

**Appendix G. Sustainability Appraisal of Part 1 Document.**

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

## **Issues and Options 2**

### **Part 1 – Joint Consultation on Development Strategy and Site Options on the Edge of Cambridge**

#### **Interim Sustainability Appraisal**

# 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This document provides a record of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process, which has been followed for the 'Issues and Options 2 – Part 1 Joint Consultation on Development Strategy and Site Options on the Edge of Cambridge'. This has been a joint process carried out by both Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. The first part of this document describes the SA processes both authorities have carried out to date in the development of their Local Plans. The second part sets out how the SA has been carried out for the following three elements, which are covered in the Issues and Options 2, Part 1 consultation Document:
- the Sustainable Development Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire to 2031;
  - the site options on the edge of Cambridge, on land currently in the Green Belt;
  - the Sub-Regional Sporting, Cultural and Community Facilities.

## Background

- 1.2 Both authorities are carrying out an SA of their Local Plan in line with the procedures prescribed by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, which were prepared in order to transpose into national law the EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive. SA is integral to plan making and ensures that the environmental, economic and social effects of a plan are assessed, and that reasonable alternatives are considered. As a result the SA guides the development of plans in order that they are developed in the most sustainable way, avoiding and mitigating adverse effects and maximising positive effects.
- 1.3 Cambridge City Council have employed consultants URS to carry out the SA of the Cambridge Local Plan. South Cambridgeshire District Council have carried out the SA 'in-house'.
- 1.4 The first stage in the SA process is to establish the scope. Both authorities have produced Scoping Reports, which identify the sustainability 'baseline', future changes to the 'baseline' and the key issues that should be the focus of the SA. The Scoping Reports were subject to consultation with the relevant consultation bodies (English Heritage, Natural England and the Environment Agency) before they were finalised.

## Cambridge Scoping Report

1.5 The Cambridge Local Plan SA Scoping Report can be found at the following link:

<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/Sustainability-Appraisal-Scoping-Report-June2012.pdf>

1.6 This identified a number of key sustainability issues, and set out a framework for undertaking the rest of the appraisal under eight thematic topics:

- Communities and well being
- Economy
- Transport
- Water
- Flood risk including climate change adaptation
- Climate change mitigation and renewable energy
- Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage
- Biodiversity and green infrastructure

1.7 Five functional areas, sub-divisions of Cambridge, were identified for consideration throughout the SA process:

- City Centre
- North Cambridge
- South Cambridge
- East Cambridge
- West Cambridge

## South Cambridgeshire Scoping Report

1.8 The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan SA Scoping Report can be found at the following link:

<http://www.scams.gov.uk/Environment/Planning/DistrictPlanning/LocalDevelopmentFramework/SCLP.htm>

1.9 The report identified 10 themes, and for each of them explored the policy context, the current situation, and key sustainability issues and problems.

| <b>Environmental</b>    | <b>Social</b>         | <b>Economic</b>   |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Land                    | Health                | Economic Activity |
| Pollution               | Housing               | Transport         |
| Biodiversity            | Inclusive Communities |                   |
| Landscape and Townscape |                       |                   |
| Climate Change          |                       |                   |

- 1.10 The outcome of the 'Scoping' stage of the SA process is a set of 23 Sustainability Objectives, which can be used to test policy and site options to identify the potential impacts and their relative sustainability.

### **Issues and Options 1 (2012)**

- 1.11 Both authorities have consulted upon an Issues and Options Report, and accompanying these were Interim SA Reports. Both of these Issues and Options Reports considered policy options and approaches for the Green Belt, including an assessment of 10 'Broad Locations' on the edge of Cambridge.
- 1.12 South Cambridgeshire's Issues and Options Report also considered potential sites for development for different types of land use throughout the district.

### **Cambridge Interim SA**

- 1.13 The Cambridge Interim SA Report can be found at the following link:  
<http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/local-plan-review-sustainability-appraisal.pdf>  
(Also see errata sheet <http://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/docs/local-plan-review-sustainability-appraisal-errata.pdf>)
- 1.14 Findings of the SA will be used by officers to develop policies in the draft Cambridge Local Plan. The appraisal of the Broad Locations was taken into account in the assessment of the fringe sites.

### **South Cambridgeshire Initial SA**

- 1.15 The South Cambridgeshire Interim SA Report can be found at the following link:  
<http://www.scambs.gov.uk/Environment/Planning/DistrictPlanning/LocalDevelopmentFramework/SCLP.htm>
- 1.16 The Initial Sustainability Appraisal considered how the options proposed in the Issues and Options Report 2012 perform against the Sustainability Objectives, whether there is likely to be positive or negative impacts, and the significance of the impact.

## **Issues and Options 2 (2013)**

- 1.17 This is the current stage of plan making for both authorities. Part 1 is a joint consultation by both authorities addressing the development strategy for the sub-region, sites at the fringe of Cambridge in the Green Belt, and options for sub-regional sporting ,cultural and community facilities. Each authority will also have a separate Part 2 consultation addressing site options and other district specific issues.

### **Initial / Interim Sustainability Appraisal of Issues and Options 2 – Part 1 Joint Consultation on Development Strategy and Site Options on the Edge of Cambridge’**

- 1.18 The remainder of this document provides an initial sustainability appraisal of the sites and options addressed in the joint consultation.

- 1.19 It is divided into three parts, reflecting the consultation document:

- A Sustainable Development Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire to 2031
- Green Belt Site Options
- Sub-Regional Sporting, Cultural and Community Facilities

- 1.20 For each part the following are detailed:

- Identification of Reasonable Alternatives
- The Sustainability Appraisal Process
- Results of the appraisal

## **2. SA of the Sustainable Development Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire to 2031**

2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) emphasises that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development which is considered to have three dimensions: economic, social and environmental. According to the NPPF, these dimensions give rise to the need for planning to perform three roles:

- an economic role - contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy;
- a social role - supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities; and
- an environmental role - contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution and mitigating and adapting to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.

2.2 The NPPF is premised on a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In the context of plan-making, this means that local authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area. Furthermore, local authorities should meet objectively assessed needs, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

2.3 The NPPF requires that when drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries, local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary.

2.4 Under the Localism Act, councils and other public bodies are required to work together on issues which span administrative boundaries. In this case, there is a close functional relationship between Cambridge city and surrounding South Cambridgeshire, which provides most of the setting to Cambridge, but also a rural hinterland to the city and includes a number of significant and world leading business parks that contribute to the national as well as the Cambridge economy.

2.4 In light of the requirements of the NPPF to plan positively and work with neighbouring authorities, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire are working closely together to plan the future development of Cambridge. In particular, a member-based Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group has been established specifically to address issues affecting Cambridge and South

Cambridgeshire. The Cambridgeshire Councils have also established a Joint Strategic Planning Unit to prepare a strategic spatial framework for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, which will also help demonstrate the coordinated approach to planning for the long term needs of the wider area.

2.5 The development strategy for Cambridge has changed over the last two decades. In particular, before 2003 the development of Cambridge had been constrained by the presence of the Green Belt. As a result, housing development which would have taken place in Cambridge was instead dispersed to towns and villages beyond the outer boundary of the Green Belt, with people commuting back to jobs in Cambridge (with corresponding impacts on traffic congestion, air quality etc.). However, the 2003 Cambridgeshire Structure Plan signalled a change of direction, focusing development in Cambridge itself and releasing Green Belt on the edge of the City. This new approach to development was taken forward in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) and South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework (2007-2010) which together released significant land from the Cambridge Green Belt and allocated a number of urban extensions to the city to the south, north west, north east and east of the city. Overall, the plans introduced a step change in levels of planned growth, unmatched since the interwar years. The spatial strategy set out in the two plans is reflected in the following sequence of preference vis-à-vis the location of new development:

1. Within the urban area of Cambridge;
2. On the edge of Cambridge;
3. In the new town of Northstowe; and
4. In the market towns and the better served villages in South Cambridgeshire.

2.6 A 2009 evaluation of this spatial strategy identified a range of challenges for future growth. In particular, significant additional expansion to Cambridge would impact on the integrity of the Green Belt and the concept of Cambridge as a compact city. Overall, the study, which was endorsed by the Cambridgeshire authorities, recommended a continuation of the current spatial strategy and indicated that some additional longer-term growth could be located on the edge of Cambridge on the basis of a limited review of the Green Belt boundary.

2.7 With the review of the local plans for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, this an opportune moment to ask whether the spatial strategy introduced above is still applicable. In light of this, over Summer 2012, the two Councils carried out Issues and Options consultations that sought comments on whether the current development strategy remains the soundest basis for development in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire for the period to 2031.



2.8 From a sustainability perspective the future sustainable development strategy will depend on the emerging economic, social and environmental evidence. From an economic perspective, the Councils recognise the role of Cambridge in the regional and national economy and the forecast job growth, which can be accommodated on already allocated employment land. From a social perspective, housing need is currently being assessed and the identified need will be taken into account in determining an appropriate spatial strategy. From an environmental perspective, the review of the Inner Green Belt boundary indicates significant vis-à-vis any further major Green Belt releases and potential compromise of the purposes of the Green Belt. In light of this, it is important to recognise that further major development cannot necessarily be accommodated within Cambridge itself or the city edge. This, in turn, means that additional development, should this be necessary, would need to be accommodated within South Cambridgeshire, either within new settlements or in the most sustainable villages. This would place new homes further from the jobs in and close to Cambridge and result in less sustainable patterns of development with risks of impacts of vehicle emissions and impacts on climate change. These would need to be mitigated as far as possible by providing sustainable forms of transport links to Cambridge. Given the critical nature of any decision to restrict development at the edge of Cambridge the second Issues and Options consultation seeks people's views on where the appropriate balance lies between protecting land on the edge of Cambridge that is of high significance to Green Belt purposes and delivering development away from Cambridge in new settlements and better served sustainable villages.

