

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

29TH MAY 2013

PRE-COMMITTEE AMENDMENT SHEET

1. Meeting of Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group – 22 May 2013

Since dispatch of the papers for Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee, the Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group met on 22 May 2013 to discuss the development strategy approach for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and the approach to sub-regional sporting, cultural and community facilities. For matters set out in A and B below, the Joint Strategic Transport and Spatial Planning Group (JST&SPG) agreed to advise both councils as follows:

A: The development strategy approach for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire

- [1] That the responses to the joint consultations were noted;
- [2] That the memorandum of co-operation approach (Appendix B to the report to JST&SPG) agreed jointly by the councils in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, confirming objectively assessed needs and their spatial distribution was noted and supported as the basis for plan making in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire;
- [3] That the sustainable development strategy sequence set out in section 2 of the report, and the sustainability appraisal (Appendix D to the report to JST&SPG) was noted; and this overall approach is recommended to both councils as the basis for their plan making;
- [4] Other than for the exceptional case made on need for release of six small sites from the Cambridge Green Belt (GB 1-6) as set out in section 10 of the report, the inner boundary of the Cambridge Green Belt to remain as currently designated and no further changes be recommended to both councils as the basis for their plan making;
- [5] That the councils be recommended the following as the basis for plan making in respect of land at the Cambridge East joint fringe site:
 - (i) Cambridge Airport remain out of the Green Belt and be designated as strategic long term reserve land;
 - (ii) Land North of Newmarket Road and two sites north of Cherry Hinton be made available for development in the period to 2031, using the Cambridge East Area Action Plan as their main planning framework and confirmed by a policy in the new Local Plans.

[6] That the suggested approach to Cambridge Northern Fringe East involving the preparation of an Action Area Plan to guide the development of the wider area be recommended to the councils as the basis for plan making.

B: Sub-Regional Sporting, Cultural and Community Facilities:

[1] As far as community stadia proposals are concerned, the JST&SPG notes the outcomes of the issues and options consultation;

[2] As far as a community stadium is concerned the evidence of need (as opposed to strong desire) for a community stadium on one of the submitted sites has not been satisfactorily demonstrated and the recommendation to the councils for plan making is not to proceed to allocate a site;

[3] The exceptional circumstances case for release of land for a community stadium from the Cambridge Green Belt has not been demonstrated; and the recommendation to the councils for plan making is not to proceed to allocate a site in the Green Belt;

[4] That the response to the councils' joint Issues and Options consultations in relation to other facilities is noted and both councils should be asked to develop specific criteria based policies to deal with sub-regional cultural and community facilities (such as a concert hall and ice rink) should such proposals be put forward in future.

2. Joint Sustainability Appraisal of the Development Strategy approach for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire

As a part of producing the development strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, a joint Sustainability Appraisal was undertaken and was presented at JST&SPG on 22 May 2013. This is attached to this document as Appendix 1 'The sustainability implications of focusing development at different spatial locations' and Appendix 2 'Site Package Options for Sustainability Appraisal.'

Since dispatch of the papers for Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee, the following amendments have also been identified:

3. Supporting text on language schools

Following the completion of a recent Section 106 agreement for Gibson House (11/1442/FUL) and discussions with officers from City Development Management and Legal Services, it is considered that the following sentences should be inserted into the supporting text to replace paragraph 5.5 of the draft Local Plan:

“Language schools can place additional burdens on the housing market. This policy seeks to ensure that when specialist schools seek to grow, those burdens are mitigated.

The applicant will need to demonstrate how many additional students will be generated by the proposal. This will allow the council to judge the residential, social and amenity impact generated. The council will be flexible in considering any robust method of calculating the additional number of students arising from any proposal, and will consider a range of mechanisms to agree an upper limit to the number of additional students. The range of mechanisms considered may include, but not be limited to, controlling the hours of operation, the number of desk spaces and the number of students. This will ensure that a proposal will generate a specific level of growth that can be measured and mitigated. Student accommodation is dealt with under policy 46 in Section Six.”

