACF from centre of the site to Waterbeach Station.
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		AMBER = Insufficient capacity / access. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.  Minor negative effects incapable of mitigation. Access constraints - the access

			link to the public highway is unsuitable to serve the number of units that are being proposed. However, the Highway Authority believes that this site could be fed from site number 112.
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>



<b>Site Information</b>	
<b>Development Sequence</b>	<b>Rural Centre</b>
<b>Site reference number(s):</b> SC306	
<b>Consultation Reference numbers:</b>	
<b>Site name/address:</b> Land west of 113, Cottenham Road, Histon	
<b>Map:</b> 	
<b>Site description:</b> This rectangular site is located to the west of the B1049 at the north edge of Histon. The eastern third of the site is meadow and the western two thirds of the site is woodland, which provides a mature tree border on this side. The site adjoins residential properties to the east and includes the garden and house at 113 Cottenham Road; to the north and west of the site is open agricultural land; to the south is allotments and paddock. The south western corner of the site adjoins Unwins Industrial Estate.	
<b>Current use(s):</b> Wood and meadow.	
<b>Proposed use(s):</b> A mixture of housing and landscaped public open spaces areas.	
<b>Site size (ha):</b> South Cambridgeshire: 2.16 ha.	
<b>Potential residential capacity:</b> 22 dwellings (30 dph)	

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

	best and most versatile agricultural land?		agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2) - small site but all Grade 2.
Minerals	Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves?		<p>GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.</p> <p>Site within an area designated in the Minerals and Waste LDF but development would not have a negative impact.</p>
<b>POLLUTION</b>			
Air Quality	Would the development of the sites result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?		<p>GREEN = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact.</p> <p>Development unlikely to impact on air quality. Site lies in an area where air quality acceptable.</p>
AQMA	Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?		GREEN = >1,000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14
Pollution	Are there potential Odour, light noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator (including compatibility with neighbouring uses)?		<p>AMBER = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation</p> <p>Will create minor negative impacts to, or as a result of, the development, with minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation - further investigation and possible mitigation of noise and odour from Unwins Industrial Estate required.</p>
Contamination	Is there possible contamination on the site?		<p>GREEN = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination</p> <p>Development not on land likely to be contaminated</p>
Water	Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?		<p>GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation</p> <p>Development unlikely to affect water quality. Assumptions for a neutral impact are that appropriate standards and pollution control measures will be achieved through the development process, e.g. as part of Sustainable Drainage Systems (Suds).</p>
<b>BIODIVERSITY</b>			
Designated Sites	Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation		GREEN = Does not contain, is not adjacent to designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species, or local area will be developed as greenspace. No or negligible impacts

	interest, and geodiversity? (Including International and locally designated sites)		
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)?		<p>AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>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>
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?		<p>AMBER = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Neutral impact (existing features retained, or appropriate mitigation possible). Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process.</p>
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>			
Landscape	Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?		<p>AMBER = negative impact on landscape character, incapable of mitigation.</p> <p>Minor Negative Impact (Development conflicts with landscape character, minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation) - Whilst the site is screened from adjoining residential properties, and the Unwins industrial estate, it is open to views across to the north west, where the landscape becomes more exposed. The landscape is clearly rural in character, and development in this location would be harmful to the character of the area.</p>
Townscape	Will it maintain and enhance the		AMBER = negative impact on townscape character, incapable of mitigation.

	diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character, including through appropriate design and scale of development?		Minor Negative Impact (Development conflicts with townscape character, minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation) - Whilst the site is screened from adjoining residential properties, and the Unwins industrial estate, it is open to views across to the north west, where the landscape becomes more exposed. The landscape is clearly rural in character, and development in this location would be harmful to the character of the area.
Green Belt	What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes?		AMBER = negative impact on Greenbelt purposes
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)?		GREEN = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, sites or features, and there is no impact to the setting  Neutral impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local townscape character). Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process.
<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?		GREEN = Flood Zone 1 / low risk  Flood Zone 1 and no drainage issues that cannot be appropriately addressed.
<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?		AMBER = 1-3km  2.1km ACF from centre of the site to Histon & Impington Recreation Ground.
Distance: Play Facilities	How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?		RED = >800m  1,023m ACF from centre of the site to land west of Water Lane, Histon
Gypsy &	Will it provide for		AMBER = No Impact

Traveller	the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?		
Distance: District or Local Centre	How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?		R = >800m Beyond 1,000m from nearest centre ACF (1,038m to Histon, High Street)
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 1,768m ACF from centre of site to Histon Surgery.
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).  No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development.
Community Facilities	Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities?		GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement / appropriate mitigation possible  No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development.
Integration with Existing Communities	How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?		RED = Limited scope for integration with existing communities / isolated and/or separated by non-residential land uses  Large area of backland development within an area characterised by linear
<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?		<p>GREEN = No effect or would support the vitality and viability of existing centres</p> <p>Development would have no effect on vitality or viability of existing centres. The indicator is likely to apply particularly to sites which include retail, offices, or leisure uses.</p>
Employment - Accessibility	How far is the nearest main employment centre?		<p>AMBER = 1-3km</p> <p>1.9km ACF from centre of site to South Cambridgeshire 006D (Histon, including Vision Park)</p>
Employment - Land	Would development result in the loss of employment land, or deliver new employment land?		G = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development
Utilities	Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband?		<p>GREEN = Existing infrastructure likely to be sufficient</p> <p>Minor Utilities Infrastructure improvements required, but constraints can be addressed. There is insufficient spare mains water capacity within the distribution zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and will require investigation and possibly mitigation.</p>
Education Capacity	Is there sufficient education capacity?		<p>AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated</p> <p>Insufficient spare school capacity but potential for improvement to meet needs. Insufficient secondary school capacity.</p>
Distance: Primary School	How far is the nearest primary school?		<p>R = &gt;800m</p> <p>948m ACF from centre of site to Histon Junior School</p>
Distance: Secondary School	How far is the nearest secondary school?		<p>A = 1 to 3 km</p> <p>1.8km ACF from centre of site to Impington Village College.</p>
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
Cycle Routes	What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?		AMBER = Medium quality off-road path.
HQPT	Is there High Quality Public Transport (at edge		AMBER = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances



	of 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 of 18
Distance: bus stop / rail station			GG = Within 400m (6)  163m to nearest bus stop ACF (Histon, Glebe Way)
Frequency of Public Transport			G = 20 minute frequency (4)  20 minute service (Citi 8)
Public transport journey time to City Centre			G = 21 to 30 minutes (4)  26 Minutes (Histon, Glebe Way to Cambridge, Emmanuel Street)
Distance for cycling to City Centre			G = 5km to 10km (4)  6.27km ACF to Cambridge City Centre
Distance: Railway Station	How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?		R = >800m  6,053m ACF from centre of the site to Waterbeach Station.
Access	Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity?		RED = Insufficient capacity/ access. Negative effects incapable of appropriate mitigation.  Insufficient capacity or access constraints that cannot be adequately mitigated. Access constraints - the track that at present serves as an access unlikely to be suitable as an access for such a large area of land.  UPDATE 2016: The promoter is proposing that access may be achieved via demolition of a property (although the site boundary does not include any property). If this were possible (subject to further investigation) it could change the score from Red to Amber (Insufficient capacity / access. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.)
Non-Car Facilities	Will it make the transport network safer for public transport, walking or cycling facilities?		AMBER = No impacts  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.
--	--	--	---