### **3. Green Belt Site Options**

- 3.1 The two authorities have worked together jointly to assess the potential for further development in the Green Belt at the edge of Cambridge, and the methodology followed is explained in detail in the Part 1 Issues and Options 2013 report Chapter 9.

#### **Identification of Reasonable Alternatives**

- 3.2 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 hierarchical approach has been followed for the sites at the edge of Cambridge. Initially the broad locations were identified as alternatives in the Issues and Options Reports. Then more detailed boundaries within these broad locations were considered.
- 3.3 The long list of sites at the fringe of the City was developed from:
- Developers' site boundaries received from the 'call for sites' for the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAAs) carried out by both authorities.
  - Additional sites identified through the 2012 Inner Green Belt Review as fulfilling Green Belt purposes to a lesser degree.
- 3.4 This resulted in an initial list of 41 sites.

#### **The Sustainability Appraisal Process**

- 3.5 These sites were assessed utilising a site assessment pro forma, which was developed jointly to take into account both authorities' SA objectives. The pro forma was specifically developed to fully integrate the sustainability appraisal process into site assessment. The criteria in the pro forma take into account the social, environmental and economic sustainability themes and objectives identified in the SA Scoping Reports of both Councils. Ensuring 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. In this way, the potential effects of bringing forward alternative sites for development can be thoroughly tested and compared. Consultants URS, who are carrying out the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Cambridge Local Plan review, advised on the development of the joint pro forma to ensure that it meets the requirements of SA and the Strategic Environmental Assessment(SEA) Directive. The pro forma also includes planning and

deliverability criteria which do not directly relate to the SA, but are important in order to ensure that the Local Plans are deliverable.

- 3.6 The Joint Green Belt Site Assessment Proforma can be found at Appendix 1. For each criterion there is an explanation as to which of the Cambridge SA topics and South Cambridgeshire SA objectives it relates to. A traffic light system has been used to score the sites from red red (a significant negative impact) to green green (no impact or minor impact which can be mitigated). In most cases there were three potential scores (red, amber, green), but in some cases this was extended to five categories to give a finer grained assessment. The grading range provides a means by which the relative sustainability of each site can be established in comparison with other sites.
- 3.7 The pro forma is split into two parts. The first part is a high level sieve (Level 1). It includes strategic considerations, including impact on the Green Belt, flood risk, national biodiversity and heritage designations. It also addresses key deliverability issues. This stage is effective for identifying issues that mean a site should be rejected.
- 3.8 Level 2 of the assessment considered a range of issues including accessibility to services and sustainable transport, pollution, historic environment and biodiversity.
- 3.9 Although a number of sites were considered to merit rejection following the Level 1 assessment, they were also assessed by the Level 2 criteria in order to give the most comprehensive and robust assessment possible.
- 3.10 Map 2 and Appendix 1 in the Issues & Options 2, Part 1 – Joint Consultation of Development Strategy & Site Options on the Edge of Cambridge (November 2012) illustrate the site options tested.

### **Results of the Appraisal**

- 3.11 The completed pro formas for all of the sites assessed can be found in the background document 'Site Assessments for Edge of Cambridge Sites', November 2012. The individual site pro formas show how each site performs against the criteria which relate to the sustainability objectives.
- 3.12 In order to draw information together in an accessible form, and reach an overall conclusion on the merits of the sites assessed, key elements from the pro formas have been combined in a series of summaries by

broad location which enable the most and least sustainable sites to be identified. These can be found in Appendix 2 of the Issues and Options Part 1 document.

- 3.13 Following the assessment, 6 sites have been identified as being sites with development potential, albeit with some constraints or adverse impacts (with an overall score of amber). These include two housing sites, two employment sites, one site which could be developed for either housing or employment and one which could be potentially developed for housing, employment or a community stadium. Five of these sites are located in the South of Cambridge and one is in the North of Cambridge. Four of the sites are within the Cambridge City Council boundary and two fall within South Cambridgeshire. These are the reasonable alternatives which are being consulted upon.
- 3.14 The other sites assessed have been rejected as options for development, due to either their significance to Green Belt purposes and/or for other reasons including planning constraints such as archaeological merit. Reasons for rejection are summarised in Appendix 3 of the Issues and Options Part 1 document.
- 3.15 The edge of Cambridge sites have also been assessed separately by URS in terms of the Cambridge SA objectives, and cumulatively with the other sites identified within Cambridge. This report can be found at the following link:

*Weblink to be added here following Committee*

## **4. Sub-Regional Sporting, Cultural and Community Facilities**

- 4.1 The two authorities have worked together jointly to assess the need and potential sites for major sporting, cultural and community facilities. The background is explained in detail in the Part 1 Issues and Options 2013 report Chapter 10.
- 4.2 Through the previous Issues and Options consultations, both Councils sought views on whether there is need for these facilities, and if there is, where they should be located (South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options Report 2012 - Issue 83; Cambridge City Council Issues and Options Report 2012 - Questions 11.39 to 11.41).

### **Community Stadium**

- 4.3 Both Councils also sought views on whether there was a need for a community stadium in the sub region, and if there was, what type and size of facility it should be, and where would be the most appropriate location. (South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options Report 2012 Issue 84; Cambridge City Council Issues and options Report 2012 Option 179). Cambridge City Council also sought views on specific proposals put forward by Grosvenor Estates for a stadium near Trumpington, and redevelopment of the Abbey Stadium site for a stadium, housing or another use.
- 4.4 The option of including a stadium was assessed in the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal Reports to the Issues and Options 1 consultations. Both appraisals highlight the potential positive benefits to the economy, open space and leisure, with consequential benefits to health and community objectives. Impacts on site specific objectives or sustainable transport were uncertain as it would depend on the location.
- 4.5 Following this consultation, the Councils have reviewed the evidence available, to explore whether there is a need for a community stadium and what a community stadium would encompass. The Cambridge Sub Regional Facilities Review (November 2012) has been published alongside the Issues and Options 2013 consultation. Following this review, it was decided to consult again on the issue of need for a community stadium, and the principles that could form part of a vision for a community stadium.

- 4.6 The principles for a community stadium identified at paragraph 10.7 of the Consultation document would confirm the potential benefits highlighted by the previous sustainability appraisals.
- 4.7 The Review concludes that no specific objective need can be quantified requiring the provision of a community stadium. However, the Review identifies that the right package of uses in a suitable location could deliver benefits for the wider sub-region. In the light of the latest work, the consultation asks whether there is considered to be a need to plan for a community stadium.

### **Identification of Reasonable Alternatives for Community Stadium Site**

- 4.8 Following the first Issues and Options consultation, the Councils have explored the potential of a range of site options to provide a community stadium as part of the Cambridge Sub-Regional Facilities Review, including a number of sites that were suggested in responses to the consultation. The identification of potential site options is detailed in 'The Cambridge Sub Regional Facilities Review' (November 2012). This identified potential site options within the built up area of Cambridge, on the edge of Cambridge (in the Green Belt), and outside Cambridge. Details of site options considered but rejected before detailed assessment can be found in Appendix 2 of this document. Following this initial review, 11 options were identified for more detailed assessment.

- Abbey Stadium site, Newmarket Road, Cambridge
- Abbey Stadium site plus allotment land to the south
- Land east of Norman Way Business Park, Coldham's Lane Cambridge
- Cowley Road, Cambridge
- Cambridge East – North of Newmarket Road
- Land between Milton and Impington (Leonard Martin – Union Place)
- West of Cambridge Road South of the A14, Impington
- South of Trumpington Meadows (Grosvenor / Wrenbridge proposal)
- Northstowe
- Waterbeach New Town Option
- Bourn Airfield

### **The Sustainability Appraisal Process**

- 4.9 Similar to the Green Belt site review above, sites were assessed utilising a site assessment pro forma, which was developed jointly to take into account both authorities' SA objectives. The pro forma was specifically developed to fully integrate the SA process into site assessment, and consider particular issues relevant to a community

stadium. The development of the pro forma is documented in section 5 of the Cambridge Sub Regional Facilities Review (November 2012).

- 4.10 The Joint Community Stadium Site Assessment Pro forma can be found at Appendix 2 of this report. For each criterion there is an explanation as to which of the Cambridge SA topics and South Cambridgeshire SA objectives it relates to. A traffic light system has been used to score the sites from red red (a significant negative impact) to green green (no impact or minor impact which can be mitigated). In most cases there were three potential scores (red, amber, green), but in some cases this was extended to five categories to give a finer grained assessment.
- 4.11 Again the assessment has been split into three levels. The first addresses strategic and infrastructure issues, the second site considerations, and thirdly availability and deliverability. A conclusion is then identified for each level, whether there are significant constraints, some constraints, or only minor constraints or adverse impacts. There is then an overall conclusion, identifying the level of constraints that have been identified.

### **Results of the Appraisal**

- 4.12 The detailed assessment resulted in rejection of two options (the existing Abbey Stadium Site, Land east of Norman Way Business Park). Nine sites were considered to merit consultation, although there are major issues associated with all site options and this may mean that some sites may not be capable of being delivered. It is considered appropriate to consult on these options at this stage in the process before any decisions are taken on whether a community stadium should be provided and if so where. The view of the local community is an important step in the process.
- 4.13 The site assessments can be found in the Cambridge Sub Regional Facilities Review (November 2012) at the following link:  
*Weblink to be added here following Committee*

### **Ice Rink and Concert Hall Options**

- 4.14 The previous Issues and Options consultations sought views on whether there was a need for an ice rink or concert hall, and if so where they should be located. Again the option of including these facilities was assessed in the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal Reports. Both appraisals highlight the potential positive benefits to the economy, open space and leisure, with consequential benefits to

health and community objectives. Impacts on site specific objectives or sustainable transport were uncertain as it would depend on the location.

