

APPENDIX A

CAMBRIDGE LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – TOWARDS 2031

PROPOSED METHODOLOGY FOR ASSESSING SITES FOR ALLOCATION IN THE NEW LOCAL PLAN

Table Of Contents

Introduction

Identification of Sites within Cambridge

Proposed Site Assessment Process – Development of Sites Appraisal Proforma

Content and Use of Sites Appraisal Pro forma

Site Assessment

Identification of Fringe Sites jointly with SCDC

Consultation on Sites

Appendix 1 – Proposed Cambridge City Sites Assessment Pro forma

Introduction

- 1.1 The Local Plan Issues and Options Report which was consulted upon in June / July 2012 set out broad locations for development and the location of some Opportunity Areas, however it did not set out detailed boundaries of potential sites for different types of land use. Another round of consultation is planned to ask the public, developers and stakeholders for their views on potential sites. This consultation is planned for six weeks in January and February 2013.
- 1.2 This paper sets out the proposed methodology for the assessment of potential sites to be allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan – Towards 2031. Once the Local Plan is adopted these allocations will be shown on the Proposals Map. In order to properly evaluate the suitability and deliverability of sites a rigorous and transparent method of assessment is required. This assessment will involve the use of a pro forma, assessing each site in relation to a number of social, economic, environmental, planning and site deliverability criteria.
- 1.3 The sites being considered include those entirely within the City boundary, and also potential sites at the fringe of the City. For the fringe sites which cross the boundary into South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC), a joint assessment will take place.

Identification of Sites within Cambridge

- 1.4 A number of sources will be used to arrive at a list of sites to assess. These include the following sources, although this is not an exhaustive list:
 - Sites allocated in the existing adopted Local Plan 2006, associated Area Action Plans, and Supplementary Planning Documents, which have not been developed.
 - Sites identified in the following studies:
 - Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) May 2012.
 - Employment Land Review 2007 and 2012 update.
 - Cambridge Sub Region Retail Study and its 2012 Cambridge Retail and Leisure Study update.
 - Gypsy and Traveller Provision in Cambridge: Site Assessment
 - Cambridge Hotel Futures: Headline Findings Issues & Options Report April 2012
 - Inner Green Belt Boundary Study 2001; Green Belt Study 2002; 2012 Green Belt Reappraisal.
 - Other documents eg those produced by Cambridgeshire Horizons.
 - Any sites and site boundaries identified by the Council within the Issues and Options Consultation (June 2012).

- Any sites subsequently submitted by landowners and developers or their agents in their responses to the Council's Issues and Options consultation June-July 2012.
 - Any sites identified by the Council's own internal directorates, other Councils, statutory government agencies, and statutory undertakers.
- 1.5 Sites may be suitable for allocation for the following uses or a mix of these uses:
- Housing
 - Employment
 - Retail
 - Leisure uses
 - Community facilities
 - Tourism uses
 - Gypsy and Traveller sites
- 1.6 In addition, some sites to be consulted upon will be designations in the Local Plan including Open Space sites and the boundaries of District and Local Centres. These would be shown on the Proposals Map along with other constraints.
- 1.7 In the case of minerals and waste, it is for the County Council to allocate sites.

Proposed Site Assessment Process – Development of Sites Appraisal Pro forma

- 1.8 To properly evaluate the suitability and deliverability of sites a rigorous and transparent method of assessment is required. This includes full evidence and justification. It is proposed to use a pro forma to assess each site. The draft pro forma can be found in Appendix 1. The purpose of the pro forma is to set out all of the constraints and other considerations that the Council will take into account in deciding whether to allocate a site or not.
- 1.9 The pro forma was developed to fully integrate the Sustainability Appraisal (SA), and the criteria in the pro forma take into account the social, environmental and economic sustainability themes identified in the SA Scoping Report. The Scoping Report set out a draft pro forma (in Chapter 16) which was subject to consultation with the statutory environmental consultees. The pro forma in the Scoping Report was the starting point for the development of the sites appraisal pro forma in Appendix 1. Making sure that the criteria take into account the SA is the most effective way of ensuring that the SA is central to the appraisal of sites. Consultants URS, who are carrying out the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Local Plan review, have been involved in developing the pro forma to ensure that it meets the requirements of SA and the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive.