## **Appendix 4 – Update of Site Assessment Summary Table**

Site Number	Location	Site Name / Address	Proposed Use(s)	Site Option Reference	Policy Number (SC & CC)	Site Size in Hectares (Ha)	Residential Housing Capacity (number of dwellings)	Development Sequence
R1	Arbury	295 Histon Road	Residential development	R1	SC/1 g & R1	SC 0, CC 0.711	32	Urban Area
R2	Arbury	Willowcroft, 137-143 Histon Road	Residential development	R2	SC/1 h & R2	SC 0, CC 1.59	78	Urban Area
R4	West Chesterton	Henry Giles House, Chesterton Road	Residential development	R4	SC/1 f & R4	SC 0, CC 0.775	48	Urban Area
R5	Abbey	Camfields Resource Centre and Oil Depot	Residential development	R5	(CC) R5	SC 0, CC 0.858	38	Urban Area
R7	Coleridge	The Paddocks, Cherry Hinton Road	Residential development	R7	(CC) R7	SC 0, CC 2.796	123	Urban Area
R8	Coleridge	149 Cherry Hinton Road & Telehpne Exchange Coleridge Road	Residential development	R8	(CC) R8	SC 0, CC 0.76	33	Urban Area
R10	Petersfield	Mill Road Depot and adjoining properties, Mill Road	Residential development	R10	(CC) R10	SC 0, CC 2.7	167	Urban Area
R11	Romsey	Horizon Resource Centre, 285 coldham's Lane	Residential development	R11	(CC) R11	SC 0, CC 0.82	40	Urban Area
R12	Romsey	Ridgeons, 75 Cromwell Road	Residential development	R12	(CC) R12	SC 0, CC 3.27	120	Urban Area
R14	Trumpington	BT telephone exchange and car park, Long Road	Residential development	R14	(CC) R14	SC 0, CC 2.012	76	Urban Area
R16	Trumpington	Cambridge Professionsl Development Centre, Foster Road	Residential development	R16	(CC) R16	SC 0, CC 3.15	50	Urban Area
R17	Castle	Mount Pleasant House	Residential development	R17	(CC) R17	SC 0, CC 0.57	50	Urban Area
M4	Market	Police Station, Parkside	Residential development	M4	(CC) M4	SC 0, CC 0.485	50	Urban Area
R40	Abbey	Land north of Teversham Drift (also referred to as R22)	Residential development	R40	(CC) R22	SC 3.67, CC 8.79	SC 147, CC 351 (total 498)	Urban Area
R44	Trumpington	Bejeman House	Residential development	R44	(CC) R44	CC 1.17		Urban Area
M1	Kings Hedges	379-381 Milton Road	Mixed use sites	M1	(CC) M1	SC 0, CC 2.413	40	Urban Area
M2	Coleridge	Clifton Road Area	Mixed use sites	M2	(CC) M2	SC 0, CC 9.43	555	Urban Area
M5	Trumpington	82-88 Hills Road and 57 - 63 Bateman Street	Mixed use sites	M5	(CC) M5	SC 0, CC 0.58	20	Urban Area
R6	Abbey	636-656 Newmarket Road, Holy Cross Church, East Barnwell Community Centre and Meadowlands, Newmarket	Mixed use sites	R6	(CC) R6	SC 0, CC 1.01	75	Urban Area
R21	Romsey	315-249 Mill Road and Brookfields	Mixed use sites	R21	(CC) R21	SC 0, CC 2.87	128	Urban Area
E4	Cherry Hinton	Church End Industrial Estatem Rosemary Lane	Employment	E4	(CC) E4	SC 0, CC 6.621	0	Urban Area
E5	Trumpington	1 and 7-11 Hills Road	Employment	E5	(CC) E5	SC 0, CC 1.401	0	Urban Area
U1	Market	Old Press/Mill Lane site	University	U1	(CC) U1	SC 0, CC 2.004	0	Urban Area
U2	Market	New Museums, Downing Street	University	U2	(CC) U2	SC 0, CC 1.971	0	Urban Area
U3	Newnham	Grange Farm, off Wilberforce Road	University	U3	(CC) U3	SC 0, CC 1.22	0	Urban Area
RM1	East Chesterton	Fen Road	Residential Moorings	RM1	(CC) RM1	SC 0, CC 0.988	0	Urban Area
Policy SP/1	Orchard Park	Orchard Park - remaining land parcels	Residential	SP/1	(SC) SS/1	SC 32.29, CC 0	140 and 80	Urban Area
CCSC1001	Newnham (Broad Location 2)	Land North of Barton Road (Developer Proposal)	Mixed Use			SC 164.11, CC 156.96	1500	Edge of Cambridge
CCSC1002	Newnham (Broad Location 1)	Land South of Barton Road (Developer Proposal)	Mixed Use			SC 58.45, CC 0	1000	Edge of Cambridge
CCSC1003	Trumpington (Broad Location 4)	Land South of Trumpinton Meadows (Developer Proposal)	Mixed Use			SC 27.56, CC 4.65	500	Edge of Cambridge
CCSC1004	Great Shelford (Broad Location 5)	Land South of Addenbrooke's Road (Developer Proposal)	Mixed Use			SC 145, CC 45	1250	Edge of Cambridge
CCSC1005	Fulbourn (Broad Location 7)	Land between Babraham Road and Fulbourn Road (Developer Proposal)	Mixed Use			SC 53.97, CC 116.55	3000 to 4000	Edge of Cambridge
CCSC1006	Fen Ditton (Broad Location 9)	Land at Fen Ditton (Developer Proposal)	Mixed Use			SC 74.99, CC 0	400 to 500	Edge of Cambridge
E1/B	Great Shelford (Broad Location 6)	Land to south of Addenbrooke's Road between Babraham Road and Shelford Road	Employment		(SC) E1/B	11.39	0	Edge of Cambridge
CC916	Newnham (Broad Location 1)	Grange Farm	Residential			SC 0, CC 44.03	991 to 1486	Edge of Cambridge
CC924	Trumpington (Broad Location 3)	Land West of Trumpington Road	Residential			CC 45.03	1019 to 1529	Edge of Cambridge
CC928	Trumpington (Broad Location 3)	Trumpington Road West amended	Residential			CC 32.8	1107	Edge of Cambridge
CC904	Trumpington (Broad Location 5)	Land East of Hauxton Road	Mixed use			CC 9.22	310	Edge of Cambridge
CC925	Queen Ediths (Broad Location 6)	Land South of Addenbrooke's and Southwest of Babraham Road	Residential			SC0, CC 39.08	896 to 1343	Edge of Cambridge
SC283	Fulbourn (Broad Location 7)	Land South of Cambridge Road Fulbourn, Cambridge	Residential			SC 6.62	132 to 199	Edge of Cambridge
CC929 (GB2)	Queen Ediths (Broad Location 7)	Land South of Worts' Causeway	Residential		(CC) GB2	SC 0, CC 6.8	230	Edge of Cambridge
CC930 (GB1)	Queen Ediths (Broad Location 7)	Land North of Worts' Causeway	Residential		(CC) GB1	SC 0, CC7.33	247	Edge of Cambridge
CC932 (GB3)	Cherry Hinton (Broad Location 7)	Fulbourn Road West (2)	Employment		(CC) GB3	SC 0, CC 2.3	0	Edge of Cambridge
CC933 (GB4)	Cherry Hinton (Broad Location 7)	Fulbourn Road West (1)	Employment or Residential		(CC) GB4	SC 0, CC 1.4	0	Edge of Cambridge
SC300 (GB5)	Fulbourn (Broad Location 7)	Fulbourn Road East	Employment		(SC) E/2 & GB5	SC 4.29, CC 0	0	Edge of Cambridge
SC036	Fen Ditton (Broad Location 9)	Land East of Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton (land South and East of 42 Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton)	Residential			SC 5.36, CC 0	120	Edge of Cambridge
SC298	Girton & Impington (Broad Location 10)	Land south of the A14 and west of Cambridge Road	Residential and Commercial			SC 8.98, CC 0	360 to 447	Edge of Cambridge
Policy CE/3 / SS/3	Cambridge East (Broad Location 6)	Cambridge East - North of Newmarket Road and North of Cherry Hinton	Mixed Use	CE/3	(CC & SC) SS/3	61.56	1500 to 2000	Edge of Cambridge
Policy SP/2 / SS/2 (NIAB 2) & SC298	Histon & Impington (Broad Location 10)	Land south of the A14 and west of Cambridge Road	Residential	SP/2	(SC) SS/2	SC 27.8, CC 0	900	Edge of Cambridge
Policy SP/2 / SS/2 (NIAB 3) & SC298	Histon & Impington (Broad Location 10)	Land south of the A14 and west of Cambridge Road	Residential		(SC) SS/2	SC 3.16, CC 0	100	Edge of Cambridge
R47 and CE/3 / SS/3	Cambridge East (Existing Location)	Land North of Cherry Hinton	Residential		R47 & (SC) SS/3	SC 15.83, CC 31.00	SC 420, CC 780 (total 1200)	Edge of Cambridge
Site 334	Edge of Cambridge (Milton)	Cambridge, Fen Road	Residential			1.74		Edge of Cambridge
(SC) H/6	Edge of Cambridge (Milton)	Chesterton Fen Road, Milton	Residential Moorings		(SC) H/6	0.95	0	Edge of Cambridge
CC929a	Edge of Cambridge (Broad Location 7)	Land South of Worts' Causeway (New or amended site March 2016)	Residential		(CC) GB2	7.73	230	Edge of Cambridge
CCSC1005a	Edge of Cambridge (Broad Location 7)	Cambridge South East - Land West of Limeekiln Road and Cherry Hinton Road (New or amended site March 2016)	Residential			59.38	950	Edge of Cambridge
CC916a	Edge of Cambridge (Broad Location 1)	Grange Farm (New or amended site March 2016)	Residential			SC 0, CC 23.86	477	Edge of Cambridge
CCSC1001a	Edge of Cambridge (Broad Lcation 2)	Land North of Barton Road and Grange Farm (New or amended site March 2016)	Residential			SC 70.88, CC 60.72	C 1134, CC972 (total 2106)	Edge of Cambridge
Site 242	Northstowe	Land north west of B1050, Station Road, Longstanton (Northstowe Reserve)	Residential	1 (I&O1)	(SC) SS/7	56.08		Northstowe
Site 273	Northstowe	Southwell Farm, Station Road, Longstanton (part of Northstowe Reserve)	Residential		(SC) SS/7	1.84	66	Northstowe
Site 274	Northstowe	Land generally to the north and north east of Northstowe adjoining the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway	Residential			202	1800	Northstowe
Site 275	Northstowe	Old East Goods Yard, Station Road, Oakington	Residential			0.59	16	Northstowe
Site 231	Waterbeach	Land north of Waterbeach	Mixed Use	2 (I&O1)		558	10500	New Settlement
Site 231 (revised boundary)	Waterbeach	Land north of Waterbeach	Mixed Use		(SC) SS/5	407.3	8000 to 9000	New Settlement

Site 231 (Built Area)	Waterbeach	Land north of Waterbeach (Built area only)	Residential	4 (l&01)		58.15	930	Minor Rural Centre
Site 231 (MOD Area)	Waterbeach	Land north of Waterbeach (MOD only)	Mixed Use	3 (l&01)		280.2	7600	New Settlement
Site 057 & 238 (revised proposal)	Bourn	Bourn Airfield, Bourn	Mixed Use	5 (l&01)	(SC) SS/6	141.7	3000 to 3500	New Settlement
Site 135	Six Mile Bottom	Land at Six Mile Bottom	Mixed use			918.22	10000	New Settlement
Site 239 (revised boundary)	Cambourne	Land west of Lower Cambourne and the Cambourne Business Park, bounded to the north by the A428 and to the west by the A1	Mixed use	17 (l&01)	(SC) SS/8	92	1200	Rural Centre
Site 303	Cambourne	Cambourne, land at Cambourne Business Park	Residential	H1 (l&O2)		7.33	165	Rural Centre
Site 239	Cambourne	Land west of Lower Cambourne and the Cambourne Business Park, bounded to the north by the A428 and to the west by the A1	Mixed use	17 (l&01)		150.88	2250	Rural Centre
Site 194	Cambourne	Land north of A428	Mixed use			164.11	2626	New Settlement
Site 265	Cambourne	Land to the north of the A428	Mixed use			271.65	2500	New Settlement
Site 265 (Revised)	Cambourne	Land to the north of the A428 (Developer Proposal)	Mixed use			271.65	3500	New Settlement
Site 248	Hinxton	Hanley Grange, east of A1301 and west of A11	Mixed use			264.56	5000	New Settlement
Site 251	Heathfield	Land at Heathfield (north of Duxford Airfield)	Residential			60.11	962	New Settlement
Site 261	Barrington	Land at Barrington Quarry	Residential			404.99	3250	New Settlement
Site 116	Sawston	Land Rear of 41 Mill Lane, Sawston	Residential	11 (l&01)		1.59	32	Rural Centre
Site 023	Sawston	Land between 66 & 68 Common Lane, Sawston	Residential	12 (l&01)		0.5	14	Rural Centre
Site 133	Histon & Impington	Land at Buxhall Farm, Glebe Way, Histon	Residential	13 (l&01)		12.44	187	Rural Centre
Site 112	Histon & Impington	Land r/o 49-71 Impington Lane, Impington	Residential	14 (l&01)	(SC) H/1 d	1.82	20	Rural Centre
Site 114	Histon & Impington	Land north of Impington Lane, Impington	Residential	15 (l&01)	(SC) H/1 d	1.77	5	Rural Centre
Site 005	Great Shelford & Stapleford	Land off Cambridge Road, Great Shelford	Residential	18 (l&01)		3.96	89	Rural Centre
Site 258	Sawston	Land south of Babraham Road, Sawston	Residential	8 (l&01)		4.63	104	Rural Centre
Site 178 & 258 (revised boundary)	Sawston	Land south of Babraham Road	Residential	8&9 (l&01)	(SC) H/1 c	11.64	260	Rural Centre
Site 178	Sawston	Land east of Sawston	Residential	9 (l&01)		17.21	160	Rural Centre
Site 308	Histon & Impington	Histon, Land at Former Bishops Hardware Store	Residential	H2 (l&O2)		0.22	10	Rural Centre
Site 310	Sawston	Sawston, Dales Manor Business Park	Residential	H3 (l&O2)		2.06	47	Rural Centre
Site 311	Sawston	Sawston, land north of White Field Way	Residential	H4 (l&O2)		6.6	66	Rural Centre
Site 312	Sawston	Sawston, land at Former Marley Tiles Site, Dales Manor Business Park	Residential	H5 (l&O2)	(SC) H/1 a	10.7	200	Rural Centre
Site 313	Sawston	Land north of Babraham Road, Sawston	Residential	H6 (l&O2)	(SC) H/1 b	3.64	80	Rural Centre
Site 330	Great Chesterford	Great Chesterford, Land adjacent to Whiteways, Ickleton Road	Residential			3.9	88	Rural Centre
Site 305	Great Shelford	Great Shelford, Land east of The Hectare, Walden Way & Hobson Acre	Residential			3.54	63	Rural Centre
Site 031	Great Shelford & Stapleford	The Railway Tavern, Station Road, Great Shelford	Residential			0.12	13	Rural Centre
Site 033	Great Shelford & Stapleford	Land east of Bar Lane, Stapleford (land north east of 34 Bar Lane, Stapleford)	Residential			1.91	52	Rural Centre
Site 041	Great Shelford & Stapleford	Land between Hinton Way & Mingle Lane, Stapleford (land south east of 90-134 Hinton Way, Stapleford)	Residential			16.93	254	Rural Centre
Site 139	Great Shelford & Stapleford	Land east of Bar Lane and South of Gog Magog Way, Stapleford	Residential			2.8	63	Rural Centre
Site 140	Great Shelford & Stapleford	Land east of Bar Lane and South of Gog Magog Way, Stapleford	Residential			0.72	15	Rural Centre
Site 141	Great Shelford & Stapleford	Land east of Bar Lane and South of Gog Magog Way, Stapleford	Residential			2.08	47	Rural Centre
Site 145	Great Shelford & Stapleford	Land at Granhams Farm, Great Shelford	Residential			17.54	263	Rural Centre
Site 146	Great Shelford & Stapleford	Land at Hinton Way, Great Shelford	Residential			12.16	182	Rural Centre
Site 149	Great Shelford & Stapleford	Land at Marfleet Close, Great Shelford	Residential			0.82	17	Rural Centre
Site 188	Great Shelford & Stapleford	Land south of Great Shelford Caravan and Camping Club, Cambridge Road, Great Shelford	Residential			1.8	49	Rural Centre
Site 205	Great Shelford & Stapleford	Land north-west of 11 Cambridge Road, Great Shelford	Residential			1.41	29	Rural Centre
Site 207	Great Shelford & Stapleford	Land east of Hinton Way, north of Mingle Lane, Great Shelford	Residential			10.04	151	Rural Centre
Site 208	Great Shelford & Stapleford	Land to the north of Gog Magog Way, Stapleford	Residential			0.32	7	Rural Centre
Site 212	Great Shelford & Stapleford	Land east of Hinton Way, Great Shelford	Residential			1.97	53	Rural Centre
Site 253	Great Shelford & Stapleford	Land at Gog Magog Way / Haverhill Road, Stapleford	Residential			0.38	11	Rural Centre
Site 262	Great Shelford & Stapleford	Land at Hinton Way, Stapleford	Residential			1.21	33	Rural Centre
Site 306	Histon & Impington	Histon, Land west of 113 Cottenham Road	Residential			2.16	22	Rural Centre
Site 006	Histon & Impington	Land off Clay Close Lane, Impington	Residential			0.59	16	Rural Centre
Site 013	Histon & Impington	Land rear of 59 & 61 Cottenham Road, Histon	Residential			1.72	46	Rural Centre
Site 053	Histon & Impington	Mill Lane, Impington	Residential			1.35	32	Rural Centre
Site 227	Histon & Impington	Land off Villa Road, Histon	Residential			6.64	21	Rural Centre
Site 336	Histon & Impington	Impington, Land off Lone Tree Avenue	Residential			1.37	37	Rural Centre
Site 044	Sawston	Land to south of Mill Lane, Sawston (land south of 106 & 108 Mill Lane, Sawston)	Residential			6.57	149	Rural Centre
Site 126	Sawston	Land at Cambridge Road, Sawston	Residential			38.14	572	Rural Centre
Site 153	Sawston	Land at Former Marley Tiles Site, Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston	Residential	6 (l&O1)		3.56	80	Rural Centre
Site 154	Sawston	Land at Grove Road / West Way, Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston	Residential	7 (l&O1)		5.19	117	Rural Centre
Site 230	Sawston	Mill Lane, Sawston	Residential	10 (l&O1)		1.48	40	Rural Centre
Site 252	Sawston	Land north east of Cambridge Road (south east of Sewage Treatment Works and north west of Woodland Road), Sawston	Residential			8.62	194	Rural Centre
SCeM4	Sawston	Land Adjacent Sawston Bypass	Employment			3.7	0	Rural Centre
Site 021	Cottenham	Land to the rear of 69 High Street, Cottenham	Residential	21 (l&01)		0.76	21	Rural Centre*
Site 260	Cottenham	Land at Oakington Road, Cottenham	Residential	22 (l&01)		4.9	110	Rural Centre*
Site 003	Cottenham	The Redlands, Oakington Road, Cottenham	Residential	23 (l&01)		2.87	65	Rural Centre*
Site 129	Cottenham	Land south of Ellis Close and East of Oakington Road, Cottenham	Residential	24 (l&01)		4.4	99	Rural Centre*
Site 123	Cottenham	Land off Histon Road, Cottenham	Residential	25 (l&01)		0.83	17	Rural Centre*
Site 263	Cottenham	Land to the rear of 34 - 46 Histon Road, Cottenham	Residential	26 (l&01)		1.04	21	Rural Centre*
Site 125	Cottenham	Cottenham Sawmills, Cottenham	Residential	27 (l&01)		1.35	9	Rural Centre*
Site 054	Cottenham	Land at the rear of 335 High Street, Cottenham	Residential			10	225	Rural Centre*
Site 113	Cottenham	Land behind Rampton Road/Oakington Road Cottenham	Residential			26.61	175	Rural Centre*
Site 124	Cottenham	Cottenham Sawmills, Cottenham	Residential			1.35	27	Rural Centre*
Site 128	Cottenham	Land at Rampton Road, Cottenham	Residential			9.77	220	Rural Centre*
Site 241	Cottenham	The Woodyard, Cottenham	Residential			1.22	25	Rural Centre*
Site 269	Cottenham	Land adjacent to The Woodyard, Cottenham	Residential			1.42	29	Rural Centre*
Site 316	Cottenham	Cottenham, Land to Rear of High Street	Residential			7.02	158	Rural Centre*
SC313a	Sawston	Land north of Babraham Road, Sawston (New or amended site March 2016)	Residential	H6 (l&O2)		3.64	110	Rural Centre