- 4.15 The Cambridge Sub Regional Facilities Review (November 2012) considered the evidence of need for these facilities, Given the limited evidence available at this stage, instead of allocating a specific site, the Local Plans could include a general policy that would provide a framework for considering any proposals for sub-regional facilities, so that should proposals come forward they can be appropriately considered. Potential policy principles are included in paragraph 10.17 of the Part 1 Issues and Options 2013.
  
- 4.16 The principles focus on sustainable access, community safety, and creating a high quality public realm. Such a policy would assist the achievement of positive impacts on a range of South Cambridgeshire Sustainability objectives for creating good spaces, human health, crime, sustainable travel and transport infrastructure. Similarly, there would be positive outcomes for a number of Cambridge Sustainability Appraisal themes, including communities and wellbeing, Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage, economy, and transport



## Appendix 1

### Cambridge City Council / South Cambridgeshire District Council Green Belt Site and Sustainability Appraisal Assessment Pro forma

#### Showing links to Cambridge SA Topics and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objectives

| <b>Level 1</b>  |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Part A: Strategic Considerations</b>   |  |  |
| <b>Conformity with the Council's Sustainable Development Strategy (SDS)</b>                 |  |  |
| Criteria  | Performance (fill with relevant colour R G B or RR R A G GG etc and retain only chosen score text) | Links to Cambridge SA Topics and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objectives  |
| Is the site within an area that has been identified as suitable for development in the SDS? | R = No<br>G = Yes  |  |
| <b>Flood Risk</b>   |  |  |
| Criteria  | Performance  | Links to Cambridge SA Topics and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objectives  |
| Is site within a flood zone?  | R = Flood risk zone 3<br>A = Flood risk zone 2<br>G = Flood risk zone 1                            | Cambridge SA topic:<br>Flood risk including climate change adaptation.<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective:<br>11. Reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects. |
| Is site at risk from surface water flooding?  | R = High risk,<br>A = Medium risk<br>G = Low risk  | Cambridge SA topic:<br>Flood risk including climate change adaptation.<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective:<br>11. Reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects. |
| <b>Green Belt</b>   |  |  |
| Criteria  | Performance  | Links to Cambridge SA Topics and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objectives  |
| What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes, and other       | See below  | Applies to all Green Belt criteria below.<br><br>Cambridge SA topic:   |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| matters important to the special character of Cambridge and setting?                                      |   | Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 7. Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character |
| To preserve the unique character of Cambridge as a compact and dynamic City with a thriving historic core | Distance from edge of the defined City Centre in Kilometres to approximate centre of site   |   |
| To prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the City.      | RR = Very significant impacts<br>R = Significant negative impacts<br>A = Some impact, but capable of mitigation<br>G = No impact  |   |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of the setting of Cambridge   | RR = Very high and high impacts<br>R = High/medium impacts<br>A = Medium and medium/minor impacts<br>G = Minor and minor/negligible impacts<br>GG = Negligible impacts  |   |
| Key views of Cambridge / Important views  | R = Significant negative impact from loss or degradation of views.<br>A = Negative impact from loss or degradation of views.<br>G = No or negligible impact on views  |   |
| Soft green edge to the City   | R = Existing high quality edge, significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation.<br>A = Existing lesser quality edge / negative impacts but capable of mitigation<br>G = Not present, significant opportunities for enhancement. |   |
| Distinctive urban edge  | R = Existing high quality edge, significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation.<br>A = Existing lesser quality  |   |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | edge / negative impacts but capable of mitigation<br>G = Not present  |   |
| Green corridors penetrating into the City  | R = Significant negative impact from loss of land forming part of a green corridor, incapable of mitigation<br>A = Negative impact from loss of land forming part of a green corridor, but capable of mitigation<br>G = No loss of land forming part of a green corridor / significant opportunities for enhancement through creation of a new green corridor |   |
| The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages (SCDC only) | RR = Very significant negative impacts incapable of satisfactory mitigation<br>R = Significant negative impacts incapable of satisfactory mitigation<br>A = Negative impacts but capable of partial mitigation<br>G = No impacts or minor impacts capable of mitigation   |   |
| A landscape which has a strongly rural character   | R = Significant negative impacts incapable of satisfactory mitigation<br>A = Negative impacts but capable of partial mitigation<br>G = No impacts or impacts capable of mitigation  |   |
| Overall conclusion on Green Belt   | RR = Very high and high impacts<br>R = High/medium impacts<br>A = Medium and medium/minor impacts<br>G = Minor and minor/negligible impacts<br>GG = Negligible impacts  |   |
| <b>Impact on national Nature Conservation Designations</b>   |   |   |
| Criteria   | Performance   | Links to Cambridge SA Topics and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objectives |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? | R = Site is on or adjacent to an SSSI with negative impacts incapable of mitigation<br>A = Site is on or adjacent to an SSSI with negative impacts capable of mitigation<br>G = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts   | Cambridge SA topic: Biodiversity and green infrastructure<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 4. Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species   |
| <b>Impact on National Heritage Assets</b>                                  |   |   |
| Criteria   | Performance   | Links to Cambridge SA Topics and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objectives   |
| Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?            | 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<br>A = Site is adjacent to a SAM that is less sensitive / not likely to be impacted or impacts are capable of mitigation<br>G = Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM   | Cambridge SA topic: Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 8. Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings. |
| Would development impact upon Listed Buildings?                            | R = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation<br>A = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation<br>G = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings | Cambridge SA topic: Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 8. Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings. |
| <b>Part B: Deliverability and other constraints</b>                        |   |   |
| Criteria   | Performance   | Links to Cambridge SA Topics and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objectives   |
| Is there a suitable access to the site?                                    | R = No<br>A = Yes, with mitigation  | Not an SA matter  |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | G = Yes   | South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 23. Secure appropriate investment and development in transport infrastructure, and ensure the safety of the transport network.                         |
| Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the local highway capacity?          | R = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects incapable of appropriate mitigation.<br>A = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.<br>G = No capacity constraints identified that cannot be fully mitigated                   | Not an SA matter<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 23. Secure appropriate investment and development in transport infrastructure, and ensure the safety of the transport network. |
| Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the strategic road network capacity? | R = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects incapable of appropriate mitigation.<br>A = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.<br>G = No capacity constraints identified that cannot be fully mitigated                   | Not an SA<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 23. Secure appropriate investment and development in transport infrastructure, and ensure the safety of the transport network.matter  |
| Is the site part of a larger site and could it prejudice development of any strategic sites?   | R = Yes major impact<br>A = Some impact<br>G = No impact  | Not an SA matter  |
| Are there any known legal issues/covenants that could constrain development of the site?       | R = Yes<br>G = No   | Not an SA matter  |
| Timeframe for bringing the site forward for development?                                       | R = Beyond 2031 (beyond plan period)<br>A = Start of construction between 2017 and 2031<br>G = Start of construction between 2011 and 2016  | Not an SA matter  |
| Would development of the site require significant new / upgraded utility infrastructure?       | R = Yes, significant upgrades likely to be required but constraints incapable of appropriate mitigation<br>A = Yes, significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation<br>G = No, existing infrastructure likely to be | Not an SA matter<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 21. Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and other infrastructure                                  |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | sufficient   |  |
| Would development of the site be likely to require new education provision?                     | R = School capacity not sufficient, constraints cannot be appropriately mitigated.<br>A = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated<br>G = Non-residential development / surplus school places  | Not an SA matter<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 20. Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence  |
| Is the site allocated or safeguarded in the Minerals and Waste LDF?                             | R = Site or a significant part of it falls within an allocated or safeguarded area, development would have significant negative impacts<br>A = Site or a significant part of it falls within an allocated or safeguarded area, development would have minor negative impacts<br>G = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area. | Not an SA matter<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 21. Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, economic mineral reserves, and productive agricultural holdings and the degradation / loss of soils |
| Is the site located within the Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone (PSZ) or Safeguarding Zone? | R = Site is within the PSZ or is designated as an area where no development should occur<br>A = Site or part of site within the SZ<br>G = Site is not within the PSZ or SZ   | Not an SA matter   |