- 1.10 The pro forma was also developed to be compatible with the assessment of housing sites which was carried out in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The sites appraisal pro forma has however been taken a step further to include performance measures for each criterion. As a result, all the housing sites identified by the SHLAA will need to be assessed again to see whether they have the potential for allocation in the Local Plan using the sites appraisal pro forma.
- 1.11 The sites appraisal pro forma also includes additional criteria relating to planning suitability of the site.

Content and Use of Sites Appraisal Pro forma

- 1.12 The sites appraisal pro forma includes basic information about the site, including a map, a photo, site area, and current uses. It then includes a number of criteria relating to social, environmental and economic factors which relate to the location of the site, and criteria relating to the planning suitability of the site. The performance of the site in relation to the criteria will be assessed and a traffic light system of red (negative), amber, green (positive) has been used to provide a visual representation of the scoring of the site.
- 1.13 The first part of the pro forma is a high level sieve (Level 1). It contains the criteria which could potentially prevent any development of the site, for example the site is within the flood plain. If a 'show stopper' is identified, the site may not need to be progressed to assessment under the second part of the pro forma (Level 2). A conclusion will be reached after the Level 1 assessment as to whether the Level 2 assessment needs to take place. If there is uncertainty, for example mitigation measures might overcome problems identified with the site, a Level 2 assessment will be carried out to ensure that the process is robust.
- 1.14 At the end of the Level 2 assessment, a conclusion will be reached as to whether the site has significant development potential, some development potential or no development potential. The conclusion will also discuss whether the proposed use is the most suitable, or whether a different land use on the site would be more suitable. For example a mixed use may have more potential than a pure housing site. The conclusion may also identify parts of the site that are more sensitive to development than others, or whether only part of the site is suitable for development.
- 1.15 Broad viability assessment will be carried out as part of the review of the Local Plan and in relation to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). In addition housing sites which have been identified as having development potential will be subject to viability assessment. This will be carried out by consultants Dixon Searle and will involve using an

accepted residual land value appraisal model. This will also evaluate all sites identified as being deliverable or developable in the Council's SHLAA.

Site Assessment

- 1.16 Site assessments will be undertaken by officers within the planning policy team, with assistance from other experts within the Council and at the County Council, and the Highways Agency. Areas of expertise which will be drawn upon include biodiversity, landscape, urban design, historic environment, cycling, environmental health, and County Council expertise in highways, education and minerals and waste.

Identification of Fringe Sites jointly with SCDC

- 1.17 Joint working has already taken place with SCDC to identify 10 possible broad locations where new development could be accommodated at the edge of Cambridge. These were shown in the Issues and Options Reports for both Local Plans. These locations are shown in Figure 1 and are as follows:

Broad Location 1 – Land to the north and south of Barton Road
Broad Location 2 – Playing fields off Grantchester Road, Newnham
Broad Location 3 – Land west of Trumpington Road
Broad Location 4 – Land west of Hauxton Road
Broad Location 5 – Land south of Addenbrooke's Road
Broad Location 6 – Land south of Addenbrooke's and between Babraham Road and Shelford Road
Broad Location 7 – Land between Babraham Road and Fulbourn Road
Broad Location 8 – Land east of Gazelle Way
Broad Location 9 – Land at Fen Ditton
Broad Location 10 – Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road

- 1.18 Following consultation on both Councils' Issues and Options Reports, the views of the public will be assessed and taken into account in assessing suitability for development.
- 1.19 The next step will be to identify whether there are any sites within the broad locations which would be reasonable alternatives for development. The SEA Directive requires that the effects of 'reasonable alternatives' are covered. The Government's SEA Practical Guide (2006) is clear that only reasonable, realistic and relevant alternatives need to be put forward. This document suggests a hierarchy of alternatives. This hierarchy approach is being followed for the urban fringes.
- 1.20 Key to the identification of sites will be appraisal of the inner Green Belt and the overall sustainable development strategy for the sub region, and work is being carried out jointly with SCDC on these matters. In addition a joint site assessment pro forma is being developed with

SCDC as a way of assessing the suitability of the fringe sites. This will take into account both the City's site appraisal pro forma and SCDC's appraisal criteria, including SA criteria, which they have used to appraise the other sites in their Issues and Options Report. The assessment of fringe sites will be undertaken jointly with SCDC, with input from specialists in both Councils.