4. Site numbers

It has been noted that the Issues and Option 2: Part 2 consultation document (Appendix 1 on other sites considered) made reference to site numbers which duplicate some of the site numbers used in the draft Local Plan. It is proposed that the final site numbers within the draft Local Plan and on the policies map will be amended for public consultation, in order to minimise confusion.

5. Amendment to Policy 54: Residential Moorings

Reference should be made to Site RM1 (Residential moorings allocation at Fen Road) within the draft policy on residential moorings. This would amend the policy to read:

Proposals for residential moorings will be permitted, where the proposal:

- a. integrates successfully and positively with the surrounding landscape and/or townscape;
- b. is served by adequate pedestrian and vehicular access;
- c. is served by appropriate electricity, sewerage and refuse disposal facilities;
- d. has no significant negative effect on the amenity, visual character, water quality, historic and ecological value of the river or nearby land;
- e. is close to existing services and amenities;
- f. only provides minimal essential lighting, which shall be located so as to minimise glare and/or visual intrusion; and
- g. does not impede navigation and/or the use of the footpath.

Site RM1 at Fen Road is allocated for off-river residential moorings within the proposals schedule set out in Appendix B and as shown on the policies map.

An additional sentence should be inserted into the supporting text at paragraph 6.46 after the first sentence to read “If developed together with the adjacent allocation for residential moorings within South Cambridgeshire District Council’s administrative boundary, Site RM1 at Fen Road could provide off-river moorings for residential and leisure boating purposes.”

6. Inclusion of Site U3 Grange Farm, off Wilberforce Road

The existing allocation site 7.09 (also known as site U3 in the Issues and Options 2 consultation) at Grange Farm, off Wilberforce Road, was not carried forward in the Issues and Options 2 consultation earlier this year, due to access and flood risk issues. New information has come to light which indicates that there may be opportunities to mitigate the access and flood risk issues. Accordingly, the site named U3 Grange Farm, off Wilberforce Road should be included within the proposals schedule of the draft Local Plan (Appendix B) and on the policies map. A map of the site is shown on page 5 of this document. The site will appear in the proposals schedule as shown on page 6 of this document.



Proposal Site U3 - Grange Farm, Wilberforce Road

(c) Crown copyright and database right 2013. Ordnance Survey Licence No. 100019730.

Date:	24 May 2013
Produced by:	GIS Team
Section/Department:	Information Systems, Environment Dept
Scale:	1:2,500 @ A4

Additional site for inclusion in the Proposals Schedule

Site	Address	Area (ha)	Existing Uses	Capacity¹	Provisional Issues Identified²	Planning Status³
Residential						
U3	Grange Farm, off Wilberforce Road	1.22	Uncultivated land and a tennis court	120 student units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Surface water flood risk would require careful mitigation; ○ Access arrangements would require careful mitigation. 	○ Local Plan allocation 7.09

¹ Approximate number based on initial assessment - final number may be greater or smaller depending on detailed assessment and detailed design

² Policies in the whole Plan must be considered in the development of the sites. However, there are a number of items for each new site that an applicant should be particularly aware of and should consider early when preparing detailed planning proposals. It should not be regarded as an exhaustive list; it is purely intended to be helpful in order to highlight known issues.

³ Summary of the status of the site where planning process has progressed, i.e. relationship to 2006 Local Plan, if it has outline planning, is under construction or has a pending planning application.

7. Recommendations from the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of Draft Cambridge Local Plan 2014

The following pages 8 - 23 show the recommendations from the initial Sustainability Appraisal of the draft Cambridge Local Plan 2014. The table shows officers' responses to the recommendations of the initial Sustainability Appraisal and sets out a limited number of proposed changes to the draft Cambridge Local Plan 2014. The final Sustainability Appraisal will reflect these changes. This iterative step represents a constructive part of the Sustainability Appraisal process.