Site 152	Linton	Land east of Station Road, Linton	Residential	29 (I&O1)		1.78	36	Minor Rural Centre
Site 171	Gamlingay	Land off Grays Road, Gamlingay	Residential	32 (I&O1)		4.32	47	Minor Rural Centre
Site 117	Gamlingay	Green End Industrial Estate, Green End, Gamlingay	Residential	33 (I&O1)	(SC) H/1 f	4.09	92	Minor Rural Centre
Site 093	Gamlingay	Land at Mill Road, Gamlingay	Residential	34 (I&O1)		1.18	24	Minor Rural Centre
Site 151	Papworth Everard	Papworth Hospital, Papworth Everard	Residential	45 (I&O1)		5.23	118	Minor Rural Centre
Site 045	Willingham	Land east of Rockmill End, Willingham (land east of 39-65 Rockmill End, Willingham)	Residential	46 (I&O1)	(SC) H/1 g	3.41	48	Minor Rural Centre
Site 204	Willingham	Land to the rear of Green Street, Willingham	Residential	47 (I&O1)		2.6	39	Minor Rural Centre
Site 001	Waterbeach	Land off Lode Avenue, Waterbeach	Residential	51 (I&O1)		0.59	14	Minor Rural Centre
Site 202	Waterbeach	Land off Cambridge Road, Waterbeach	Residential	52 (I&O1)		4.81	8	Minor Rural Centre
Site 320	Melbourn	Melbourn, land to the east of New Road	Residential	H7 (I&O2)		26.02	200	Minor Rural Centre
Site 176	Melbourn	East Farm, Melbourn	Residential	H8 (I&O2)		2.83	60	Minor Rural Centre
Site 331	Melbourn	East Farm	Residential	H8 (I&O2)		2.83	60	Minor Rural Centre
Site 235	Melbourn	36 New Road, Melbourn	Residential		(SC) H/1 e	0.71	14	Minor Rural Centre
Site 168	Gamlingay	Land off Green Acres, Gamlingay (land west of 65 & 67 Greenacres, Gamlingay)	Residential			4.64	104	Minor Rural Centre
Site 170	Gamlingay	Land off Green Acres, Gamlingay (land west of 1, 11, 27 & 35 Greenacres, Gamlingay)	Residential			1.88	38	Minor Rural Centre
Site 172	Gamlingay	Land rear of Merton Farm, Gamlingay	Residential			1.24	25	Minor Rural Centre
Site 173	Gamlingay	Land off Honey Hill, Gamlingay	Residential			4.51	101	Minor Rural Centre
Site 174	Gamlingay	Land off Green End, Gamlingay	Residential			1.52	31	Minor Rural Centre
Site 015	Linton	1 Horseheath Road, Linton	Residential			0.28	6	Minor Rural Centre
Site 032	Linton	Land to south of Horseheath Road, Linton (land south of Wheatsheaf, Horseheath Road, Linton)	Residential			3.96	89	Minor Rural Centre
Site 101	Linton	Land to the east of Linton (to the north of Tower View and Balsham Road), Linton	Residential			18.16	272	Minor Rural Centre
Site 102	Linton	Land to the east of Linton (to the east of The Ridgeway and north of Bartlow Road), Linton	Residential			1.42	29	Minor Rural Centre
Site 103	Linton	Land to the east of Linton (land north of Horseheath Road), Linton	Residential			6.53	147	Minor Rural Centre
Site 104	Linton	Land to the east of Linton (land south of Bartlow Road), Linton	Residential			3.68	83	Minor Rural Centre
Site 120	Linton	Land East of Linton	Residential			46.05	691	Minor Rural Centre
Site 197	Linton	Land adjacent to Back Road, Linton	Residential			16.73	251	Minor Rural Centre
Site 198	Linton	Land adjacent to Balsham Road, Linton	Residential			3.07	69	Minor Rural Centre
Site 199	Linton	Land adjacent to Horseheath Road, Linton	Residential			6.53	147	Minor Rural Centre
Site 200	Linton	Land to the north and south of Long Lane and east of The Grip, Linton	Residential			6.48	146	Minor Rural Centre
Site 201	Linton	Land north of Cambridge Road, Linton	Residential			6.3	142	Minor Rural Centre
Site 276	Linton	Land adjacent to Paynes Meadow, Linton	Residential			0.83	22	Minor Rural Centre
Site 318	Linton	Linton, Land to the east of Linton	Residential			27.95	420	Minor Rural Centre
Site 196	Papworth Everard	Land to east of Ridgeway and north of Old Pine Way, Papworth Everard	Residential			81.77	981	Minor Rural Centre
Site 321	Papworth Everard	Papworth Everard, land at The Ridgeway	Residential			11.12	167	Minor Rural Centre
Policy SP/10, site 2	Papworth Everard	Papworth Everard West Central	Residential	SP/10(2)	(SC) H/3	8.55	66 and 2	Minor Rural Centre
Site 019	Waterbeach	Land adj to 35 Burgess Road, Waterbeach	Residential			4	30	Minor Rural Centre
Site 043	Waterbeach	Land north of Glebe Road, Waterbeach (land north west of 1 Glebe Road, Waterbeach)	Residential			5.35	120	Minor Rural Centre
Site 090	Waterbeach	Burgess Road, Waterbeach	Residential			1.14	19	Minor Rural Centre
Site 091	Waterbeach	Saberton Close, Waterbeach	Residential			1.08	12	Minor Rural Centre
Site 142	Waterbeach	Land north of Poorsfield Road, Waterbeach	Residential			0.2	5	Minor Rural Centre
Site 155	Waterbeach	North side of Bannold Road, Waterbeach	Residential	50 (I&O1)		1.43	29	Minor Rural Centre
Site 190	Waterbeach	Land adjacent to Pieces Lane, Waterbeach	Residential			1.78	30	Minor Rural Centre
Site 270	Waterbeach	Land off Gibson Close, Waterbeach	Residential			0.69	14	Minor Rural Centre
Site 337	Waterbeach	Waterbeach, Land adjacent to Bannold Road	Residential			6.21	140	Minor Rural Centre
Site 047	Willingham	Land to the south of Over Road, Willingham	Residential			1.84	28	Minor Rural Centre
Site 058	Willingham	Land South of 77 Station Road, Willingham	Residential			0.41	2	Minor Rural Centre
Site 157	Willingham	Land to the rear of High Street / George Street, Willingham	Residential			2.55	57	Minor Rural Centre
Site 259	Willingham	Land Adjacent to 15 Priest Lane, Willingham	Residential			0.52	12	Minor Rural Centre
Site 279	Willingham	Land at Black Pit Drove / Rampton Road, Willingham	Residential			0.85	10	Minor Rural Centre
Site 323	Willingham	Willingham, Land north of Rook Grove	Residential			2.08	25	Minor Rural Centre
Site 074	Fulbourn	Land off Station Road, Fulbourn	Residential	28 (I&O1)		12.41	186	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 083	Swavesey	Land south of Whitton Close & west of Boxworth End, Swavesey	Residential	36 (I&O1)		7.65	75	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 085	Bassingbourn	Next to Walnut Tree Close, North End, Bassingbourn	Residential	37 (I&O1)		3.14	53	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 219	Bassingbourn	Land north of Elbourn Way, Bassingbourn	Residential	38 (I&O1)		5.31	41	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 078	Bassingbourn	Land between South End & Spring Lane, Bassingbourn	Residential	39 (I&O1)		2.12	48	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 143	Girton	Land at Cockerton Road, Girton	Residential	40 (I&O1)		0.63	13	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 158	Comberton	Land off Long Road (south of Branch Road), Comberton	Residential	41 (I&O1)		5.71	128	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 004	Comberton	Land adj (north) to 69 Long Road, Comberton	Residential	42 (I&O1)		0.32	10	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 255	Comberton	Land to the East of Bush Close, Comberton	Residential	43 (I&O1)		4.83	73	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 110	Comberton	Land to the west of Birdlines, Manor Farm, Comberton	Residential	44 (I&O1)		6	90	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 326 (revised proposal)	Comberton	Comberton, Land at Bennell Farm	Residential	H10 (I&O2)	(SC) H/1 h	6.27	90	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 059	Bassingbourn	North End & Elbourne Way, Bassingbourn	Residential			2.8	63	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 066	Bassingbourn	Land off the Causeway, Bassingbourn	Residential			1.03	28	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 220	Bassingbourn	Land south of Poplar Farm Close & north of Brook Road, Bassingbourn	Residential			0.51	11	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 291	Bassingbourn	Land opposite 68 Spring Lane, Bassingbourn	Residential			0.61	12	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 324	Bassingbourn	Bassingbourn, 2 parcels north of High Street	Residential			3.89	57	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 079	Comberton	40 - 48 West Street, Comberton	Residential			1.42	29	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 080	Comberton	50 - 54 West Street, Comberton	Residential			0.89	18	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 087	Comberton	Land to the rear of 42 Swaynes Lane, Comberton	Residential			0.66	13	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 088	Comberton	Land south and east of 42 Swaynes Lane, Comberton	Residential			2.24	50	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 181	Comberton	Land to the West of Green End, Comberton	Residential			6.02	135	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 037	Fulbourn	Land at Fulbourn Old Drift (south of Cambridge Road and north of Shelford Road), Fulbourn	Residential			76.78	921	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 038	Fulbourn	Land north of Cambridge Road, Fulbourn	Residential			11.08	166	Minor Rural Centre*