| <b>Level 2</b>   |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Accessibility to existing centres and services</b>          |  |  |
| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Performance</b>                     | <b>Links to Cambridge SA Topics and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objectives</b>   |
| How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre? | R = >800m<br>A = 400-800m<br>G = <400m | Cambridge SA topic: Communities and well being<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 22. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices. |
| How far is the nearest health centre or GP                     | R = >800m<br>A = 400-800m              | Cambridge SA topic: Communities and well   |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| service in Cambridge?   | G = <400m   | being<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 22. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices.   |
| Would development lead to a loss of community facilities?                       | R = Development would lead to the loss of one or more community facilities incapable of appropriate mitigation<br>G = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or appropriate mitigation possible   | Cambridge SA topic: Communities and well being<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 16. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities) |
| How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities? | R = Limited scope for integration with existing communities / isolated and/or separated by non-residential land uses<br>A = Adequate scope for integration with existing communities<br>G = Good scope for integration with existing communities / of sufficient scale to create a new community. | Cambridge SA topic: Communities and well being<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 18. Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities  |
| How far is the nearest secondary school?  | R = >3km<br>A = 1-3km<br>G = <1km or non-housing allocation or site large enough to provide new school  | Cambridge SA topic: Communities and well being<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 16. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities) |
| How far is the nearest primary school?  | City preference:<br><br>R = >800m<br>A = 400-800m<br>G = <400m or non-housing allocations or site large enough to provide new school  | Cambridge SA topic: Communities and well being<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 16. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of  |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | <p>SCDC:</p> <p>R = &gt;3km<br/> A = 1-3 km<br/> G = &lt;1km or non housing allocation or site large enough to provide new school</p>              | <p>services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities)</p>  |
| <p>Would development protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, Town, District and Local Centres?</p>  | <p>R = Significant negative effect<br/> A = Negative effect<br/> G = No effect or would support the vitality and viability of existing centres</p> | <p>Cambridge SA topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Communities and well being</li> <li>- Economy</li> </ul> <p>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective:<br/> 19. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy.</p>  |
| <b>Accessibility to outdoor facilities and green spaces</b>   |  |  |
| Criteria  | Performance  | Links to Cambridge SA Topics and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objectives  |
| <p>Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).</p>  | <p>R=Yes<br/> G=No</p>   | <p>Cambridge SA topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Communities and Well Being</li> <li>- Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</li> <li>- Biodiversity and green infrastructure</li> </ul> <p>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective:<br/> 14. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space.</p> |
| <p>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 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9 (for land in South Cambridgeshire)?</p> | <p>R=No<br/> G=Yes</p>   | <p>Cambridge SA topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Communities and Well Being</li> <li>- Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</li> <li>- Biodiversity and green infrastructure</li> </ul> <p>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective:<br/> 14. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space.</p> |
| <p>If the site does not involve</p>   | <p>RR = No, the site by virtue</p>   | <p>Cambridge SA topics:</p>  |



|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| 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 (OS) provision? | of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of OS and is located in a ward or parish with identified deficiency.<br>R= No, the site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of OS.<br>G = Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite<br>GG = Development would create the opportunity to deliver significantly enhanced provision of new public open spaces in excess of adopted plan standards. | - Communities and Well Being<br>- Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage<br>- Biodiversity and green infrastructure<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 14. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space. |
| <b>Supporting Economic Growth</b>   |  |   |
| Criteria  | Performance  | Links to Cambridge SA Topics and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objectives   |
| How far is the nearest main employment centre?  | R = >3km<br>A = 1-3km<br>G = <1km or allocation is for or includes a significant element of employment or is for another non-residential use   | Cambridge SA topic: Economy<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective:..20. Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence   |
| Would development result in the loss of employment land identified in the Employment Land Review?   | R = Significant loss of employment land and job opportunities not mitigated by alternative allocation in the area (> 50%)<br>A = Some loss of employment land and job opportunities mitigated by alternative allocation in the area (< 50%).<br>G = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development  | Cambridge SA topic: Economy<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective:.. 19. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy.  |
| Would allocation result in development in deprived areas of Cambridge?  | A = Not within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple   | Cambridge SA topic: Economy<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability  |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | Deprivation 2010.<br>G = Within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Local Super Output Areas (LSOA) within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010.   | Objective:.20. Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence   |
| <b>Sustainable Transport</b>   |  |   |
| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Performance</b>   | <b>Links to Cambridge SA Topics and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objectives</b>  |
| What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site? | R = Service does not meet the requirements of a high quality public transport (HQPT)<br>A = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances<br>G = High quality public transport service   | Cambridge SA topic: Transport<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 22. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices. |
| How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?              | R = >800m<br>A = 400 - 800m<br>G = <400m   | Cambridge SA topic: Transport<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 22. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices. |
| What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?                   | RR = no cycling provision and traffic speeds >30mph with high vehicular traffic volume.<br>R = 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.<br>A = Medium quality off-road path.<br>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 | Cambridge SA topic: Transport<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 22. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices. |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
|   | busway.<br>GG = Quiet residential street designed for 20mph speeds, high quality off-road paths with good segregation from pedestrians, uni-directional hybrid cycle lanes.                             |   |
| SCDC Would development reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable transport choices: | RR = Score 0-4 from 4 criteria below<br>R = Score 5-9 from 4 criteria below<br>A = Score 10-14 from 4 criteria below<br>G = Score 15-19 from 4 criteria below<br>GG = Score 19-24 from 4 criteria below | Cambridge SA topic: Transport<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 22. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices. |
| SCDC Sub-indicator: Distance to a bus stop / rail station                                   | Within 400m (6)<br>Within 600m (4)<br>Within 800m (3)<br>Within 1000m (2)<br>Beyond 1000m (0)   | Cambridge SA topic: Transport<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 22. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices. |
| SCDC Sub-indicator: Frequency of Public Transport   | 10 minute service or better (6)<br>20 minute service (4)<br>30 minute service (3)<br>60 minute service (2)<br>Less than hourly service (0)  | Cambridge SA topic: Transport<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 22. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices. |
| SCDC Sub-Indicator: Typical public transport journey time to Cambridge City Centre          | 20 minutes or less (6)<br>Between 21 and 30 minutes (4)<br>Between 31 and 40 minutes (3)<br>Between 41 and 50 minutes (2)<br>Greater than 50 minutes (0)  | Cambridge SA topic: Transport<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 22. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices. |
| SCDC Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre                                     | Up to 5km (6)<br>5-10km (4)<br>10-15km (3)<br>15km + (2)<br>20km + (0)  | Cambridge SA topic: Transport<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective:   |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | 22. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices.  |
| <b>Air Quality, pollution, contamination and noise</b>   |   |  |
| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Performance</b>  | <b>Links to Cambridge SA Topics and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objectives</b>   |
| Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?   | R = Within or adjacent to an AQMA, M11 or A14<br>A = <1000m of an AQMA, M11 or A14<br>G = >1000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14  | Cambridge SA topic: Communities and well being<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 3. Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution. |
| Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?                | R = Significant adverse impact<br>A = Adverse impact<br>G = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact  | Cambridge SA topic: Communities and well being<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 3. Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution. |
| Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator? | R = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation<br>A = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation<br>G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation | Cambridge SA topic: Communities and well being<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 3. Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution. |
| Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?     | R = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation<br>A = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation<br>G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation | Cambridge SA topic: Communities and well being<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 3. Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution. |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?   | R = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation<br>A = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation<br>G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation   | Cambridge SA topic: Communities and well being<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 3. Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution. |
| Is there possible contamination on the site?   | 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<br>A = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development<br>G = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination | Cambridge SA topic: Communities and well being<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 3. Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution. |
| <b>Protecting Groundwater</b>  |   |  |
| Criteria   | Performance   | Links to Cambridge SA Topics and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objectives  |
| Would development be within a source protection zone?<br>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. | R = Within SPZ 1<br>G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace   | Cambridge SA topic: Water<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 3. Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution                       |
| <b>Protecting the townscape and historic environment</b> ( <i>Landscape addressed by Green Belt criteria</i> )   |   |  |
| Criteria   | Performance   | Links to Cambridge SA Topics and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objectives  |
| Would allocation impact upon a historic  | R = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the  | Cambridge SA topic: Landscape, townscape and   |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| park/garden?   | <p>setting of such areas with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>A = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such areas with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>G = Site does not contain or adjoin such areas, and there is no impact to the setting of such areas</p>  | <p>cultural heritage</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 8. Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings.</p>  |
| Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?                         | <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</p> <p>A = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such an area with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>G = Site does not contain or adjoin such an area, and there is no impact to the setting of such an area</p> | <p>Cambridge SA topic: Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 8. Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings.</p> |
| Would development impact upon buildings of local interest (Cambridge only) | <p>A = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>G = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings</p>   | <p>Cambridge SA topic: Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 8. Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings.</p> |
| Would development impact upon archaeology?                                 | <p>A = Known archaeology on site or in vicinity</p> <p>G=No known archaeology on site or in vicinity</p>   | <p>Cambridge SA topic: Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 8. Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings.</p> |

| <b>Making Efficient Use of Land</b>   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Criteria  | Performance   | Links to Cambridge SA Topics and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objectives  |
| Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?                | R = Significant loss (20 ha or more) of grades 1 and 2 land<br>A = Minor loss of grade 1 and 2 land<br>G = Neutral.<br>Development would not affect grade 1 and 2 land. | Cambridge SA topic: Communities and well being<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 1. Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, economic mineral reserves, and productive agricultural holdings and the degradation / loss of soils. |
| Would development make use of previously developed land (PDL)? (CITY)                               | R = No<br>G = Yes   | Cambridge SA topic: Communities and well being<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 1. Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, economic mineral reserves, and productive agricultural holdings and the degradation / loss of soils. |
| Would development make use of previously developed land (PDL)? (SCDC)                               | A=No<br>G=Yes   | Cambridge SA topic: Communities and well being<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 1. Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, economic mineral reserves, and productive agricultural holdings and the degradation / loss of soils. |
| <b>Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure</b>  |   |  |
| Criteria  | Performance   | Links to Cambridge SA Topics and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objectives  |
| Would development impact upon a locally designated wildlife site i.e. (Local Nature Reserve, County | R = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site and impacts incapable of appropriate  | Cambridge SA topic: Biodiversity and green infrastructure  |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site)  | mitigation<br>A = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation<br>G = Does not contain, is not adjacent to or local area will be developed as greenspace  | South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective:<br>5.Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species.  |
| Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?  | R = Development involves a loss of existing green infrastructure which is incapable of appropriate mitigation.<br>A = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation<br>G = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure  | Cambridge SA topic:<br>Biodiversity and green infrastructure<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective:<br>5.Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species.  |
| Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?) | R = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links incapable of appropriate mitigation<br>A = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation<br>G = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links | Cambridge SA topic:<br>Biodiversity and green infrastructure<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective:<br>5.Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species.  |
| Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?   | R = Development likely to have a significant adverse impact on the protected trees incapable of appropriate mitigation<br>A = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation<br>G = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees   | Cambridge SA topics:<br>- Biodiversity and green infrastructure<br>- Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage<br><br>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 5. Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species. |
| <b>Any other information not captured above?</b>  |  |   |
| <b>Level 1 Conclusion</b> (after allowing scope for   | <b>R = Significant constraints or adverse</b>  |   |



|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| mitigation)   | <b>impacts</b><br><b>A = Some constraints or adverse impacts</b><br><b>G = Minor constraints or adverse impacts</b>   |  |
| <b>Level 2 Conclusion</b> (after allowing scope for mitigation) | <b>R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts</b><br><b>A = Some constraints or adverse impacts</b><br><b>G = Minor constraints or adverse impacts</b>  |  |
| <b>Overall Conclusion</b>                                       | <b>R = Site with no significant development potential (significant constraints and adverse impacts)</b><br><b>A = Site with development potential (some constraints or adverse impacts)</b><br><b>G = Site with development potential (few or minor constraints or adverse impacts)</b> |  |
| <b>Viability feedback (from consultants)</b>                    | <b>R = Unlikely to be viable,</b><br><b>A = May be viable</b><br><b>G = Likely to be viable</b>   |  |