Recommendations from the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of Draft Cambridge Local Plan 2014

Sustainability Topic	Policy	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation	Officer Response	Action
Climate Change Mitigation and renewable energy	Policies in Section Four: Responding to Climate Change and Managing Resources	Work closely with applicants to ensure that design features, mitigation and infrastructure is implemented as fully as possible, given viability constraints.	This is a matter to be addressed through the use of the policy in the consideration of planning applications.	No change proposed.
Economy		Ensure that new employment areas have strong transport links to Kings Hedges and Abbey Ward areas so that residents of these income and employment deprived areas can take advantage of new employment opportunities elsewhere in the city. It is notable that no policy is directed specifically at addressing problems of deprivation in these areas, albeit it is recognised that Cambridge is a compact city and hence wherever employment is located it will be relatively easy to	Policies in Section 8 seek to ensure that new developments appropriately link to public transport, cycling and walking routes.	No change proposed.

Sustainability Topic	Policy	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation	Officer Response	Action
		access by public transport or bicycle.		
Flood risk Including climate change adaptation		No recommendations made.	N/A	N/A
Landscape, Townscape and Cultural Heritage		No recommendations made.	N/A	N/A
Transport	Policy 81 (Mitigating the Transport Impact of Development)	The policy could be strengthened and reworded to make it clearer what type of infrastructure the financial contributions would be used for. This policy would better support the transport objectives if these contributions were to be directed towards sustainable transport infrastructure.	The City Council in collaboration with the County Council is encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport. Additional text is proposed in the policy.	Propose additional wording to criterion (c) of Policy 81 so that the second sentence reads: 'This could include investment in infrastructure, services or behavioural change measures to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport.'
Transport	Policy 56 (Creating	The policy could be reworded to emphasise the need for proposals to be	Policy 80 - Supporting sustainable access to development, addresses	No change proposed.

Sustainability Topic	Policy	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation	Officer Response	Action
	Successful Places)	accessible by sustainable modes of transport such as through the inclusion of foot / cycle paths and public transport.	the need for development to prioritise access by sustainable modes.	
Biodiversity		Encourage additional focus on prioritising brownfield development.	<p>The prioritisation of sites is dealt with in the Spatial Strategy of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Local Plan needs to avoid repeating the policies in the NPPF, which outlines how Green Belt land should be protected.</p>	No change proposed.
Biodiversity	Policy 8 (Setting of the City)	Increased consideration of the role that new or existing green space can play as part of the wider ecological network of the city, including as green infrastructure (promoting the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy).	Policy 8 already states that development on the urban edge will only be supported where it enhances biodiversity and particular reference is made to supporting proposals for landscape scale enhancement and the conservation or enhancement of biodiversity.	No change proposed.

Sustainability Topic	Policy	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation	Officer Response	Action
			Other policies in the Plan also seek to enhance biodiversity and linkages in the ecological network (Policies 67, 69 and 70). Also, Policy 7 looks at the enhancement of natural resources and renaturalisation of the River Cam.	
Biodiversity	Policy 35 (Protection of Human Health from Noise and Vibration)	Highlight the need to consider the impacts of noise on wildlife in addition to human health.	Policies 69 and 70 seek to protect both sites of local nature conservation importance and priority species and habitats from the impacts of development, including disturbance.	No change proposed.
Biodiversity	Policy 52 (Protecting Garden Land and the Subdivision of Existing Dwelling)	Encourage consideration of the wildlife value of gardens.	Agree that the policy could be strengthened by referring to the wildlife value of gardens.	Propose change criterion (b) of Policy 52 to read: 'sufficient garden space and space around existing dwellings is retained, especially where these

Sustainability Topic	Policy	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation	Officer Response	Action
	Plots)			spaces and any trees are worthy of retention due to their contribution to the character of the area and their biodiversity importance.
Biodiversity	Policy 67 (Protection of Open Space)	Ensure that replacement green space is positioned with reference to the City's wider green infrastructure network in order to maximise benefits.	Change suggested to the supporting text to Policy 67.	Propose the inclusion of an additional sentence at the end of paragraph 7.45: 'Where replacement facilities are provided, consideration should be given to how they link with the wider ecological network and enhance biodiversity.'
Water	Policy 27 (Carbon Reduction, Community Energy)	Strengthen the call for increased water efficiency in new development by removing the conditions relating to technical and economic viability.	The flexibility in the policy is required to reflect the fact that each individual planning application will need to be	No change proposed.