Site 108	Fulbourn	Land south of Hinton Road, Fulbourn	Residential			3.48	78	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 109	Fulbourn	Land to the South of Fulbourn Old Drift & Hinton Road, Fulbourn	Residential			7.42	78	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 136	Fulbourn	Land at Balsham Road, Fulbourn	Residential			2.76	62	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 162	Fulbourn	Land between Teversham Road and Cow Lane, Fulbourn	Residential			6.14	92	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 213	Fulbourn	Land at east of Court Meadows House, Balsham Road, Fulbourn	Residential			13.84	166	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 214	Fulbourn	Land off Home End, Fulbourn	Residential			0.52	14	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 245	Fulbourn	Bird Farm Field, Cambridge Road, Fulbourn	Residential			5.67	85	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 335	Fulbourn	Fulbourn, Land to the rear of 12-18 Teversham Road	Residential			0.39	9	Minor Rural Centre*
Policy SP/9	Fulbourn	Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals	Residential	SP/9	(SC) E/7	26.91	250 to 275	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 018	Girton	Town End, Duck End, Girton	Residential			0.37	8	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 144	Girton	Land at Dodford Lane / High Street, Girton	Residential			3.5	2	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 177	Girton	Land off Oakington Road, Girton	Residential			3.12	47	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 203	Girton	Land off Duck End, Girton	Residential			3.41	51	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 240	Girton	Land at Littleton House, High Street, Girton	Residential			2.58	50	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 132	Milton	The Former EDF Depot & Training Centre, Ely Road, Milton	Residential	35 (I&O 2012)		8.53	128	Minor Rural Centre
Site 327	Milton	Milton, Land west of A10	Residential			9.54	0 (215 if unconstrained)	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 008	Swavesey	Land adj to 79 Middlewatch, Swavesey	Residential			0.26	3	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 048	Swavesey	The Farm, Boxworth End, Swavesey	Residential			1.99	38	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 049	Swavesey	Land to east of Boxworth End, Swavesey	Residential			61.54	738	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 050	Swavesey	Dairy Farm, 31 Boxworth End, Swavesey	Residential			3.55	80	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 065	Swavesey	Land abutting Fen Drayton Road, Swavesey	Residential			7.22	162	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 071	Swavesey	Land south of Hale Road, Swavesey	Residential			10.76	81	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 169	Swavesey	Land south of Market Street & at Fenwillow Farm, Swavesey	Residential			1.09	0	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 250	Swavesey	Driftwood Farm, Swavesey	Residential			1.74	47	Minor Rural Centre*
Site 287	Swavesey	Land adj to Fen Drayton Road, Swavesey	Residential			1.3	26	Minor Rural Centre*
SCEM1	Milton	Land between the A14 and Milton, Milton	Employment			1.79	0	Minor Rural Centre*
SCEM2	Milton	West of the A10 and south of the Park & Ride, Milton	Employment			9.5	0	Minor Rural Centre*
SCEM5	Melbourn	Land North of Melbourn South of the A10	Employment			33.5	0	Minor Rural Centre
SCEM7	Swavesey	Land adjoining Buckingway Business Park, Swavesey	Employment			2.1	0	Minor Rural Centre
SC340	Bar Hill	Land at Hallmark Hotel, Bar Hill (New or amended site March 2016)	Residential			2.88	65	Minor Rural Centre
SC037a	Fulbourn	Land at Fulbourn Old Drift (south of Cambridge Road and north of Shelford Road), Fulbourn (New or amended site March 2016)	Residential			17.8	268	Minor Rural Centre
SC038a	Fulbourn	Land north of Cambridge Road, Fulbourn (New or amended site March 2016)	Employment			11.08	0	Minor Rural Centre
SC327a	Milton	Land west of A10, Milton (New or amended site March 2016)	Employment			9.54	0	Minor Rural Centre
SC071a	Swavesey	Land south of Hale Road, Swavesey (New or amended site March 2016)	Residential			4.36	144	Minor Rural Centre
H/1:i	Great Abington	Land at Linton Road	Residential		(SC) H/1:i	4.11	35	Parish Proposal
Site 211 (part)	Great Abington	Land at Pampisford Road/High Street, Great Abington	Residential		(SC) H/1:j	0.55	12	Parish Proposal
Site 028	Great Abington	Land at Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington	Residential		(SC) H/1:k	0.42	6	Parish Proposal
H/1:l	Graveley	Land at Toseland Road, Graveley	Residential		(SC) H/1:l	0.4	6	Parish Proposal
SC098a	Teversham	Land to the east of Cherry Hinton Road, Teversham (New or amended site March 2016)	Residential			17.9	269	Group Village
SC025a	Little Abington	Land south of Bourn Bridge Road, Little Abington (New or amended site March 2016)	Residential			2.5	57	Group Village







Site 239	Rural Centre	r	r	r	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	r	r	a	g	g	a	g	g	a	a	g	a	a	g	gg	g	a	a	r	a	a								
Site 194	New Settlement	r	r	g	a	g	r	g	g	g	a	a	a	r	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	r	r	g	g	r	a	g	a	g	a	a	g	a	r	a	r	r	r	a					
Site 265	New Settlement	r	r	g	a	g	r	g	g	a	a	a	a	r	g	g	a	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	r	r	g	g	r	a	g	g	a	a	g	a	a	r	a	a	a							
Site 265 (Revised)	New Settlement	r	r	g	a	g	r	g	g	a	a	a	a	g	r	g	g	a	a	g	g	g	a	g	r	g	g	g	r	a	g	g	a	a	g	g	g	a	a	r	a	a						
Site 248	New Settlement	r	r	g	a	g	r	g	g	a	a	g	a	r	r	g	a	gg	g	g	g	g	a	g	r	g	a	g	g	a	g	g	gg	a	a	g	g	a	a	g	gg	g	a	r	a	g		
Site 251	New Settlement	r	r	g	a	r	r	a	g	g	a	g	a	g	r	a	r	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	a	a	r	r	r	r	a	a	g	rr	a	r	g	a	
Site 261	New Settlement	a	r	a	a	g	a	a	g	a	a	g	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	g	gg	g	g	a	g	r	g	g	g	a	a	g	r	a	a	a	g	g	a	a	a	g	a	r	g	a		
Site 116	Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	a	a	a	a	g	r	a	a	g	g	g	a	a	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	a	g	a	g	a	g	r	a	g	g	a	g	r	g	a		
Site 023	Rural Centre	r	g	g	a	g	g	a	g	g	a	a	a	a	g	g	a	a	a	g	g	a	a	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	a	g	a	g	a	a	g	r	a	a	a	g	r	g	a	
Site 133	Rural Centre	r	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	g	a	a	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	g	g	a	a	g	g	a	a	a	a	g	gg	g	g	g	r	g	a				
Site 112	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	g	a	g	a	a	r	a	a	g	a	a	g	a	g	a	a	g	gg	gg	g	gg	g	r	g	a				
Site 114	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	g	g	g	a	a	r	g	a	g	a	a	g	g	a	a	g	gg	gg	g	gg	g	r	a	a					
Site 005	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	a	a	g	g	g	g	g	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	g	g	a	r	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	g	g	r	r	r	r	a	g	gg	g	a	g	r	a	a			
Site 258	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	a	r	g	a	g	r	g	a		
Site 178 & 258 (revised boundary)	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	a	a	a	g	gg	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	a	a	g	a	a	a	a	a	a	g	a	a	r	a	a	
Site 178	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	a	a	a	g	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	a	a	g	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	g	a	a	r	a	a
Site 308	Rural Centre	g	g	g	g	a	a	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	gg	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	r	r	g	a	g	g	a	a	g	a	a	g	a	a	g	a	a	gg	gg	gg	gg	gg	r	g	g
Site 310	Rural Centre	g	g	g	g	a	a	g	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	g	r	g	r	g	a			
Site 311	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	a	a	a	g	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	r	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	a	a	r	g	r	a	a	a	g	r	g	a		
Site 312	Rural Centre	g	g	g	g	g	gg	a	g	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	g	a	g	r	g	a		
Site 313	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	a	a	r	g	r	g	r	g	a	
Site 330	Rural Centre	r	a	g	a	a	r	g	g	g	a	g	a	g	r	g	g	a	g	g	a	r	a	a	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	a	a	r	r	r	r	g	gg	r	gg	g	r	a	a	
Site 305	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	r	g	a	a	g	a	r	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	a	g	g	a	r	r	a	a	g	gg	g	a	g	r	g	a	
Site 031	Rural Centre	g	g	g	g	a	a	g	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	a	a	g	g	a	a	a	r	g	a	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	r	a	g	gg	a	gg	g	g	g	a			
Site 033	Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	a	a	a	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	r	g	a	a	g	r	g	g	a	g	a	r	a	g	g	a	g	r	g	a		
Site 041	Rural Centre	r	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	a	a	a	r	a	r	r	a	g	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	r	a	a	r	g	a	g	r	g	a	
Site 139	Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	a	a	a	a	g	a	a	a	a	g	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	g	a	a	r	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	
Site 140	Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	g	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	g	a	g	a	r	a	g	g	g	a	g	r	g	a
Site 141	Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	a	a	g	g	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	g	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	g	g	r	a	g	r	g	g	a	g	a	r	a	a	a	g	a	g	r	g	a	
Site 145	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	r	a	a	r	r	r	r	a	g	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	a	a	a	r	r	g	a	g	a	g	gg	g	a	g	a		
Site 146	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	a	r	a	r	r	a	g	g	a	r	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	a	a	a	r	r	r	a	a	a	gg	g	r	g	a			
Site 149	Rural Centre	r	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	a	r	r	g	a	g	g	a	r	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	a	g	a	a	r	r	a	a	a	gg	g	a	g	r	a	a	
Site 188	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	a	a	g	g	g	g	a	a	r	a	g	a	g	g	a	r	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	a	g	a	r	r	a	a	g	gg	g	a	gg	r	a	a		
Site 205	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	a	a	r	a	a	r	a	g	g	a	r	a	r	r	a	a	g	r	a	g	a	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	gg	g	a	g	r	g	a	
Site 207	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	a	a	g	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	a	g	g	a	a	a	r	a	g	g	a	gg	g	a	a	a	
Site 208	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	a	a	g	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	a	g	a	a	a	r	a	a	a	g	a	g	r	g	a		
Site 212	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	a	a	a	r	a	g	g	g	r	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	a	g	a	a	a	r	a	g	g	a	gg	g	a	r	a		
Site 253	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	a	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	g	a	g	a	g	g	a	a	a	r	a	a	r	g	a	g	r	g	a	
Site 262	Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	a	r	g	a	g	g	g	r	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	a	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	gg	rr	gg	g	r	g	a		
Site 306	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	g	a	g	a	r	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	a	g	g	a	r	a	a	a	g	gg	g	g	g	r	r	a		
Site 006	Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	r	a	g	g	g	r	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	a	g	g	a	r	g	a	a	gg	gg	g	gg	gg	r	g	a		
Site 013	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	a	a	a	r	a	g	g	g	r	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	g	gg	g	g	g	r	a	a				
Site 053	Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	a	a	r	a	g	g	a	g	a	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	a	a	g	a	a	g	gg	gg	g	gg	g	r	a	a			
Site 227	Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	a	a	a	g	g	a	g	a	r	a	r	g	a	a	g	g	g	a	r	r	a	a	g	a	a	g	g	g	a	a	a	g	gg	g	g	gg	gg	r	a	a			
Site 336	Rural Centre	r	a	g	a	r	a	a	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	g	a	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	a	g	a	a	a	g	gg	gg	g	gg	gg	r	a	a				
Site 044	Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	a	r	g	r	g	a	a	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	a	a	r	g	a	r	g	a	g	r	g	a			
Site 126	Rural Centre	r	r	g	a	g	r	a	g	g	a	a	a	r	r	r	r	a	g	g	g	r	a	r	r	r	g	g	r	a	g	r	g	a	a	g	g	a	a	a	a	g	a	g				