## Links between Joint Green Belt Site Pro forma and Cambridge Sustainability Appraisal Topics

| Cambridge Sustainability Appraisal Topic |                            | Joint Green Belt Testing Criteria   |
|--|----------------------------|---|
| 1  | Communities and well being | <p>How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?</p> <p>How far is the nearest health centre or GP service in Cambridge?</p> <p>Would development lead to a loss of community facilities?</p> <p>How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?</p> <p>How far is the nearest secondary school?</p> <p>How far is the nearest primary school?</p> <p>Would development protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, Town, District and Local Centres?</p> <p>Would development result in the loss of protected open space (protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9) (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status)?</p> <p>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 (OS) provision?</p> <p>Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?</p> <p>Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?</p> <p>Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</p> <p>Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</p> <p>Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</p> <p>Is there possible contamination on the site?</p> <p>Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?</p> <p>Would development make use of previously developed land?</p> <p>Would allocation result in development in deprived areas of Cambridge?</p> |
| 2  | Economy                    | <p>Would development protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, Town, District and Local Centres?</p> <p>How far is the nearest main employment centre?</p> <p>Would development result in the loss of employment land identified in the Employment Land Review?</p> <p>Would allocation result in development in deprived areas of Cambridge?</p>   |
| 3  | Transport                  | <p>What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site?</p> <p>How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?</p> <p>What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?</p> <p>Would development reduce the need to travel and</p>   |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   |  | promote sustainable transport choices?  |
| 4 | Water  | Would development be within a source protection zone?   |
| 5 | Flood risk including climate change adaptation | Is site within a flood zone?<br>Is site at risk from surface water flooding?  |
| 6 | Climate change mitigation and renewable energy | N/A<br>No criteria have been developed for this, as the information is not available at site allocation stage. These objectives will be addressed through the development and inclusion of policies in the Local Plan relating to sustainable construction standards and on-site carbon emissions reductions.   |
| 7 | Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage     | What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes, and other matters important to the special character of Cambridge and setting?<br>Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?<br>Would development impact upon Listed Buildings?<br>Would development result in the loss of protected open space (protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9) (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status)?<br>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 (OS) provision?<br>Would allocation impact upon a historic park/garden?<br>Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?<br>Would development impact upon buildings of local interest?<br>Would development impact upon archaeology?<br>Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)? |
| 8 | Biodiversity and green infrastructure          | Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)?<br>Would development result in the loss of protected open space (protected by Cambridge Local Plan policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9) (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status)?<br>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 (OS) provision?<br>Would development impact upon a locally designated wildlife site i.e. (Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site)?<br>Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?<br>Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)<br>Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?   |

## Links between Joint Green Belt Site Pro forma and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

| South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives |   | Joint Green Belt Testing Criteria  |
|--|---|--|
| 1  | Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, economic mineral reserves, and productive agricultural holdings and the degradation / loss of soils | Is the site allocated or safeguarded in the Minerals and Waste LDF?<br>Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?<br>Would development make use of previously developed land?  |
| 2  | Minimise waste production and support the reuse and recycling of waste products   | N/A dependent on type and design of development not location.  |
| 3  | Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution   | Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?<br>Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?<br>Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?<br>Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?<br>Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?<br>Is there possible contamination on the site?<br>Would development be within a source protection zone? |
| 4  | Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species  | Would allocation impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)?<br>Would development impact upon a locally designated wildlife site i.e. (Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site)?  |
| 5  | Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species   | Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)<br>Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?   |
| 6  | Improve opportunities for people to access and appreciate wildlife and wild places  | Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?   |
| 7  | Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character   | What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes, and other matters important to the special character of Cambridge and setting?   |
| 8  | Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings.   | Will allocation impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?<br>Would development impact upon Listed Buildings?<br>Would allocation impact upon a historic park/garden?<br>Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?<br>Would development impact upon buildings of local interest?<br>Would development impact upon archaeology?   |
| 9  | Create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look good   | N/A<br>Dependent on type and design of development not   |

|    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
|    |  | location.  |
| 10 | Minimise impacts on climate change (including greenhouse gas emissions)  | N/A<br>No specific opportunities for renewable energy have been identified at this stage.<br><br>Impacts on air quality, and sustainable transport addressed separately.   |
| 11 | Reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects  | Is site within a flood zone?<br>Is site at risk from surface water flooding?   |
| 12 | Maintain and enhance human health  | N/A<br><br>To avoid repetition this indicator will not be applied at a site comparison level. There are a range of other indicators relate to human health, including environmental issues (air quality and other forms of pollution), access to services and facilities, safe transport access and opportunities to use alternative transport modes, access to open space and Green Infrastructure. |
| 13 | Reduce and prevent crime and reduce fear of crime  | N/A<br>Addressed by site specific design.  |
| 14 | Improve the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space.  | Would development result in the loss of land protected open space?<br>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 (OS) provision?   |
| 15 | Ensure everyone has access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing   | N/A<br>Testing housing proposals.  |
| 16 | Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities) | Would development lead to a loss of community facilities?<br>How far is the nearest secondary school?<br>How far is the nearest primary school?  |
| 17 | Redress inequalities related to age, disability, gender assignment race, faith, location and income  | N/A<br>Primarily a matter of site design. Location addressed by accessibility criteria.  |
| 18 | Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities  | How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities?  |
| 19 | Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy.   | Would development protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, Town, District and Local Centres?<br>Would development result in the loss of employment land identified in the Employment Land Review?   |
| 20 | Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence                                     | Would development of the site be likely to require new education provision?<br>How far is the nearest main employment centre?<br>Would allocation result in development in deprived areas of Cambridge?  |
| 21 | Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and other   | Would development of the site require significant new / upgraded utility infrastructure?   |

|    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
|    | infrastructure   |   |
| 22 | Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices.  | How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre?<br>How far is the nearest health centre or GP service in Cambridge?<br>What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site?<br>How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?<br>What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?<br>Would development reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable transport choices? |
| 23 | Secure appropriate investment and development in transport infrastructure, and ensure the safety of the transport network. | Is there a suitable access to the site?<br>Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the local highway capacity?<br>Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the strategic road network capacity?  |

## Appendix 2

### Cambridge City Council / South Cambridgeshire District Council Community Stadium Site and Sustainability Appraisal Assessment Pro forma

#### Showing links to Cambridge SA Topics and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objectives

|   |
|---|
| <b>Site Information</b>   |
| <b>Site reference number(s):</b>  |
| <b>Site name/address:</b>   |
| <b>Functional area (taken from Cambridge City SA Scoping Report):</b> <i>City only</i>  |
| <b>Photo:</b>   |
| <b>Map:</b>   |
| <b>Site description:</b>  |
| <b>Current use(s):</b> Current use of the site  |
| <b>Proposed use(s):</b> Identifies whether the site has been proposed for a particular use through representations to the Cambridge or South Cambridgeshire Local Plan consultations, or whether the Local Plan Issues and Options Reports proposed a use.  |
| <b>Site size (ha):</b> South Cambridgeshire: ha Cambridge: ha   |
| <b>Ability to accommodate Sub regional Facilities</b> including potential to accommodate associated community uses<br><br><b>VERY GOOD</b> (likely to be large enough to accommodate a community stadium and a range of other sub-regional facilities)<br><br><b>GOOD</b> (likely to be large enough to accommodate a community stadium and one other sub-regional facility)<br><br><b>ADEQUATE</b> (likely to be large enough to accommodate a community stadium)<br><br><b>LIMITED</b> (unlikely to be large enough to accommodate a community stadium) |
| <b>Site owner/promoter:</b> <i>Owners known/Unknown</i>   |
| <b>Landowner has agreed to promote site for this development?:</b> <i>Yes/No/Unknown</i>  |
| <b>Relevant planning history:</b> A summary of recent planning history, as a result of planning applications, or development plans.   |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Level 1</b>  |  |  |
| <b>Part A: Strategic Considerations</b>                           |  |  |
| <b>Sequential approach to main town centre uses</b>               |  |  |
| Criteria  | Performance  | Comments / Links to Sustainability Objectives  |
| What position does the site fall within the settlement hierarchy? | G – Built up area of Cambridge<br>A = Edge of City<br>R = New Town<br>RR = Village | <i>When considering main town centre uses, particularly major sub-regional facilities, a sequential approach needs to be demonstrated.</i> |