Sustainability Topic	Policy	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation	Officer Response	Action
	Networks, Sustainable Design and Construction and Water Use)		assessed on its own merits.	
Water	Policy 32 (Flood Risk)	Encourage flood risk management in new development to take into account the role SuDS can play in reducing the pollution of watercourses.	An intrinsic benefit of SuDS is their role in reducing pollution of watercourses. Policy 31 seeks to ensure all surface water that is discharged to ground or into rivers, watercourses and sewers has an appropriate level of treatment to reduce the risk of diffuse pollution. Therefore, it is not felt necessary to repeat this in Policy 32.	No change proposed.
Community and Wellbeing	Policy 9 (The City Centre)	Policy could perhaps go further in terms of explicitly requiring that development proposals in the City Centre take into account and reflect identified needs associated with the local community.	Policy 10 which deals with development in the City Centre Primary Shopping Area talks about the use of the upper floors of units for residential, student accommodation, offices and	No change proposed.

Sustainability Topic	Policy	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation	Officer Response	Action
			community facilities, which will be of benefit for the local community and potentially increase the residential community in the City Centre.	
Community and Wellbeing	Policy 73 (Community and Leisure Facilities)	Include criteria setting out conditions that would apply should development result in the loss of educational and healthcare facilities.	<p>The 'Loss of facilities' section in Policy 73 is applicable to community facilities which includes educational facilities and healthcare facilities. It also clearly states that the redevelopment of school sites for other uses will be permitted only if it can be demonstrated that they are not required in the longer term for continued educational use.</p> <p>Appendix K explains what information an applicant needs to provide to demonstrate that a community facility (including education facilities and healthcare) is no longer needed. For example,</p>	No change proposed.

Sustainability Topic	Policy	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation	Officer Response	Action
			a healthcare facility will need to be marketed as a healthcare facility and other community facilities.	
Community and Wellbeing	Policy 29 (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation)	Broaden considerations of the impact of renewable and low-carbon energy generation to include all forms of energy infrastructure.	The focus of this policy is on increasing the proportion of energy generated from renewable and low carbon sources. Other policies in the Plan deal with minimising the impact of development on the environment, for example the policies dealing with design, flood risk, light pollution, protection of human health from noise and vibration and air quality.	No change proposed.
Community and Wellbeing	Policy 83 (Aviation Development)	Make explicit the need to consider the potential health impacts of aviation development at Cambridge Airport.	It is proposed that the policy will be amended to include the following sentence "A health impact assessment will be submitted alongside any planning application to demonstrate that the potential impacts on health have been	Propose the policy is amended to include the following sentence: 'A health impact assessment will be submitted alongside any

Sustainability Topic	Policy	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation	Officer Response	Action
			considered at the planning and design stage.”	planning application to demonstrate that the potential impacts on health have been considered at the planning and design stage.’
City Centre	Policy 6 (Hierarchy of Centres and Retail Capacity)	The supporting text for Policy 6 could be strengthened to explain how monitoring of retail and leisure capacity will be managed in the period beyond 2022.	At paragraph 2.67, the supporting text to Policy 6 talks about the advice in the Retail and Leisure Study to plan to accommodate retail capacity to 2021 due to the uncertainty in forecasting. The paragraph talks about monitoring, but this could be explained further.	Propose additional text to the end of paragraph 2.6, so that it reads: ‘This will be subject to monitoring over the plan period, including the monitoring of retail developments in the wider area, which will inform when a review of the Retail and Leisure Study should be carried out.’
City Centre	Section 3	Provide details on how the economic impacts of site allocations that result in the loss of employment space will be	The economic impacts of site allocations that result in the loss of employment space are considered through the overall assessment of	No change proposed.