Site 235	Minor Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	g	a	g	g	a	g	r	g	g	g	a	a	r	r	a	a	r	gg	gg	r	g	a			
Site 168	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	g	a	g	r	a	g	g	a	r	a	a	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	g	g	a	a	r	r	a	gg	rr	g	g	r	r	a				
Site 170	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	g	g	a	g	g	g	r	a	a	r	a	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	g	g	a	g	r	r	a	gg	rr	g	g	r	g	a		
Site 172	Minor Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	g	a	g	r	a	g	g	a	a	a	r	a	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	g	g	a	g	r	r	a	g	rr	g	g	r	g	a					
Site 173	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	r	r	g	r	a	a	g	g	a	g	r	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	g	a	g	r	r	a	a	rr	g	g	r	g	a				
Site 174	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	a	a	a	g	r	a	g	g	a	a	r	a	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	g	g	a	g	r	r	a	gg	rr	g	g	r	g	a					
Site 015	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	a	a	g	a	g	a	a	g	g	r	a	g	r	a	a	g	g	a	g	r	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	g	gg	a	a	g	r	g	a		
Site 032	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	g	g	g	a	g	g	a	r	a	r	r	a	g	g	a	g	r	g	a	a	a	a	r	r	g	gg	a	a	g	r	r	a		
Site 101	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	g	g	a	a	g	g	a	r	a	r	r	a	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	a	a	a	a	r	r	a	a	a	a	g	r	r	a	
Site 102	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	a	g	g	r	a	g	g	a	r	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	a	a	a	a	r	r	g	gg	a	a	g	r	r	a	
Site 103	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	g	g	r	a	g	g	a	r	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	a	a	a	a	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	r	r	a	
Site 104	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	g	g	r	a	g	g	a	r	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	a	a	a	a	r	r	a	gg	a	a	g	r	r	a	
Site 120	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	g	g	r	a	g	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	a	a	a	a	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	r	r	r	
Site 197	Minor Rural Centre	r	a	a	g	g	a	g	g	a	g	a	r	g	g	r	a	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	a	a	a	a	r	r	a	rr	a	a	g	r	r	a		
Site 198	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	a	g	g	a	g	g	a	r	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	a	a	a	a	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	r	r	a		
Site 199	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	g	g	r	a	g	g	a	r	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	a	a	a	a	r	r	g	gg	a	a	g	r	r	a	
Site 200	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	r	a	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	g	a	a	g	a	a	r	a	a	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	a	a	a	a	g	r	r	g	gg	a	a	g	r	r	a		
Site 201	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	a	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	g	r	a	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	a	a	a	g	r	r	g	gg	a	a	g	r	r	a		
Site 276	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	g	g	a	a	g	g	r	a	a	a	r	a	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	a	a	a	g	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	r	r	a	
Site 318	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	g	g	r	a	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	a	a	a	a	r	r	a	a	g	r	r	a				
Site 196	Minor Rural Centre	r	r	g	a	g	a	g	g	a	a	g	a	r	a	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	r	a	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	a	a	a	r	r	r	a	a	rr	gg	g	r	a	a		
Site 321	Minor Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	a	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	a	a	r	a	a	g	a	a	g	g	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	a	g	rr	gg	g	r	a	a	
Policy SP/10, site 2	Minor Rural Centre	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	a	a	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	r	g	a	g	g	a	a	g	g	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	g	gg	r	gg	g	r	g	a		
Site 019	Minor Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	a	a	a	a	r	g	g	a	a	a	r	a	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	a	a	a	g	a	a	a			
Site 043	Minor Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	a	a	g	g	a	g	a	r	a	r	a	a	g	g	g	a	a	a	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	g	g	r	a	a	
Site 090	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	a	a	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	a	r	a	g	g	g	a	a	a	r	a	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	a	g	a	g	g	a	r	a	
Site 091	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	a	r	a	g	g	g	a	a	a	r	g	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	g	a	g	r	r	r	a	g	a	g	a	a			
Site 142	Minor Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	r	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	r	a	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	g	gg	r	g	g	r	a	a	
Site 155	Minor Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	a	a	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	a	r	g	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	g	a	g	r	r	r	a	g	r	g	g	r	g	a	
Site 190	Minor Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	a	a	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	r	a	g	g	g	a	a	g	r	a	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	g	a	g	r	r	r	a	g	r	g	g	a	a		
Site 270	Minor Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	g	r	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	r	a	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	g	gg	r	g	g	a	r	a	
Site 337	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	a	r	g	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	g	gg	a	g	g	r	g	a	
Site 047	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	a	a	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	g	a	r	g	g	g	a	a	r	a	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	g	gg	r	a	g	r	r	a		
Site 058	Minor Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	g	a	g	g	a	r	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	r	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	g	gg	r	a	g	r	a	a	
Site 157	Minor Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	g	r	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	r	g	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	g	gg	r	a	g	r	r	a	
Site 259	Minor Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	g	a	a	g	g	g	a	g	r	a	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	a	a	a	a			
Site 279	Minor Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	a	a	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	g	g	a	g	g	a	r	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	a	a	a	g	r	a	a		
Site 323	Minor Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	g	a	a	r	g	g	g	a	g	r	a	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	a	gg	r	r	g	r	r	a	
Site 074	Minor Rural Centre*	r	a	g	g	g	a	a	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	a	g	g	g	g	a	a	g	r	a	a	g	a	a	g	a	g	a	a	a	r	r	g	g	gg	g	r	g	a	a		
Site 083	Minor Rural Centre*	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	a	a	g	g	g	a	a	r	r	g	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	g	a	a	g	r	r	g	gg	r	g	g	r	g	a		
Site 085	Minor Rural Centre*	r	a	g	g	g	a	a	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	g	g	a	a	g	g	a	a	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	g	a	r	g	r	r	g	gg	rr	gg	gg	r	g	a		
Site 219	Minor Rural Centre*	r	a	g	g	g	a	a	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	g	r	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	r	a	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	g	a	r	r	r	g	gg	rr	gg	gg	r	g	a		
Site 078	Minor Rural Centre*	g	a	g	g	g	a	a	g	g	g	g	a	a	a	g	a	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	r	g	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	g	a	a	g	r	r	g	gg	r	g	gg	gg	r	g	a
Site 143	Minor Rural Centre*	r	a	g	g	a	g	a	g	g	a	g	a	a	a	a	r	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	a	g	g	a	g	a	r	a	gg	gg	g	gg	gg	r	g	a	
Site 158	Minor Rural Centre*	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	g	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	a	a	r	r	a	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	g	g	a	g	r	r	a	a	r	g	g	r	g	a	
Site 004	Minor Rural Centre*	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	a	a	r	r	a	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	g	g	a	a	r	r	a	a	r	g	g	r	g	a		
Site 255	Minor Rural Centre*	r																																														

Site 049	Minor Rural Centre*	r	g	g	a	a	a	a	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	g	r	a	g	g	a	r	a	r	r	a	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	a	r	r	a	r	r	a	g	r	g	g	r	g	g
Site 050	Minor Rural Centre*	r	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	g	a	a	g	g	g	r	a	r	r	g	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	a	r	r	g	r	r	g	gg	r	g	g	r	g	a	
Site 065	Minor Rural Centre*	r	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	a	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	a	a	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	r	g	a	r	a	g	r	r	a	g	r	g	g	r	g	a	
Site 071	Minor Rural Centre*	r	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	g	a	a	r	g	g	g	a	g	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	a	r	a	g	r	r	g	g	r	g	gg	r	g	a
Site 169	Minor Rural Centre*	r	g	g	g	g	r	a	g	g	g	a	r	r	g	r	a	r	g	g	g	a	g	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	g	r	g	r	r	g	gg	r	g	g	r	a	a		
Site 250	Minor Rural Centre*	r	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	g	r	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	g	r	a	g	r	r	g	gg	r	g	gg	r	r	a	
Site 287	Minor Rural Centre*	r	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	g	a	a	g	g	g	g	a	a	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	a	r	a	g	r	r	a	g	r	g	g	r	g	a
SCEM1	Minor Rural Centre*	r	g	g	a	a	g	a	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	r	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	r	gg	gg	a	gg	gg	r	g	a
SCEM2	Minor Rural Centre*	r	a	a	a	a	r	a	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	r	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	r	g	gg	gg	gg	g	gg	r	g	a	
SCEM5	Minor Rural Centre	r	a	g	a	g	a	a	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	r	r	g	g	r	gg	a	r	g	a
SCEM7	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	a	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	r	r	r	r	r	r	a	r	r	a	
SC340	Minor Rural Centre	a	g	g	r	r	r	a	g	g	a	a	a	g	a	g	a	a	a	g	g	g	a	a	r	a	a	g	r	a	g	a	a	a	a	a	r	rr	a	g	gg	g	g	r	a	a	
SC037a	Minor Rural Centre	r	a	g	a	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	r	r	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	a	g	a	r	r	a	g	a	g	g	r	g	r	a	g	
SC038a	Minor Rural Centre	r	a	g	g	g	r	r	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	r	a	a	g	g	a	a	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	r	r	a	g	g	gg	g	r	g	r	g	g
SC327a	Minor Rural Centre	r	a	g	a	a	r	a	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	r	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	r	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	g	g	g	g	a	a	r	g	gg	gg	gg	gg	gg	r	g	a
SC071a	Minor Rural Centre	r	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	g	a	a	r	g	g	g	a	a	r	r	a	g	r	a	g	r	g	a	a	a	g	r	r	g	g	a	g	a	r	g	a
H/1:i	Parish Proposal	r	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	a	a	g	g	a	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	r	r	a	g	g	a	g	a	g	g	a	a	r	r	g	gg	a	g	a	r	a	a	
Site 211 (part)	Parish Proposal	r	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	a	a	g	g	a	a	g	g	g	a	a	a	r	r	a	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	a	r	r	g	gg	a	g	g	r	a	a	
Site 028	Parish Proposal	a	a	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	a	a	g	a	a	g	g	g	a	a	g	r	r	a	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	g	gg	a	g	a	r	g	a	
H/1:l	Parish Proposal	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	g	a	g	g	r	r	a	g	r	r	a	g	g	a	g	r	g	g	g	g	r	rr	r	rr	rr	rr	rr	g	r	g	a	
SC098a	Group Village	r	a	g	g	g	a	a	g	g	a	g	a	r	r	r	r	a	g	g	g	g	a	a	r	r	a	g	r	a	a	gg	gg	gg	a	gg	gg	gg	a	gg	gg	gg	r	r	a		
SC025a	Group Village	r	a	g	g	g	a	g	g	g	a	a	a	r	r	g	r	a	g	g	g	r	a	a	r	r	a	g	a	a	g	g	a	a	r	r	r	r	g	gg	a	a	a	r	a	a	

## **Appendix 5 – Screening of Additional Proposed Modifications**

## Appendix 5

### Amendments to SAA Screening tables as a result of changes to the Proposed Modifications

Planning Practice Guidance (available at <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk>) states that it is up to the local planning authority to decide whether SA reports should be amended following proposed modifications. In order to make this decision, a screening exercise was been undertaken of the major modifications proposed and updated conclusions drawn where necessary. Screening of the changes was included in Table 10.1a and b of the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum.

Additional and amended proposed modifications proposed following the Proposed Modifications Consultation have been considered, and added to the tables below.

**Table 10.1: Screening the Proposed Changes – Cambridge Local Plan**

<b>Table 10.1: Screening the Proposed Changes – Cambridge Local Plan<sup>1</sup></b>		
<b>Policy or plan reference</b>	<b>Proposed Change and reason for change</b>	<b>SA screening</b>
Policy 3: Spatial strategy for the location of residential development.	<p>Amend the second paragraph of Policy 3 to read:</p> <p>Provision will be made for the development of not less than 14,000 additional dwellings within Cambridge City Council's administrative boundary over the period from April 2011 to March 2031 to meet the objectively assessed need for homes in Cambridge. This will enable continuous delivery of housing for at least 15 years from the anticipated date of adoption of this local plan. The housing trajectories for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, as updated each year in the Annual Monitoring Report, will be considered together for the purposes of phasing and housing delivery, including for calculating 5-year housing land supply in development management decisions that concern housing development. This Provision includes two small sites to be released from the Cambridge Green Belt at Worts' Causeway, which will deliver up to 430 dwellings.</p> <p>The joint housing trajectory reflects the close functional relationship between the Councils, the joint development strategy and the way that strategy is being built out, in particular that sites on the edge of Cambridge are building out from the built up area in Cambridge and have not yet reached or</p>	The matter of a joint housing trajectory is an administrative change and will not lead to materially different sustainability effects on the ground.