|  |  | <p><i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 16. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities)</i></p>   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Flood Risk</b>  |  |   |
| Criteria   | Performance  | Comments / Links to Sustainability Objectives   |
| Is site within a flood zone?   | <p>RR = Flood risk zone 3b<br/> A = Flood risk zone 3<br/> G = Flood risk zone 2<br/> GG = Flood risk zone 1</p> | <p><i>Identifies the fluvial flood risk of the site, using the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</i></p> <p><i>The National Planning Policy Framework requires a sequential approach to development, seeking land at lowest risk first. Development in zone 3a would require exception test if included medical or educational uses.</i></p> <p><i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 11. Reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects.</i></p> <p><i>Cambridge SA topic: Flood risk including climate change adaptation.</i></p> |
| Is site at risk from surface water flooding?   | <p>A= High risk,<br/> G = Medium risk<br/> GG= Low risk</p>  | <p><i>Information from Surface Water Management plans. Takes 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> <p><i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 11. Reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects.</i></p> <p><i>Cambridge SA topic: Flood risk including climate change adaptation.</i></p>   |
| <b>Green Belt</b>  |  |   |
| Criteria   | Performance  | Comments / Links to Sustainability Objectives   |
| Is the site in the Green Belt?   | If yes, complete section below.  | <i>Not all sites being tested are located in the Green Belt</i>   |
| What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes, and other matters important to the special character of Cambridge and setting? | See below  | <i>The purposes of the Green Belt were defined in the South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy, drawing on the Green Belt Study 2002.</i>   |



|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
|   |   | <p><i>The review of impact on Green Belt purposes has been completed with assistance from landscape architects. This will draw on the findings of the Inner Green Belt Study 2012.</i></p> <p><i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 7. Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character</i></p> <p><i>Cambridge SA topic: Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</i></p> |
| To preserve the unique character of Cambridge as a compact and dynamic City with a thriving historic core | Distance from edge of the defined City Centre in Kilometres to approximate centre of site   |   |
| To prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the City.      | RR = Very significant impacts<br>R = Significant negative impacts<br>A = Some impact, but capable of mitigation<br>G = No impact  |   |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of the setting of Cambridge   | RR = Very high and high impacts<br>R = High/medium impacts<br>A = Medium and medium/minor impacts<br>G = Minor and minor/negligible impacts<br>GG = Negligible impacts  |   |
| Key views of Cambridge / Important views  | R = Significant negative impact from loss or degradation of views.<br>A = Negative impact from loss or degradation of views.<br>G = No or negligible impact on views  |   |
| Soft green edge to the City   | R = Existing high quality edge, significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation.<br>A = Existing lesser quality edge / negative impacts but capable of mitigation<br>G = Not present, significant opportunities for enhancement. |   |
| Distinctive urban edge  | R = Existing high quality edge, significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation.<br>A = Existing lesser quality edge / negative impacts but  |   |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | capable of mitigation<br>G = Not present  |   |
| Green corridors penetrating into the City  | R = Significant negative impact from loss of land forming part of a green corridor, incapable of mitigation<br>A = Negative impact from loss of land forming part of a green corridor, but capable of mitigation<br>G = No loss of land forming part of a green corridor / significant opportunities for enhancement through creation of a new green corridor |   |
| The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages (SCDC only) | RR = Very significant negative impacts incapable of satisfactory mitigation<br>R = Significant negative impacts incapable of satisfactory mitigation<br>A = Negative impacts but capable of partial mitigation<br>G = No impacts or minor impacts capable of mitigation   |   |
| A landscape which has a strongly rural character   | R = Significant negative impacts incapable of satisfactory mitigation<br>A = Negative impacts but capable of partial mitigation<br>G = No impacts or impacts capable of mitigation  |   |
| Overall conclusion on Green Belt   | RR = Very high and high impacts<br>R = High/medium impacts<br>A = Medium and medium/minor impacts<br>G = Minor and minor/negligible impacts<br>GG = Negligible impacts  | <i>Assessment likely to pull across findings from the 2012 Inner Green Belt Boundary Study. Using 5 bands allows a finer grained appreciation of importance/significance of site in relation to GB purposes and functions.</i>  |
| <b>Impact on the Landscape</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Performance</b>  | <b>Comments / Links to Sustainability Objectives</b>  |
| Would development maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?       | RR = Development conflicts with landscape character with significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation<br>R = Development conflicts with landscape character with minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation<br>A = Development would be generally compatible or capable of being made compatible with local                                       | <i>Includes consideration of whether a stadium or other facility would have different impacts to residential development.</i><br><br><i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 7. Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character</i> |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | <p>landscape character</p> <p>G = Development would relate to local landscape character and offer opportunities for landscape enhancement</p> <p>GG = Development would relate to local landscape character and offer significant opportunities for landscape enhancement</p>   | <p><i>Cambridge SA topic: Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</i></p>  |
| <b>Impact on the Townscape</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Performance</b>  | <b>Comments / Links to Sustainability Objectives</b>  |
| Would development maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character?           | <p>RR = Development conflicts with townscape character with significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation</p> <p>R = Development conflicts with townscape character with minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation</p> <p>A = Development would be generally compatible or capable of being made compatible with local townscape character</p> <p>G = Development would relate to local townscape character and offer opportunities for townscape enhancement</p> <p>GG = Development would relate to local townscape character and offer significant opportunities for landscape enhancement</p> | <p><i>Includes consideration of whether a stadium or other facility would have different impacts to residential development.</i></p> <p><i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 7. Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character</i></p> <p><i>Cambridge SA topic: Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</i></p> |
| <b>Impact on national Nature Conservation Designations</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Performance</b>  | <b>Comments / Links to Sustainability Objectives</b>  |
| Would development impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and European Designated sites? | <p>R = Site is on or adjacent to an SSSI with negative impacts incapable of mitigation</p> <p>A = Site is on or adjacent to an SSSI with negative impacts capable of mitigation</p> <p>G = Site is not near to an SSSI with no or negligible impacts</p>  | <p><i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 4. Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species</i></p> <p><i>Cambridge SA topic: Biodiversity and green infrastructure</i></p>  |
| <b>Impact on National Heritage Assets</b>  |   |   |
| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Performance</b>  | <b>Comments / Links to Sustainability Objectives</b>  |
| Would development impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?  | R = Site is on a SAM or allocation will lead to development adjacent to a SAM with the potential for  | <i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 8.</i>  |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   | <p>negative impacts</p> <p>A = Site is adjacent to a SAM that is less sensitive / not likely to be impacted</p> <p>G = Site is not on or adjacent to a SAM</p>   | <p><i>Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings.</i></p> <p><i>Cambridge SA topic: Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</i></p>  |
| Would development impact upon Listed Buildings?   | <p>R = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>A = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>G = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings</p> | <p><i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 8. Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings.</i></p> <p><i>Cambridge SA topic: Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</i></p>  |
| <b>Part B: Infrastructure Criteria</b>  |  |   |
| <b>Criteria</b>   | <b>Performance</b>   | <b>Comments / Links to Sustainability Objectives</b>  |
| Is the site allocated or safeguarded in the Minerals and Waste LDF?                             | <p>R = Site or a significant part of it falls within an allocated or safeguarded area, development would have significant negative impacts</p> <p>A = Site or a significant part of it falls within an allocated or safeguarded area, development would have minor negative impacts</p> <p>G = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area.</p>  | <p><i>Cambridgeshire County Council have been consulted.</i></p> <p><i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 1. Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, economic mineral reserves, and productive agricultural holdings and the degradation / loss of soils</i></p> <p><i>Cambridge SA topic: Communities and Well Being</i></p> |
| Is the site located within the Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone (PSZ) or Safeguarding Zone? | <p>R = Site is within the PSZ or is designated as an area where no development should occur</p> <p>A = Site or part of site within the SZ</p> <p>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><i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 23. Secure appropriate investment and development in transport infrastructure, and ensure the safety of the transport network.</i></p>                |
| Is there a suitable access to the site?   | <p>R = No</p> <p>A = Yes, with mitigation</p>  | <i>Advice from Cambridgeshire County Council, as the Local</i>  |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | G = Yes   | <i>Highways Authority.</i>   |
| Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the local highway capacity?          | R = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects incapable of appropriate mitigation.<br>A = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.<br>G = No capacity constraints identified that cannot be fully mitigated | <i>Advice from Cambridgeshire County Council, as the Local Highways Authority.</i><br><br><i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 23. Secure appropriate investment and development in transport infrastructure, and ensure the safety of the transport network.</i> |
| Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the strategic road network capacity? | R = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects incapable of appropriate mitigation.<br>A = Insufficient capacity. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation.<br>G = No capacity constraints identified that cannot be fully mitigated | <i>Advice from the Highways Agency.</i><br><br><i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 23. Secure appropriate investment and development in transport infrastructure, and ensure the safety of the transport network.</i>  |

| <b>Level 2 Site Considerations</b>                        |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Community facilities</b>                               |   |  |
| <b>Criteria</b>   | <b>Performance</b>  | <b>Comments / Links to Sustainability Objectives</b>   |
| Would development lead to a loss of community facilities? | R = Development would lead to the loss of one or more community facilities incapable of appropriate mitigation<br>G = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or appropriate mitigation possible<br>GG = Potential for additional community facilities | <i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 18. Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities</i><br><br><i>Cambridge SA topic: Communities and Well Being</i>   |
| Could it form part of an existing or new community?       | R = Isolated from existing or planned residential community.<br>A = Near to existing community, but limited opportunities for integration.<br>G = Near to a planned new community, with opportunities for integration.  | <i>One of the goals of a community stadium is to play a hub role in a community. This criteria considers how a proposal could link to an existing or planned community.</i><br><br><i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 18. Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities</i><br><br><i>Cambridge SA topic:</i> |