Sustainability Topic	Policy	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation	Officer Response	Action
		identified and addressed.	employment land needs versus supply.	
City Centre	Section 3	Make explicit the need to create a safer and improved environment for cyclists in a number of the centre's Opportunity Areas.	Policy 80: Supporting Sustainable Access to Development applies city-wide in respect of sustainable modes of travel such as cycling which needs to be considered alongside any Opportunity Area policies. This requires the prioritisation of cycling in areas to be improved e.g. Opportunity Areas.	No change proposed.
City Centre	Section 3	Call of development proposals in a number of the centre's Opportunity Areas to promote and prioritise the use of sustainable forms of transport.	Policy 80: Supporting Sustainable Access applies city-wide in respect of sustainable modes of transport which needs to be considered alongside any Opportunity Area policies. This requires the prioritisation of sustainable modes of travel in respect of proposal sites. Many proposals sites can be found in and around Opportunity	No change proposed.

Sustainability Topic	Policy	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation	Officer Response	Action
			Areas.	
City Centre	Policy 27 (Carbon Reduction, Community Energy Networks, Sustainable Design and Construction and Water Use)	Ensure that 'major' development in the Strategic Heating area is defined and that conditions are only relaxed where there is a 'significant' impact on viability.	<p>Major development is defined in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) (England) Order (2010) as 10 or more dwellings or a site area of 0.5 ha or more where the number of dwellings is unknown, or the provision of a building where the floorspace is 1,000 sq m or more, or where development is carried out on a site having an area of 1 hectare or more. This will be included within the glossary to the Plan.</p> <p>The inclusion of 'significant' does not add anything further to the policy, as each development will be looked at on a case by case basis and it would be difficult to define 'significant'.</p>	Propose inclusion of the definition of 'major development' in the glossary.

Sustainability Topic	Policy	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation	Officer Response	Action
North Cambridge		Ensure that open space infrastructure spending from development in the North Cambridge area goes towards quality improvements in areas of deficiency; particularly Arbury.	Policy 67 and paragraph 7.45 make reference to the need to maintain the level of open space provision in the general area surrounding the development. Where it is identified that there is a surplus of provision, Policy 67 requires re-provision of open space to be redirected to areas experiencing deficiencies, such as Arbury.	No change proposed.
North Cambridge	Policy 85 (Infrastructure Delivery, Planning Obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy)	Prioritise remodelling the High Street in the Chesterton and Ferry Lane Conservation Areas as an infrastructure scheme in Policy 85 in order to reduce heavy traffic and restore the historic character of the areas.	Policy 85 does not set out detailed infrastructure schemes. The update to the Infrastructure Delivery Study will set out a list of schemes, including transport infrastructure, and prioritise these for funding.	No change proposed.
South Cambridge		No recommendations made.	N/A	N/A

Sustainability Topic	Policy	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation	Officer Response	Action
East Cambridge		Ensure that transport links and the new multi-modal transport interchange at the rail station allow new employment opportunities surrounding the train station to be accessed by deprived areas in Abbey Ward.	Policy 14 (Northern Fringe East and land surrounding the proposed Cambridge Science Park Station Area of Major Change) ensures that appropriate access and linkages are planned for.	No change proposed.
West Cambridge	Policy 18 (West Cambridge Area of Major Change)	Ensure that peripheral employment sites incorporate social spaces.	This is covered by criterion (h) in Policy 13 (Areas of Major Change and Opportunity Areas – General Principles) - <i>‘create active and vibrant places which encourage social interaction and meeting, and foster a sense of community’</i> . . This policy relates to all Areas of Major Change including West Cambridge.	No change proposed.
West Cambridge	Policy 18 (West Cambridge Area of Major Change)	Make explicit the need for the provision of publically accessible green space and biodiversity protection in the West Cambridge Area of Major Change.	Green Infrastructure rather than publically accessible green space is an omission in the policy and is made all the more important given the proposed higher density of development. Therefore recommend this is covered	Propose add in new criterion (i) to Policy 18 which states: ‘proposals provide appropriate green infrastructure which is