<sup>1</sup> Please note that the Cambridge SA assessed the significant positive effects of the plan overall rather than assessing the effects of individual policies. Therefore, the screening assessment above focuses on the changes that the modifications will have on the effects of the plan overall.

**Table 10.1: Screening the Proposed Changes – Cambridge Local Plan<sup>1</sup>**

Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p>started building over the administrative boundary is South Cambridgeshire. It is about the phasing of housing delivery, not overall housing provision. Modification relates to the changes required to give effect to the Memorandum of Understanding between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council: Greater Cambridge Joint Housing Trajectory (September 2014, RD/Strat/350).</p>	
<p>Policy 12: Cambridge East (and site R47)</p>	<p>Amendments to the policy are proposed including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A larger site allocation for land north of Cherry Hinton (site R47 for approximately 780 dwellings during the plan period (along with adjoining land allocated in Policy SS/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan for approximately 420 dwellings);</li> <li>• Amendments to policy criteria related to mitigation of environmental and health impacts, masterplanning and operation of Cambridge Airport;</li> <li>• <b>Additional change following Proposed Modifications Consultation (March 2016):</b> Additional criteria regarding vehicular access being only via the new spine road.</li> <li>• Additional criterion added related to school provision and other local facilities.</li> </ul> <p>Consequential changes are also proposed to the supporting text of the policy and figure 3.2, proposals schedule and policies map.</p> <p>These changes are to reflect the fact that the exact boundary of the land that could be developed north of Cherry Hinton is more extensive than is currently allocated for development in the Local Plans. The Councils are working closely together to ensure delivery of the maximum area of land appropriate with the Airport remaining operational, consistent with the objectives of the AAP and the submitted Local Plans.</p>	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported from page 455 onwards in the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>The assessment found the plan would have a positive effect on community and well-being as the policy includes calls for residential proposals in Cambridge East to demonstrate that any environmental and health impacts (including noise) from the airport can be acceptably mitigated for residents of new development. This remains the case for the policy so the assessment remains valid.</p>

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



**Table 10.1: Screening the Proposed Changes – Cambridge Local Plan<sup>3</sup>**

<b>Policy or plan reference</b>	<b>Proposed Change and reason for change</b>	<b>SA screening</b>
Policy 27: Carbon reduction, community energy networks, sustainable design and construction, and water use	<p>As a result of the Housing Standards Review and the associated Written Ministerial Statement published on 25 March 2015, the following changes to the policy are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of requirements related to the achievement of the Code for Sustainable Homes for new residential development. As a result of the Housing Standards Review, the Code has now been abolished and Local Planning Authorities are no longer able to set specific construction standards for residential development; and</li> <li>• Amendment of the water efficiency standard to reflect the new national technical standard of 110 litres/person/day, giving consideration to the requirements set out in paragraph 56-015-20150327 of the Planning Practice Guidance related to evidence of need.</li> <li>• <b>Additional change following Proposed Modifications Consultation (March 2016):</b> Additional reference to proposals which relate to designated heritage assets, requiring proposals to not cause unacceptable harm to the assets significance.</li> </ul>	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported from page 455 onwards in the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State<sup>3</sup>. The assessment found the plan would have a significant positive effect in terms of climate change mitigation and renewable energy, partly due to Policies 27 and 28. We consider that the plan overall will still have a slight positive effect as the policy still includes considerable requirements with regard to sustainability and other elements of the plan contribute to this positive effect. However, the removal of the zero carbon requirements and allowable solutions are a major step backwards in terms of delivering sustainable development and remove the clarity that the policies provided. The plan can no longer be considered to have a significant positive effect.</p> <p>The assessment found the plan would have a significant positive effect in terms of water partly due to the water requirements set out in Policy 27. These have now been relaxed from 80 litres to 110 litres/person/day. Again, the result of this change is that the plan can no longer be considered to have a significant positive effect.</p>
Policy 28 and Supporting Text (paragraphs 4.13 – 4.16)	<p>As part of the 2015 budget, the Treasury published a document called Fixing the Foundations: Creating a more prosperous nation. As part of this, the Government announced that it did not intend to proceed with the zero carbon Allowable Solutions carbon offsetting scheme. As such, the Council proposes the deletion of policy 28, which was based on the introduction of Allowable Solutions as part of national zero carbon policy in 2016.</p>	<p>All other SA conclusions in relation to Policy 27 still stand.</p>
Policy 29: Renewable and low carbon energy generation	<p>On 18 June 2015, the Government published a Written Statement on proposed wind energy development, which signalled a change in direction to the determination of planning applications for onshore wind. This statement sets out that when determining</p>	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported from page 455 onwards in the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State. The assessment found the plan would</p>

<sup>3</sup> Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014) (Ref: RD/Sub/C/030 – Part 1 and RD/Sub/C/040 – Part 2). <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/ldf/coredocs/RD-SUB-C-030.pdf>



**Table 10.1: Screening the Proposed Changes – Cambridge Local Plan<sup>4</sup>**

<b>Policy or plan reference</b>	<b>Proposed Change and reason for change</b>	<b>SA screening</b>
	<p>planning applications for one or more wind turbine, permission should only be granted where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development site is in an area for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan; and</li> <li>• Following consultation, it can be clearly demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing.</li> </ul> <p>While the Council is supportive of all forms of renewable energy, the technical assessment of renewable energy capacity included within the Decarbonising Cambridge<sup>4</sup> study highlights that the wind resource in Cambridge is highly constrained due to the relatively modest raw resource and the urban characteristics of the area. As such, the Council proposes modifications to Policy 29 and the addition of a new paragraph after paragraph 4.21 to clarify the situation regarding wind turbines. The Council is not, at this stage, seeking to allocate any sites in the local plan for wind turbine development. This approach will be reviewed as part of subsequent Local Plans.</p>	<p>have a positive effect in terms of climate change mitigation and renewable energy partly due to the promotion of renewable energy in Policy 29. However, the SA noted that Cambridge has limited opportunities for wind energy generation. Therefore, this policy will not change the conclusion of the SA overall. However, please note that the assessment against this criteria has changed as a result to changes to Policies 27 and 28.</p>
Policy 45: Affordable housing and dwelling mix	This main modification to the penultimate paragraph of Policy 45 indicates that Starter Homes Exceptions Sites are not expected to deliver affordable housing in accordance with the 2 March 2015 Written Ministerial Statement on Starter Homes.	This policy was subject to SA and this is reported from page 455 onwards in the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State. The assessment found the plan would have a positive effect in terms of community wellbeing, partly due to Policy 45. It is expected that the effects of this policy will not change due to the modification as the policy is not expected to reduce the amount of affordable homes available overall.
Policy 50: Residential space	On 25 March 2015, the Government published a Written Ministerial Statement in respect of space standards following the	This policy was subject to SA and this is reported from page 455 onwards in the Cambridge Final

<sup>4</sup> RD/CC/250 – Element Energy (2010). Decarbonising Cambridge: A renewable and low carbon energy study for Cambridge City Council.

**Table 10.1: Screening the Proposed Changes – Cambridge Local Plan<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Policy or plan reference</b>	<b>Proposed Change and reason for change</b>	<b>SA screening</b>
standards	<p>Housing Standards Review. This statement introduced the Government's Optional Technical Standard for internal space standards (Paragraphs 56-018-20150327 – 056-022-20150327 of the National Planning Practice Guidance and the Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard document).</p> <p>Modification proposes that new residential units will be permitted where their gross internal floor areas meet or exceed the residential space standards set out in the Government's Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard (2015).</p>	SA for Submission to the Secretary of State. The assessment found the plan would have a positive effect in terms of community wellbeing. It is expected that the effects of this policy will not change due to the modification as although the Government standards are more prescriptive the space standards are broadly equivalent to what the original policy proposed
Site GB2	<p><b>Additional change following Proposed Modifications Consultation (March 2016):</b></p> <p>Amend allocation for GB2 to include Newbury Farm. The site size increases from 6.8 hectares to 7.7 hectares.</p>	<p>Site has been subject to appraisal using the site assessment proforma (Annex 1), and the additional land made no changes to the site scoring.</p> <p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported from page 455 onwards in the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State. It is expected that the effects of this policy will not change due to the modification, which does not alter the number of units proposed for the site.</p>

**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan****Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

<b>Policy or plan reference</b>	<b>Proposed Change and reason for change</b>	<b>SA screening</b>
Policy S/5	Amend Policy S/5(b) housing requirement as	See Chapter 4 of this SA

<sup>5</sup> Please note that the South Cambridgeshire SA assessed the significant positive effects of each policy individually. Therefore, the screening assessment above focuses on the changes that the modifications will have on the effects of the individual policy.

**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

<b>Policy or plan reference</b>	<b>Proposed Change and reason for change</b>	<b>SA screening</b>
Provision of New Jobs and Homes	<p>follows:</p> <p><del>19,000</del> 19,500 new homes, including affordable housing and 85 Gypsy &amp; Traveller pitches.</p> <p><u>Reasons:</u></p> <p>Additional evidence prepared in 2015 considered Objectively Assessed Need, particularly in relation to the latest household projections data and whether market signals and affordable housing indicated the need for any uplift to the national household projections starting point. This identified that the need was slightly higher than 19,000 homes, at 19,377. In response, an increase to the requirement in the Local Plan to a rounded figure of 19,500 homes is proposed.</p>	Addendum Report.
Policy S/6 The Development Strategy to 2031	<p>Amend part 3 of Policy S/6 as follows:</p> <p>The following 3 new strategic scale allocations are proposed for housing-led development with associated employment and supporting services and facilities to meet the majority of the additional development needs to 2031 and beyond:</p> <p>A new town north of Waterbeach for 8,000 to 9,000 homes, <del>1,400 of which by 2031</del>;</p> <p>A new village based on Bourn Airfield for 3,500 homes <del>1,700 of which by 2031</del>;</p> <p>A major expansion of Cambourne for a fourth linked village of 1,200 homes, all of which by 2031.</p> <p><u>Reasons:</u></p> <p>National policy requires a flexible plan that can respond to changing circumstances. The site promoters consider that they could start development sooner and deliver higher annual rates of housing completions. Whilst the Council is taking a cautious approach to these matters in its housing trajectory based on available evidence of the time taken to start strategic developments and to provide a greater level of confidence of the delivery of the housing requirement, it would not be positive planning for the Local Plan policy to prevent such development if it</p>	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report<sup>6</sup> Part 3, Appendix 5 from page 3-A210 onwards. A summary of this assessment is as follows:</p> <p>Significant negative effect - irreversible loss of agricultural land due to the levels of development proposed by the strategy as a whole.</p> <p>Uncertain impacts on air quality which cannot fully be mitigated due to the levels of development proposed by the strategy as a whole.</p> <p>Uncertain effects on biodiversity as some of the sites have protected species although the new settlement at Waterbeach, could support delivery of significant green infrastructure with biodiversity value</p> <p>Significant beneficial impact on climate mitigation and work / investment / transport as the concentration of development in new settlements will also enable</p>

<sup>6</sup> South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/060).