Figure 1: Broad Location Options



Consultation on Sites

- 1.21 The City Council recognises the importance of consultation and has often gone beyond what is required by Government guidance as was shown during the production of the SHLAA. The Council is proposing to consult for 6 weeks on the proposed sites.
- 1.22 Following the assessment of sites, a document will be produced setting out all of the potential sites for allocation. A joint document will be produced with SCDC in relation to the joint fringe sites as well as providing appropriate context on the development strategy alternatives for the wider Cambridge area.
- 1.23 The Issues and Options 2 consultation document will therefore include the Cambridge sites, joint fringe sites and any other matters such as car and cycle parking standards and space standards. In addition a Sustainability Appraisal Report will be produced by consultants to be consulted upon alongside. This will explain how SA has been taken into account in the identification of sites and will also look at the cumulative effects of potential sites in Cambridge, at the fringes and in the wider area.
- 1.24 The reports will be taken to Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee (DPSSC) in December 2012 for approval. Public consultation will then take place in January 2013 for 6 weeks. At the same time, SCDC will be consulting upon the joint fringe sites and any other issues as part of their Issues and Options Report 2.
- 1.25 Consultation on the draft submission plan will follow in June/July 2013, where the public will have another opportunity to comment on any sites which have been identified as allocations.

Appendix 1 – Proposed Cambridge City Sites Assessment Pro forma

Site Information	
Site reference number(s):	
Site name/address:	
Functional area (taken from SA Scoping Report):	
Map	
Photo	
Site description:	

Current use:
Proposed use(s):
Site size (ha): x.xx Assumed net developable area:
Assumed residential density:
Potential residential capacity:
Site owner/promoter:
Landowner has agreed to promote site for development?:
Site origin: SHLAA Call for Sites, Green Belt Assessment, ELR, Allocated Site , Other
Relevant planning history:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<p><i>priority to pedestrian and cycle movements. The inclusion of criteria that measures the distance of a site from the nearest cycle route will provide an indication of the sustainability of the site.</i></p>	<p>R = No cycling provision or a cycle lane less than 1.5m with medium volume of traffic. Having to cross a busy junction with high cycle accident rate to access local facilities/school. Poor quality off road path.</p> <p>A = Medium quality off-road path.</p> <p>G = 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>GG = Quiet residential street designed for 20mph speeds, high quality off-road paths with good segregation from pedestrians, uni-directional hybrid cycle lanes.</p>	<p><i>pedestrians.</i></p>
<p>Air Quality, pollution, contamination and noise</p>		
<p>Criteria</p>	<p>Performance</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?</p> <p><i>The planning system has a role to play in the protection of air quality by ensuring that land use decisions do not adversely affect, or are not adversely affected by, the air quality in any AQMA, or conflict with or render ineffective any elements of the local authority's air quality action plan. There is currently one AQMA within Cambridge. Inclusion of criteria that measures the distance between the site and the AQMA, as well as between the site and roads with the highest traffic volumes causing poor air quality, will provide an indication of the sustainability of the site.</i></p>	<p>R = Within or adjacent to an AQMA, M11 or A14</p> <p>A = <1000m of an AQMA, M11 or A14</p> <p>G = >1000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14</p>	<p><i>Environmental Health to complete and consider scope for appropriate mitigation</i></p>
<p>Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?</p> <p><i>National planning policy requires preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of air pollution.</i></p>	<p>R = Significant adverse impact</p> <p>A = Adverse impact</p> <p>G = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact</p>	<p><i>Environmental Health to complete and consider scope for appropriate mitigation</i></p>

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

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

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

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

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