Sustainability Topic	Policy	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation	Officer Response	Action
			<p>through the incorporation of an additional criterion 'i' in Policy 18.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to require 'publically accessible' as West Cambridge is private, albeit other people are permitted to use it.</p> <p>The supporting text refers to the importance of biodiversity in Para 3.71, and this is reinforced by other policies which cover biodiversity in the draft Local Plan and which apply to West Cambridge including Policy 8: Setting of the City, Policy 31: Integrated water management and the water cycle, Policy 57: Designing New Buildings, Policy 59: Designing Landscape and the Public Realm. The new criteria (i) also covers biodiversity in the Local Plan definition of green</p>	<p>well integrated with the existing and new development and with the surrounding area.'</p>

Sustainability Topic	Policy	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation	Officer Response	Action
			infrastructure.	
West Cambridge	Policy 19 (NIAB 1 Area of Major Change)	Call for a comprehensive transport strategy to be produced alongside development proposals in the NIAB 1 Area of Major Change.	<p>This is an omission for the Policy which should be covered. Whilst current negotiations are quite advanced it is possible that new proposals could be submitted in the future and it would be appropriate to include an additional criterion in Policy 19 with similar wording to Policy 18:</p> <p><i>'it includes a comprehensive transport strategy for the site, incorporating a sustainable transport plan to minimise reliance on the private car.'</i></p> <p>The last sentence in Policy 18 <i>'This should include assessing the level, form and type of car parking that exists on the site.'</i> has been removed because there is no</p>	Propose a new criterion 'h' as follows and then renumber the following criteria in the policy: 'it includes a comprehensive transport strategy for the site, incorporating a sustainable transport plan to minimise reliance on the private car'

Sustainability Topic	Policy	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation	Officer Response	Action
			existing car parking.	
West Cambridge	Policy 19 (NIAB 1 Area of Major Change)	Ensure that development proposals in the NIAB 1 Area of Major Change take into account the area's noise pollution and footpath related constraints.	<p>The key constraints of noise pollution and footpaths crossing the site are referred to in Paragraph 3.76 of Policy 19.</p> <p>Noise Pollution is also covered in Policy 35: Protection of Human Health from Noise and Vibration which specifically refers to major sites and noise sensitive development, and refers to the need for noise assessments and noise mitigation measures.</p> <p>The existing footpaths are not covered in other policies and therefore an additional criterion is proposed.</p>	<p>Propose a new criterion as follows between the existing criteria (i) and (j), and then renumber the following criteria in the policy:</p> <p>'where possible retain and enhance existing definitive footpaths that cross the site or provide suitable and safe equivalent links of a similar length as part of the new development'</p>

APPENDIX 1

The sustainability implications of focusing development at different spatial locations

The following builds on the assessment of South Cambridgeshire Issues and Options 2012 Issue 9: Development Strategy, which considered the broad implications of focusing development at different locations in the development sequence. It additionally includes a comparison with development within the Cambridge urban area to cover the whole of the development sequence. It has also been reviewed by Environ, who are completed the Final Sustainability Appraisal of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan.

The appraisal is structured around the South Cambridgeshire sustainability objectives, established through the South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. The linkages to the Cambridge City Sustainability Appraisal Framework and its Objectives have been considered, and the relationship between the sustainability objectives is detailed at the end of this note.