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

**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	proves to be deliverable.	<p>the delivery of employment and transport infrastructure to support sustainable travel, such as rail or bus improvements and cycling. This will result in a higher modal share for sustainable modes than a more dispersed development strategy.</p> <p>Significant beneficial impacts on housing and services for the strategy as a whole.</p> <p>The changes to the policy will not change the conclusions of the Submission Draft SA. Overall effects on issues like agricultural land and air quality will still be significantly negative. Policies in the plan provide protection from site level impacts such as impacts on species and habitats that could occur from bringing larger amounts of development forward and some of the impacts will be beneficial as supporting infrastructure can be bought forward sooner (for example transport infrastructure and green infrastructure).</p>
Policy S/12: Phasing, Delivery and Monitoring	<p>Amend part 1 of Policy S/12 to read: 'The Local Plan aims to achieve a continuous high level of housing production throughout the plan period to support predicted and actual jobs growth. <u>The housing trajectories for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, as updated each year in the Annual Monitoring Report, will be considered together for the purposes of phasing of housing delivery, including for calculating 5-year housing land supply in development management decisions that concern housing development.</u> Housing sites are not <u>deliberately</u> phased.</p> <p>a. <del>New town at Waterbeach Barracks—to start delivering housing in 2026, unless otherwise determined through a review of the Local Plan;</del></p> <p>b. <del>New village at Bourn Airfield—to not start delivering housing before 2022, unless an undersupply of housing earlier in the plan period is demonstrated such that it needs to come forward earlier, including to provide an adequate 5-year housing land supply.</del></p>	<p>The matter of a joint housing trajectory is an administrative change and will not lead to materially different sustainability effects on the ground.</p> <p>The matter of start dates related to strategic sites is addressed below.</p>

**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p><u>Reasons:</u></p> <p>Modification (in part) relates to the changes required to reflect the Memorandum of Understanding between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council: Greater Cambridge Joint Housing Trajectory (September 2014, RD/Strat/350). This modification was attached to the Councils' Matter 1 Hearing Statement.</p> <p>Cambridge City Council is demonstrably delivering housing within the urban areas and urban fringe sites in the early and middle parts of the plan period. South Cambridgeshire District Council is committed to delivery of housing in the urban fringe sites and at new settlements, with an emphasis on the middle and latter parts of the plan period, but with an element of village housing allocations to provide some early delivery. This is a logical and appropriate way of delivering sites that meet the combined housing need across the Greater Cambridge footprint area.</p> <p>The site promoters of Waterbeach and Bourn Airfield new settlements consider that they could start development sooner than set out in policy S/12. Whilst the Council is taking a cautious approach to start times in its housing trajectory based on available evidence of the time taken to start strategic developments, it would not be positive planning for the Local Plan policy to prevent such development if it proves to be deliverable.</p> <p>Modification is proposed to the policy to remove start date restrictions contained in Policy S/12 part 1a and 1b.</p>	
Policy SS/3 Cambridge East	<p>Amendments to the policy are proposed including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A larger site allocation for land north of Cherry Hinton (site R47 for approximately 780 dwellings during the plan period (along with adjoining land allocated in Policy SS/3 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan for approximately 420 dwellings);</li> <li>• Amendments to policy criteria related to mitigation of environmental and health</li> </ul>	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report Part 3, Appendix 5 from page 3-A232 onwards.</p> <p>This assessment found a significant negative effect on land and soil (due to the effects on high grade agricultural land), an uncertain effect on pollution and health due to the potential noise effects from</p>

**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p>impacts, masterplanning and operation of Cambridge Airport;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional criterion added related to school provision and other local facilities.</li> <li>• <b>Additional change following Proposed Modifications Consultation (March 2016):</b> Additional criteria regarding vehicular access being only via the new spine road.</li> </ul> <p>Consequential changes are also proposed to the supporting text of the policy relevant figures and the policies map.</p> <p>Policy S/3 is proposed to read:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Land at Cambridge East is allocated for development as shown on the Policies Map:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <u>Land north of Newmarket Road will deliver approximately 1,300 dwellings during the plan period.</u></li> <li>b) <u>Land north of Cherry Hinton will deliver approximately 420 dwellings during the plan period (it adjoins land allocated in Policy 12 of the Cambridge Local Plan for 780 dwellings).</u></li> </ol> </li> <li>2. <u>Proposals for residential development on sites a), and b) as shown on the Policies Map, will only be supported if:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) <u>acceptable mitigation of environmental and health impacts (including noise) from the airport can be provided; and</u></li> <li>d) <u>a masterplan is submitted for the development of site SS/3 1b) and adjoining land in Cambridge (site R47) which safeguards the appropriate future development</u></li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>the airport and a significant positive effect on open space and services and transport infrastructure.</p> <p>The significant negative effect in relation to land and soil will remain as will the uncertain effect on pollution and health. Noise from aircraft movements including flight school and helicopters, commercial activities including engine testing as well as traffic noise from Coldham's Lane will require assessment as part of the planning application process. Mitigation measures including detailed layout and design of the development and specific mitigation measures within the built fabric of development as may be necessary</p> <p>Therefore, the SA conclusions regarding this policy are unchanged.</p>

**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p><u>of the wider safeguarded land;</u> <u>and</u></p> <p>e) <u>the continued authorised use of Cambridge Airport does not pose a safety risk.</u></p> <p>3. <u>Residential development on site SS/3 1b) as shown on the Policies Map, together with adjoining land in Cambridge (site R47), will make provision for a primary and secondary school, a local centre with community hub, open space and a spine road connecting Coldham's Lane with Cherry Hinton Road. Vehicular access to the site will only be permitted via the new spine road, unless needed for emergency access.</u></p> <p>4. <u>The rest of the Cambridge East site is safeguarded for longer term development beyond 2031. Development on safeguarded land will only occur once the site becomes available and following a review of both this Plan and the Cambridge East Area Action Plan.</u></p> <p>5. <u>This policy replaces Policies CE/3 and CE/35 of the Cambridge East AAP. All other policies in the Cambridge East AAP are retained.</u></p> <p><u>Reasons:</u> It would not be positive, reasonable or appropriate for the Local Plans to convert an existing allocation to safeguarded land if it can reasonably be brought forward for development to help meet objectively assessed development requirements whilst the airport remains in operation. The boundary of the land that could be developed north of Cherry Hinton is more extensive</p>	



**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

<b>Policy or plan reference</b>	<b>Proposed Change and reason for change</b>	<b>SA screening</b>
	<p>than is currently allocated for development in the Local Plans. A significant shortfall in school capacity across the City is currently forecast from 2018, which coupled with proposed development north of Newmarket Road and north of Cherry Hinton will require the early provision of the secondary school. The landowners both agree that additional land north of Cherry Hinton is deliverable over the plan period. The Councils are working closely together to ensure delivery of the maximum area of land appropriate with the Airport remaining operational, consistent with the objectives of the AAP and the submitted Local Plans. The land is highly sustainable being on the edge of Cambridge and not in the Green Belt, having been released from the Green Belt in the current adopted plans for development.</p>	
Policy SS/5: Waterbeach New Town	<p>Delete section 5 of Policy SS/5 which required no more than 1,400 dwellings to be completed by 2031, except as may be agreed by the Local Planning Authority to be necessary to maintain a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites.</p> <p><u>Reasons:</u></p> <p>National policy requires a flexible plan that can respond to changing circumstances. The site promoters consider that they could start development sooner and deliver higher annual rates of housing completions. Whilst the Council is taking a cautious approach to these matters in its housing trajectory based on available evidence of the time taken to start strategic developments and to provide a greater level of confidence of the delivery of the housing requirement, it would not be positive planning for the Local Plan policy to prevent such development if it proves to be deliverable.</p>	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report<sup>7</sup> Part 3, Appendix 5 from page 3-A231 onwards.</p> <p>A summary of this assessment is as follows:</p> <p>Beneficial and negative impacts as the development will use agricultural land but will also utilise some previously developed land</p> <p>Uncertain but potentially minor negative impact as development will lead to air pollution</p> <p>Significant beneficial impact on green spaces as the new settlement could support delivery of significant green infrastructure</p> <p>Significant beneficial impacts on climate mitigation/sustainable construction as the development requires sustainable standards of design</p> <p>Significant beneficial impacts on housing</p> <p>Significant beneficial impact on services / community / work /</p>

<sup>7</sup> South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/060).

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

**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

<b>Policy or plan reference</b>	<b>Proposed Change and reason for change</b>	<b>SA screening</b>
		<p>investment / transport as the concentration of development in new settlements will also enable the delivery of employment, services and transport infrastructure</p> <p>The changes to the policy will not change the conclusions of the Submission Draft SA. Overall effects on issues like agricultural land and air quality will still be negative regardless of start date of development or levels of development. Policies in the plan provide protection from site level impacts such as impacts on species and habitats that could occur from bringing larger amounts of development forward and some of the impacts will be beneficial as supporting infrastructure can be bought forward sooner (for example transport infrastructure and green infrastructure).</p>
Policy SS/6: New Village at Bourn Airfield	<p>Delete section 4 of Policy SS/6 which required development to be phased so that the first housing completions will be in 2022, with no more than 1,700 dwellings being completed by 2031, except as may be agreed by the Local Planning Authority to be necessary to maintain a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites.</p> <p><u>Reasons:</u></p> <p>National policy requires a flexible plan that can respond to changing circumstances. The site promoters consider that they could start development sooner and deliver higher annual rates of housing completions. Whilst the Council is taking a cautious approach to the these matters in its housing trajectory based on available evidence of the time taken to start strategic developments and to provide a greater level of confidence of the delivery of the housing requirement, it would not be positive planning for the Local Plan</p>	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report<sup>8</sup> Part 3, Appendix 5 from page 3-A231 onwards.</p> <p>A summary of this assessment is as follows:</p> <p>Beneficial and negative impacts as the development will use agricultural land but will also utilise some previously developed land</p> <p>Uncertain but potentially minor negative impact as development will lead to air pollution</p> <p>Significant beneficial impact on green spaces as the new settlement could support delivery of significant green infrastructure</p> <p>Negative / uncertain impact as the site includes a known Roman/Saxon settlement</p>

<sup>8</sup> South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/060).

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

**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

<b>Policy or plan reference</b>	<b>Proposed Change and reason for change</b>	<b>SA screening</b>
	policy to prevent such development if it proves to be deliverable.	<p>Significant beneficial impacts on climate mitigation/sustainable construction as the development requires sustainable standards of design</p> <p>Significant beneficial impacts on housing</p> <p>Significant beneficial impact on services / community / work / investment / transport as the concentration of development in new settlements will also enable the delivery of employment, services and transport infrastructure</p> <p>The changes to the policy will not change the conclusions of the Submission Draft SA. Overall effects on issues like agricultural land and air quality will still be negative regardless of start date of development or levels of development. Policies in the plan provide protection from site level impacts such as impacts on species and habitats that could occur from bringing larger amounts of development forward and some of the impacts will be beneficial as supporting infrastructure can be brought forward sooner (for example transport infrastructure and green infrastructure).</p>
Policy CC/2: Renewable and low carbon energy generation	<p>Amend Policy CC/2 criteria 1 of Policy CC/2 as follows: Planning permission for proposals to generate energy from renewable and low carbon sources, with the exception of proposals for wind turbines, will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>Amend Policy CC/2 criteria 1a to add reference to there being no unacceptable impacts on high quality agricultural land.</p> <p>Revise wording of Policy CC/2 criteria 2 to read: <u>Planning permission for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines will only be permitted provided that:</u></p>	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report<sup>9</sup> Part 3, Appendix 5 from page 3-A425 onwards. This assessment found that the policy had a significant positive effect on climate change mitigation through enabling low carbon energy development and through ensuring that the development can be effectively linked to national energy infrastructure. Due to the change in the policy, the assessment of the</p>

<sup>9</sup> South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/060).

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

**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p>e. <u>the development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Neighbourhood Plan; and</u></p> <p>f. <u>following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing.</u></p> <p><u>Reasons:</u></p> <p>18 June 2015 – Written Ministerial Statement made by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Greg Clark) – Local planning (HCWS42) – this Written Statement sets out new considerations to be applied to proposed wind energy development:</p> <p><i>'When determining planning applications for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines, local planning authorities should only grant planning permission if:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan; and</li> <li>• Following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing.</li> </ul> <p><i>In applying these new considerations, suitable areas for wind energy development will need to have been allocated clearly in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan.'</i></p> <p>The proposed modification replaces the requirement for a minimum separation distance between a dwelling and a wind turbine, included as there was support from Members, Parish Councils and local residents for this criteria, with the guidance set out in the Written Statement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council has not identified areas as suitable for wind energy development in</li> </ul>	<p>policy has changed from significant positive to minor positive as it will effectively rule out promotion of wind energy developments. The change will not affect other forms of renewable energy development. All other SA conclusions in relation to Policy CC/2 still stand.</p>

**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p>the Local Plan; however areas could be identified in Neighbourhood Plans made during the plan period.</p> <p>25 March 2015 – Written Ministerial Statement from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Eric Pickles) This WMS covers a number of topics related to local plan policies including solar energy. It states:</p> <p><i>‘The National Planning Policy Framework includes strong protections for the natural and historic environment and is quite clear that local councils when considering development proposals should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Yet, some local communities have genuine concerns that when it comes to solar farms insufficient weight has been given to these protections and the benefits of high quality agricultural land....’</i></p> <p>The proposed modifications will ensure that consideration is given to the impact of the proposed development on agricultural land.</p> <p>Main modification required to ensure that the plan is consistent with changes to national planning policy.</p>	
Policy CC/4 Sustainable Design and Construction	<p>Revise wording of section 1 of Policy CC/4 as follows: All new residential developments must achieve as a minimum <del>the equivalent of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 for water efficiency (105 litres per person per day)</del> <u>water efficiency equivalent to 110 litres per person per day.</u></p> <p><u>Reasons:</u></p> <p>25 March 2015 – Written Ministerial Statement from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Eric</p>	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report Part 3, Appendix 5 from page 3-A425 onwards. This assessment found that the policy had either neutral or minor positive effects on all SA objectives. The policy will still have the same effects as the policy still includes considerable requirements with regard to</p>