|  |   | <i>Communities and Well Being</i>   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Outdoor facilities and green spaces</b>   |   |   |
| Criteria   | Performance   | Comments / Links to Sustainability Objectives   |
| Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan (CLP) policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9? (excluding land which is protected only because of its Green Belt status).  | R = Yes<br>A = In part<br>G = No  | <i>Including commons, recreation grounds, outdoor sports facilities, provision for children and teenagers, semi-natural green spaces, and allotments and other similar areas.</i><br><br><i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 14. Improve the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space.</i><br><br><i>Cambridge SA topics:</i><br>- <i>Communities and Well Being</i><br>- <i>Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</i><br>- <i>Biodiversity and green infrastructure</i> |
| If the site is protected open space, would the loss or replacement of the open space be consistent with CLP Local Plan policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space (for land in Cambridge), or with South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9 (for land in South Cambridgeshire)? | R=No<br>A = Unknown<br>G=Yes  | <i>Policy requires a satisfactory replacement facility elsewhere.</i><br><br><i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 14. Improve the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space.</i><br><br><i>Cambridge SA topics:</i><br>- <i>Communities and Well Being</i><br>- <i>Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</i><br>- <i>Biodiversity and green infrastructure</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 (OS) provision?       | A = No, the site by virtue of its size is not able to provide additional open space<br>G = Development could provide some enhanced provision of new public open spaces<br>GG = Development could create the opportunity to deliver significantly enhanced provision of new public open spaces | <i>A key objective of national planning policy is for planning to promote healthy communities. Good accessibility to open spaces and sports facilities is likely to encourage healthier lifestyles.</i><br><br><i>G or GG where there is potential for training pitches and community facilities, not just a stadium pitch.</i><br><br><i>Appraisal guided by site size and circumstance, as specific</i>   |

|   |   | <p>proposals not available for all sites.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 14. Improve the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space.</p> <p>Cambridge SA topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Communities and Well Being</li> <li>- Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</li> <li>- Biodiversity and green infrastructure</li> </ul> |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Supporting Economic Growth</b>   |   |   |
| Criteria  | Performance   | Comments / Links to Sustainability Objectives   |
| Would development result in the loss of employment land identified in the Employment Land Review? | <p>R = Significant loss of employment land and job opportunities not mitigated by alternative allocation in the area (&gt; 50%)</p> <p>A = Some loss of employment land and job opportunities mitigated by alternative allocation in the area (&lt; 50%), or no reasonable prospect of employment development.</p> <p>G = No loss of employment land / allocation is for employment development</p> | <p>From GIS. Retained business estates, office locations and other portfolio sites defined in ELR</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 19. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy.</p> <p>Cambridge SA topic: Economy</p>   |
| <b>Sustainable Transport</b>  |   |   |
| Criteria  | Performance   | Comments / Links to Sustainability Objectives   |
| What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site?                      | <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>Cambridge City Council have carried out a assessment of where HQPT is available, using the definition in the Cambridge Local Plan.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 22. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices.</p> <p>Cambridge SA topic: Transport</p>  |
| How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?                                   | <p>R = &gt;800m</p> <p>A = 400 - 800m</p> <p>G = &lt;400m</p>   | <p>From approximate centre of site to proposed Science Park Station or Cambridge Station.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 22. Reduce the need to travel</p>   |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  |   | <p>and promote more sustainable transport choices.</p> <p>Cambridge SA topic: Transport</p>   |
| <p>What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?<br/>CITY</p>                         | <p><b>RR</b> = no cycling provision and traffic speeds &gt;30mph with high vehicular traffic volume.</p> <p><b>R</b> = No cycling provision or a cycle lane less than 1.5m 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><b>A</b> = Medium quality off-road path.</p> <p><b>G</b> = Quiet residential street speed below 30mph, cycle lane with 1.5m minimum width, high quality off-road path e.g. cycleway adjacent to guided busway.</p> <p><b>GG</b> = Quiet residential street designed for 20mph speeds, high quality off-road paths with good segregation from pedestrians, uni-directional hybrid cycle lanes.</p> | <p>Completed by Cambridge City Cycling Officer taking into account speed of traffic and accident records and width of facility and nature of any sharing with pedestrians.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 22. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices.</p> <p>Cambridge SA topic: Transport</p> |
| <p>SCDC Would development reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable transport choices:</p> | <p>RR = Score 0-4 from 4 criteria below<br/>R = Score 5-9 from 4 criteria below<br/>A = Score 10-14 from 4 criteria below<br/>G = Score 15-19 from 4 criteria below<br/>GG = Score 19-24 from 4 criteria below</p>  | <p>This assessment of accessibility have been utilised in the South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 22. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices.</p> <p>Cambridge SA topic: Transport</p>   |
| <p>SCDC Sub-indicator: Distance to a bus stop / rail station</p>                                   | <p>Within 400m (6)<br/>Within 600m (4)<br/>Within 800m (3)<br/>Within 1000m (2)<br/>Beyond 1000m (0)</p>  |   |
| <p>SCDC Sub-indicator: Frequency of Public Transport</p>   | <p>10 minute service or better (6)<br/>20 minute service (4)<br/>30 minute service (3)</p>  |   |



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | 60 minute service (2)<br>Less than hourly service (0)   |  |
| SCDC Sub-Indicator: Typical public transport journey time to Cambridge City Centre                     | 20 minutes or less (6)<br>Between 21 and 30 minutes (4)<br>Between 31 and 40 minutes (3)<br>Between 41 and 50 minutes (2)<br>Greater than 50 minutes (0)                          |  |
| SCDC Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre  | Up to 5km (6)<br>5-10km (4)<br>10-15km (3)<br>115km + (2)<br>20km + (0)   |  |
| <b>Air Quality, pollution, contamination and noise</b>   |   |  |
| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Performance</b>  | <b>Comments / Links to Sustainability Objectives</b>   |
| Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?   | R= Within or adjacent to an AQMA<br>A = Within or adjacent to M11 or A14<br>G = <1000m of an AQMA, M11 or A14<br>GG = >1000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14                              | The assessment will include consideration of the health impacts of air quality.<br><br><i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 3. Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution</i><br><br><i>Cambridge SA topic: Communities and Well Being</i> |
| Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?                | R = Significant adverse impact<br>A = Adverse impact<br>G = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact  | <i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 3. Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution</i><br><br><i>Cambridge SA topic: Communities and Well Being</i>  |
| Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator? | R = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation<br>A = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation<br>G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation | <i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 3. Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution</i><br><br><i>Cambridge SA topic: Communities and Well Being</i>  |
| Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?     | R = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation<br>A = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation   | <i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 3. Improve air quality and</i>   |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
|   | G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation  | <i>minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution</i><br><br><i>Cambridge SA topic: Communities and Well Being</i>   |
| Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?  | R = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation<br>A = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation<br>G = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation   | <i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 3. Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution</i><br><br><i>Cambridge SA topic: Communities and Well Being</i> |
| Is there possible contamination on the site?  | 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<br>A = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development<br>G = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination | <i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 3. Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution</i><br><br><i>Cambridge SA topic: Communities and Well Being</i> |
| <b>Protecting Groundwater</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Criteria</b>   | <b>Performance</b>  | <b>Comments / Links to Sustainability Objectives</b>  |
| Would development be within a source protection zone? 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. | R = Within SPZ 1<br>G = Not within SPZ1 or allocation is for greenspace   | <i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 3. Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution</i><br><br><i>Cambridge SA topic: Water</i>                      |
| <b>Protecting the townscape and historic environment</b>  |   |   |
| <b>Criteria</b>   | <b>Performance</b>  | <b>Comments / Links to Sustainability Objectives</b>  |
| Would allocation impact upon a historic park/garden?  | R = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such areas with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation<br>A = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such areas with potential for negative impacts capable of   | <i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 8. Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings.</i><br><br><i>Cambridge SA topic:</i>                |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | appropriate mitigation<br>G = Site does not contain or adjoin such areas, and there is no impact to the setting of such areas   | <i>Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</i>  |
| Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?                                   | R = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such an area with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation<br>A = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such an area with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation<br>G = Site does not contain or adjoin such an area, and there is no impact to the setting of such an area | <i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 8. Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings.</i><br><br><i>Cambridge SA topic: Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</i>                |
| Would development impact upon buildings of local interest (Cambridge only)           | A = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such buildings with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation<br>G = Site does not contain or adjoin such buildings, and there is no impact to the setting of such buildings   | <i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 8. Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings.</i><br><br><i>Cambridge SA topic: Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</i>                |
| Would development impact upon archaeology?   | A = Known archaeology on site or in vicinity<br>G=No known archaeology on site or in vicinity   | <i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 8. Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings.</i><br><br><i>Cambridge SA topic: Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</i>                |
| <b>Making Efficient Use of Land</b>  |   |  |
| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Performance</b>  | <b>Comments / Links to Sustainability Objectives</b>   |
| Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land? | R = Significant loss (20 ha or more) of grades 1 and 2 land<br>A = Minor loss of grade 1 and 2 land<br>G = Neutral. Development would not affect grade 1 and 2 land.  | <i>Maps produced by DEFRA identify that most of South Cambridgeshire's farmland is in the higher grades of the Agricultural Land Grades 1, 2 and 3a are the grades which comprise the best and most versatile land which is a national resource. The</i> |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  |   | <p>DEFRA maps do not divide zone 3 into a and b. The focus of the appraisal will be on grade 1 and 2. Loss of 20 hectares or more would be considered significant, reflecting the threshold used for referring planning applications to DEFRA.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 1. Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, economic mineral reserves, and productive agricultural holdings and the degradation / loss of soils</p> <p>Cambridge SA topic: Communities and Well Being</p> |
| Would development make use of previously developed land (PDL)?   | <p>R = No<br/>A = Partly<br/>G = Yes</p>  | <p>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 1. Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, economic mineral reserves, and productive agricultural holdings and the degradation / loss of soils</p> <p>Cambridge SA topic: Communities and Well Being</p>  |
| <b>Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Performance</b>  | <b>Comments / Links to Sustainability Objectives</b>  |
| Would development impact upon a locally designated wildlife site i.e. (Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site) | <p>R = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site and impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation<br/>A = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation<br/>G = Does not contain, is not adjacent to or local area will be developed as greenspace</p> | <p>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 5. Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species</p> <p>Cambridge SA topic: Biodiversity and green infrastructure</p>   |
| Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?   | <p>R = Development involves a loss of existing green infrastructure which is incapable of appropriate mitigation.<br/>A = No significant opportunities or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate</p>  | <p>Only larger sites are likely to be able to deliver significant green infrastructure. Note that potential for additional sports pitches and open space are addressed by a separate category.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire</p>  |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | mitigation<br>G = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure   | <i>Sustainability Objective: 6. Improve opportunities for people to access and appreciate wildlife and green spaces</i><br><br><i>Cambridge SA topic: Biodiversity and green infrastructure</i>  |
| Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?) | R = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links incapable of appropriate mitigation<br>A = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation<br>G = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links | <i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 5. Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species</i><br><br><i>Cambridge SA topic: Biodiversity and green infrastructure</i>   |
| Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?   | R = Development likely to have a significant adverse impact on the protected trees incapable of appropriate mitigation<br>A = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation<br>G = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees   | <i>South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objective: 5. Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species</i><br><br><i>Cambridge SA topics:</i><br><i>- Biodiversity and green infrastructure</i><br><i>- Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage</i> |
| <b>Any other information not captured above?</b>  |  |  |

| <b>Level 3</b>   |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Availability and Deliverability</b>   |  |  |
| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Performance</b>                                       | <b>Comments / Links to Sustainability Objectives</b> |
| Are there any known legal issues/covenants that could constrain development of the site?     | R = Yes<br>G = No  |  |
| Is the site part of a larger site and could it prejudice development of any strategic sites? | R = Yes major impact<br>A = Some impact<br>G = No impact |  |
| Is the site available for this type of development?  | R = Yes<br>A = Unknown<br>G = No                         |  |
| Is the site viable for this type of development?   | R = Yes<br>A = Unknown<br>G = No                         |  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Timeframe for bringing the site forward for development? | R = Beyond 2031<br>G = Start of construction between 2017 and 2031<br>GG = Start of construction between 2011 and 2016 | Cambridge United have a 50 year lease on their current ground, but have a desire to move soon. This is reflected in the scoring. |
|--|--|--|

| <b>Conclusions</b>  |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Level 1 Conclusion</b> (after allowing scope for mitigation) | R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts<br>A = Some constraints or adverse impacts<br>G = Minor constraints or adverse impacts                                       |  |
| <b>Level 2 Conclusion</b> (after allowing scope for mitigation) | R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts<br>A = Some constraints or adverse impacts<br>G = Minor constraints or adverse impacts                                       |  |
| <b>Level 3 Conclusion</b>                                       | R = Significant constraints or adverse impacts<br>A = Some constraints or adverse impacts<br>G = Minor constraints or adverse impacts                                       |  |
| <b>Overall Conclusion</b>                                       | R = Site with significant constraints and adverse impacts<br>A = Site with some constraints or adverse impacts<br>G = Site with few or minor constraints or adverse impacts |  |

## Links between Joint Community Stadium Pro forma and Cambridge Sustainability Appraisal Topics

| Cambridge Sustainability Appraisal Topics |  | Joint Community Stadium Testing Criteria   |
|---|--|--|
| 1   | Communities and well being                     | <p>Is the site allocated or safeguarded in the Minerals and Waste LDF?</p> <p>Would development lead to a loss of community facilities?</p> <p>Could it form part of an existing or new community?</p> <p>Would development result in the loss of protected open space?</p> <p>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 (OS) provision?</p> <p>Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?</p> <p>Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?</p> <p>Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</p> <p>Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</p> <p>Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?</p> <p>Is there possible contamination on the site?</p> <p>Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?</p> <p>Would development make use of previously developed land (PDL)?</p> |
| 2   | Economy  | <p>Would development result in the loss of employment land identified in the Employment Land Review?</p>   |
| 3   | Transport                                      | <p>Is there a suitable access to the site?</p> <p>Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the local highway capacity?</p> <p>Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the strategic road network capacity?</p> <p>What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site?</p> <p>How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?</p> <p>What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?</p> <p>Would development reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable transport choices?</p>   |
| 4   | Water  | <p>Would development be within a source protection zone?</p>   |
| 5   | Flood risk including climate change adaptation | <p>Is site within a flood zone?</p> <p>Is site at risk from surface water flooding?</p>  |
| 6   | Climate change mitigation and renewable energy | <p>N/A</p> <p>No specific opportunities for renewable energy have been identified at this stage.</p>   |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| 7 | Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage | <p>What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes, and other matters important to the special character of Cambridge and setting?</p> <p>Would development maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?</p> <p>Would development maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character?</p> <p>Would development impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?</p> <p>Would development impact upon Listed Buildings?</p> <p>Would development result in the loss of protected open space?</p> <p>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 (OS) provision?</p> <p>Would allocation impact upon a historic park/garden?</p> <p>Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?</p> <p>Would development impact upon buildings of local interest?</p> <p>Would development impact upon archaeology?</p> <p>Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?</p> |
| 8 | Biodiversity and green infrastructure      | <p>Would development impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and European Designated sites?</p> <p>Would development result in the loss of protected open space?</p> <p>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 (OS) provision?</p> <p>Would development impact upon a locally designated wildlife site i.e. (Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site)</p> <p>Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?</p> <p>Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)</p> <p>Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?</p>  |



## Links between Joint Community Stadium Pro forma and South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

| South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives |   | Joint Community Stadium Testing Criteria  |
|--|---|---|
| 1  | Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, economic mineral reserves, and productive agricultural holdings and the degradation / loss of soils | Is the site allocated or safeguarded in the Minerals and Waste LDF?<br>Would development lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?<br>Would development make use of previously developed land (PDL)?   |
| 2  | Minimise waste production and support the reuse and recycling of waste products   | N/A dependent on type and design of development not location.   |
| 3  | Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution   | Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14?<br>Would the development of the site result in an adverse impact/worsening of air quality?<br>Are there potential noise and vibration problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?<br>Are there potential light pollution problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?<br>Are there potential odour problems if the site is developed, as a receptor or generator?<br>Is there possible contamination on the site?<br>Would development be within a source protection zone?<br>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. |
| 4  | Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species  | Would development impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)?<br>Would development impact upon a locally designated wildlife site i.e. (Local Nature Reserve, County Wildlife Site, City Wildlife Site)   |
| 5  | Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species   | Would development reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?)<br>Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?  |
| 6  | Improve opportunities for people to access and appreciate wildlife and wild places  | Does the site offer opportunity for green infrastructure delivery?  |
| 7  | Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character   | What effect would the development of this site have on Green Belt purposes, and other matters important to the special character of Cambridge and setting?<br>Would development maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?<br>Would development maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character?  |
| 8  | Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings.   | Would development impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?<br>Would development impact upon Listed Buildings?<br>Would allocation impact upon a historic park/garden?<br>Would development impact upon a Conservation Area?<br>Would development impact upon archaeology?  |
| 9  | Create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look good   | N/A<br>Dependent on type and design of development not  |

|    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
|    |  | location.<br><br>Also considered in ability to form part of a community criteria.  |
| 10 | Minimise impacts on climate change (including greenhouse gas emissions)  | N/A<br><br>No specific opportunities for renewable energy have been identified at this stage.<br><br>Impacts on air quality, and sustainable transport addressed separately.   |
| 11 | Reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects  | Is site within a flood zone?<br>Is site at risk from surface water flooding?   |
| 12 | Maintain and enhance human health  | N/A<br><br>To avoid repetition this indicator will not be applied at a site comparison level. There are a range of other indicators relate to human health, including environmental issues (air quality and other forms of pollution), access to services and facilities, safe transport access and opportunities to use alternative transport modes, access to open space and Green Infrastructure.   |
| 13 | Reduce and prevent crime and reduce fear of crime  | N/A<br>Impacted by a range of factors, including in particular transport arrangements.   |
| 14 | Improve the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space.  | Would development result in the loss of land protected by Cambridge Local Plan (CLP) policy 4/2 or South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9?<br>If the site is protected open space, would the loss or replacement of the open space be consistent with CLP Local Plan policy 4/2 Protection of Open Space or with South Cambridgeshire Development Control policy SF/9?<br>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 (OS) provision? |
| 15 | Ensure everyone has access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing   | N/A Housing options have been tested separately.   |
| 16 | Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities) | What position does the site fall within the settlement hierarchy?  |
| 17 | Redress inequalities related to age, disability, gender assignment race, faith, location and income  | N/A<br>Primarily a matter of site design. Location addressed by accessibility criteria.  |
| 18 | Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities  | Would development lead to a loss of community facilities?<br>Could it form part of an existing or new community?   |
| 19 | Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy.   | Would development result in the loss of employment land identified in the Employment Land Review?  |
| 20 | Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence                                     | N/A<br>Addressed by accessibility criteria.  |

|    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 21 | Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and other infrastructure                                  | N/A<br>Not dependant on site location A community stadium proposal could include education elements. Larger sites could have potential to include more facilities but impact uncertain at this stage.   |
| 22 | Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices.  | What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site?<br>How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station?<br>What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?<br>Would development reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable transport choices?                               |
| 23 | Secure appropriate investment and development in transport infrastructure, and ensure the safety of the transport network. | Is the site located within the Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone (PSZ) or Safeguarding Zone?<br>Is there a suitable access to the site?<br>Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the local highway capacity?<br>Would allocation of the site have a significant impact on the strategic road network capacity? |