**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p><a href="#">Pickles</a>) This Written Ministerial Statement withdraws the Code for Sustainable Homes aside from legacy cases and sets out a new approach for the setting of technical standards for new housing, including for water efficiency. It states under the sections on Housing standards: streamlining the system and Plan making that:</p> <p><i>'New homes need to be high quality, accessible and sustainable. To achieve this, the government has created a new approach for the setting of technical standards for new housing. ... The new system will comprise new additional optional Building Regulations on water and access. ... From the date the <a href="#">Deregulation Bill 2015</a> is given Royal Assent, local planning authorities and qualifying bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should not set in their emerging Local Plans, neighbourhood plans, or supplementary planning documents, any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings. This includes any policy requiring any level of the <a href="#">Code for Sustainable Homes</a> to be achieved by new development; the government has now withdrawn the code, aside from the management of legacy cases. ... The optional new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered.'</i></p> <p>The proposed modifications take account of the withdrawal of the Code for Sustainable Homes and the introduction of optional Building Regulations standards by removing details related to the Code for Sustainable Homes, and amending the policy to refer to the optional new national technical standard for water efficiency.</p> <p>The Cambridge Water Company is in an area of water stress as designated by the Environment Agency. Cambridge Water Company's Resources Management Plan shows that beyond 2035, without additional resources or greater efficiency, the need for water to serve development will be greater than currently available supply. The policy reflects these local circumstances by requiring higher water efficiency standards</p>	<p>sustainability and other elements of the plan contribute to this positive effect.</p>

**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

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



**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

<b>Policy or plan reference</b>	<b>Proposed Change and reason for change</b>	<b>SA screening</b>
	<p>H/1: k Land at Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington</p> <p>Area (ha.) and indicative dwelling capacity: 0.42 ha. 6 dwellings</p> <p>H/1: l Land at Toseland Road, Graveley</p> <p>Area (ha.) and indicative dwelling capacity: 0.40 ha. 6 dwellings</p> <p><u>Reasons:</u></p> <p>These sites were agreed for inclusion in the submission Local Plan at the 11<sup>th</sup> February 2014 meeting of the Planning Policy and Localism Portfolio Holder, and by Council on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2014.</p> <p>The Parish Councils of Great and Little Abington and Graveley, have promoted a number of small scale housing developments through the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan process to meet identified local housing needs, as an alternative to taking forward a Neighbourhood Plan. Local people were consulted by leaflet about whether the sites should be developed and there is clear evidence of local support. These Parish Council-led sites were brought forward just before the submission of the Local Plan for examination and have already been identified as Main Modifications, but have not yet been generally consulted upon. They provide part of the Council's housing supply, respond to the localism agenda, provide additional rural housing as supported by the DEFRA 'Towards a one nation economy: A 10-point plan for boosting productivity in rural area' publication of August 2015, and provide flexibility in housing land supply. This</p>	

**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p>consultation provides an opportunity for consultation to be carried out by the district council ahead of consideration at the examination.</p> <p>Parish Council led proposals pursued through Local Plan instead of Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>This consultation provides an opportunity for consultation to be carried out by the district council ahead of consideration at the examination.</p>	
Policy H/4 Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate	<p>Revise wording of Policy H/4 as follows:</p> <p>Within the former Land Settlement Association Estate at Fen Drayton, as defined on the Policies Map, planning permission for the redevelopment of existing buildings (excluding glasshouses) will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>a. <u>Any new development delivers onsite experimental or groundbreaking forms of sustainable living and that any new dwellings achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 6 are carbon neutral</u> and any non-residential buildings achieve Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) outstanding standard;</p> <p><u>Reasons:</u>  <a href="#">25 March 2015 – Written Ministerial Statement from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Eric Pickles)</a> This Written Ministerial Statement withdraws the Code for Sustainable Homes aside from legacy cases. It states under the section on Plan making that:  <i>'From the date the <a href="#">Deregulation Bill 2015</a> is given Royal Assent, local planning authorities and qualifying bodies preparing</i> </p>	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report Part 3, Appendix 5 from page 3-A227 onwards. The assessment showed a significant positive effect on land and soil (as this is a brownfield site) and health (due to the fact that the policy requires development to meet the highest sustainable construction standards). The assessment also found an uncertain effect on landscape and travel (because of its remote nature). The policy will still have a significant positive effect as the policy still requires carbon neutral and experimental or groundbreaking forms of sustainable living. All other SA conclusions in relation to Policy H/4 still stand, including the uncertain effects identified above.</p>

**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

<b>Policy or plan reference</b>	<b>Proposed Change and reason for change</b>	<b>SA screening</b>
	<p><i>neighbourhood plans should not set in their emerging Local Plans, neighbourhood plans, or supplementary planning documents, any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings. This includes any policy requiring any level of the <a href="#">Code for Sustainable Homes</a> to be achieved by new development; the government has now withdrawn the code, aside from the management of legacy cases.'</i></p> <p>The proposed modifications take account of the withdrawal of the Code for Sustainable Homes by removing details related to the Code for Sustainable Homes, and amending the policy so that it will still ensure the delivery of the same outcomes.</p> <p>The Fen Drayton former LSA estate would be considered as 'countryside', if it was not designated as a special policy area. Housing would therefore not usually be permitted in this location unless it was a replacement dwelling, reusing/converting an existing building or a dwelling required for the functioning of a rural enterprise or tied to agricultural use. For housing to be acceptable in this location, the current adopted policy in the Site Specific Policies DPD (January 2010) requires new developments to deliver ground breaking and experimental forms of sustainable living, which is defined in the accompanying SPD as meeting the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 6.</p> <p>Continuing to seek 'ground breaking and experimental forms of sustainable living' in this location is consistent with national policy as the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, published in March 2012) allows new isolated homes in the countryside in certain circumstances, such as delivering an exceptional quality or innovative nature to the design of the dwelling (paragraph 55); supports the move to a low carbon future by planning for development in a location and way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (paragraph 95); and states that new developments should be planned to minimise energy consumption and avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change (paragraphs 96 and</p>	

**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p>99).</p> <p>Whilst the policy can no longer specifically require that new dwellings in this location applied for under this policy must achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 6, any new dwelling should still be 'experimental and ground breaking' and carbon neutral. Modification required to ensure that the plan is consistent with changes to national planning policy.</p>	
Policy H/8 Housing Mix	<p>Include reference in criterion 1 in Policy H/8 to 'those seeking starter homes' and 'people wishing to build their own homes:</p> <p>'A wide choice, type and mix of housing will be provided to meet the needs of different groups in the community including families with children, older people, <u>those seeking starter homes, people wishing to build their own homes</u> and people with disabilities. The market homes in developments of 10 or more homes will consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. At least 30% 1 or 2 bedroom homes;</li> <li>b. At least 30% 3 bedroom homes;</li> <li>c. At least 30% 4 or more bedroom homes;</li> </ul> <p>With a 10% flexibility allowance that can be added to any of the above categories taking account of local circumstances.'</p> <p>Amend section 2 of the policy as follows:</p> <p>Section 1 is subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The housing mix of affordable homes (<u>except starter homes</u>) in all developments being determined by local housing needs evidence;</li> <li>b. The mix of market homes to be provided on sites of 9 or fewer homes taking account of local circumstances; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>On all sites of 20 or more dwellings, and in each phase of</u></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report Part 3, Appendix 5 from page 3-A227 onwards. The assessment showed a significant positive effect on housing and inequalities. The policy will still have a significant positive effect. All other SA conclusions in relation to Policy H/8 still stand.</p>

**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

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

**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p>make this form of housing a mainstream housing option. Local planning authorities should, therefore, plan to meet the strong latent demand for such housing. Additional local demand, over and above current levels of delivery can be identified from secondary data sources.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire District Council is one of the vanguard authorities and has a self build register. As a local planning authority it has made an early start to considering the needs of people wishing to build their own homes and the modification seeks to achieve this through the Local Plan. modification required to ensure that the plan is consistent with changes to national planning policy.</p>	
<p>New Policy E/1b Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension</p>	<p>PROVISIONAL MODIFICATION to add a new Policy E/1B as follows:</p> <p><u>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.</u></p> <p><u>2. Proposals for development should:</u></p> <p>a. <u>Create substantial and attractive landscaped edges to the western, eastern and southern boundaries reinforcing existing planting on the southern boundary.</u></p> <p>b. <u>Provide an appropriate landscaped setting for the Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve, and provide pedestrian access to the Reserve whilst mitigating visitor</u></p>	<p>This is a new policy/site allocation which has not been subject to assessment before. Therefore, a new assessment has been included in Table 10.3.</p>

**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

Policy or plan reference	Proposed Change and reason for change	SA screening
	<p>impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. <u>Demonstrate and ensure that there will be no material impact on the volume, pattern of flow or water quality of the chalk springs at Nine Wells.</u></li> <li>d. <u>Demonstrate that surface water flood risks can be appropriately managed and mitigated to avoid flood risks to the site and to not increase flood risks elsewhere.</u></li> <li>e. <u>Have building heights which are no higher than those on the adjoining part of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and which step down to the western, eastern and southern boundaries.</u></li> <li>f. <u>Provide high quality new public realm and open space, and retain and incorporate existing watercourses.</u></li> <li>g. <u>Include measures to enhance access to and within the Cambridge Biomedical Campus including for cyclists, pedestrians, wheelchair users and people with other disabilities, and mitigate impacts on the existing road network and parking in the surrounding area.</u></li> <li>h. <u>Connect to the Addenbrooke's Hospital energy network, where feasible and viable.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>Reasons:</u></p> <p>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</p>	



**Table 10.2: Screening the Proposed Changes – South Cambridgeshire Local Plan<sup>5</sup>**

<b>Policy or plan reference</b>	<b>Proposed Change and reason for change</b>	<b>SA screening</b>
	<p>of employment land within South Cambridgeshire for high-tech and research and development companies and organisations, the findings of the new study provide an opportunity to allocate land for an extension to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus to provide high quality biomedical development on the edge of Cambridge with its locational benefits, without causing significant harm to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. It would not be positive planning for the Local Plan policy to prevent such development if it proves to be deliverable.</p> <p>Proposed policy would provide an effective response to the employment issues relating to the Cambridge area and the circumstances of the site.</p>	
Policy E/2 Fulbourn Road East	<p>Amend the title of Policy E/2 as follows: Policy E/2: Fulbourn Road East (Fulbourn) <del>6.9</del> <u>4.3</u> hectares</p> <p>There is a consequential amendment to site area shown on the Policies Map</p> <p><u>Reasons</u></p> <p>In response to the findings in the LDA Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study 2015 (See Sector 13), which recommended allocating a smaller site to minimise impact on the Green Belt. The area will reduce from 6.9 to 4.3 hectares and will extend no further east than the Yarrow Road roundabout.</p>	<p>This policy was subject to SA and this is reported in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report Part 3, Appendix 5 from page 3-A310 onwards.</p> <p>The assessment found either neutral or positive effects for the site. In relation to the Green Belt, the assessment stated that it has a neutral effect as although this site is within the current Green Belt the Local Plan proposes its removal as a result of the Cambridge Green Belt Review (2012) which suggests that the site can be released without significant harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. The Green Belt Review identified that to avoid significant negative effects the site areas would need to be reduced, and this has been reflected in the modification. This conclusion still stands and the rest of the SA conclusions in regard to this site / policy still stand.</p>

## **Appendix 6 – Letter form Natural England regarding Habitats Directive Assessment**

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



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

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

**BY EMAIL ONLY**

T 0300 060 3900

Dear Ms Davies

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

Thank you for consulting Natural England on the above in your email of 14 January 2016.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

You will be aware that Natural England has recently responded to the Cambridge and South Cambridge Local Plans Proposed Modifications consultation. In developing these modifications we note that the Councils have considered whether they have any implications for the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Reports already developed for the submission plans. Having recently reviewed the Proposed Modifications I can confirm that we are satisfied with the Councils' conclusions that the proposed modifications do not amend the findings of the HRA screening reports and that the Draft Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans are unlikely to have significant effects on Natura 2000 or Ramsar sites.

I hope these comments are helpful. For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter only please contact Janet Nuttall on 0300 060 1239. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to [consultations@naturalengland.org.uk](mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk).

Yours sincerely

**Janet Nuttall**  
**Sustainable Land Use Adviser**

This page is intentionally left blank