	1. Land	2. Waste	3. Air quality and environmental pollution	4. Designated sites and protected species	5. Habitats and species	6. Access to wildlife and green spaces	7. Landscape and townscape character	8. Historic Environment	9. Good Spaces	10. Climate Change Mitigation	11. Climate Change Adaptation	12. Human health	13. Crime	14. Public Openspace	15. Housing	16. Inequalities	17. Services and Facilities	18. Involvement	19. Economy	20. Access to Work	21. Infrastructure	22. Sustainable Travel	23. Transport infrastructure
Cambridge Urban Area	+++	~	?	~	?	~	+	~	~	~	~	?	~	~	~	~	+++	~	~	+++	+++	+++	+++
Edge of Cambridge	-	~	?	?	?	+++	--	-	~	~	~	?	~	~	~	~	+ / +++	~	~	+++	+++	+++	+++
New settlements	+	~	~	?	?	+++	--- / ?	~	~	+++ / ?	~	~	~	~	~	~	+ / +++	~	~	+++ / ?	+++	+ / ++	+++
More sustainable villages	-	~	~	?	?	+	- / ?	~	~	~	-	~	~	~	~	~	+	~	~	+	+	-	-
Smaller less sustainable villages	-	~	~	?	?	+	- / ?	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	--	~	~	--	-	--	--

ASSESSMENT KEY

Symbol	Likely effect against the SA Objective
+++	Potentially significant beneficial impact, option supports the objective
+	Option supports this objective although it may have only a minor beneficial impact
~	Option has no impact or effect is neutral insofar as the benefits and drawbacks appear equal and neither is considered significant
?	Uncertain or insufficient information on which to determine the assessment at this stage
-	Option appears to conflict with the objective and may result in adverse impacts
---	Potentially significant adverse impact, conflict with the objective

This assessment considers the range of broad strategies / options available for growth. This is a high level appraisal of strategic options and actual impacts on many objectives would depend on the specific site options identified for development, and therefore these are more appropriately explored elsewhere.

Cambridge

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

Edge of Cambridge

An edge of Cambridge focus would involve Green Belt development, and loss of significant amounts of high grade agricultural land. The review of the Green Belt identified that it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development on the edge of Cambridge without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. These purposes highlight the importance to the historic City of Cambridge of the quality of its setting as well as the usual role of Green Belts in preventing communities from merging with one another. The recent review of the Green Belt released large areas of less significance to Green Belt purposes, and the land that remains on the inner edge becomes increasingly important.

Development on the edge of Cambridge would be the next closest development option to the urban area of the city, supporting access opportunities by alternative modes, although access to public transport services is better close to radial routes with good services, and some areas around the City currently have more limited access to high quality public transport. Larger developments could include their own local centres, and be accessed by new public transport routes.

Development on the edge of Cambridge could bring dwellings closer to the M11 or A14, areas of relatively poor air quality (with an AQMA on the A14). Major development has the potential to worsen air quality, although it would support greater use of non-car modes than more distributed patterns of development. Development near to busy routes would still add to congestion at peak times.

Green Infrastructure opportunities would vary by site, but larger scale development could support delivery of significant green infrastructure. A number of larger site proposals specifically reference the potential to deliver significant open space or Green Infrastructure beyond the minimum required by policy.

New Settlements

A focus on new settlements could utilise previously developed land opportunities, such as former airfields or military barracks, although they would also be likely to still utilise significant areas of greenfield land. New settlements could incorporate significant public transport routes to Cambridge, and new town and local centres as appropriate, to ensure that residents have convenient access to local services and facilities by walking, cycling and public transport. They have the potential to enable focussed investment in public transport and cycling infrastructure, delivering high quality services to provide a significantly higher modal share of travel by non-car modes than village based growth options. The greater distance from Cambridge would mean higher levels of car use (although significantly better than dispersed villages based strategies), and it would result in focused pressure on specific routes. This could have local air quality implications.

New settlements could be developed with a mix of uses with employment delivering jobs locally and their own services and facilities of higher order than smaller scale growth at existing villages. This could provide a degree of self-containment, by providing opportunities to live and work in the same place, however, the greatest concentration of jobs will remain in and close to Cambridge.

The scale and mixed use nature of new settlements offer specific opportunities for renewable energy based upon potential for combined heat and power.

Impact on landscape would depend on the site, but the scale of a new settlement means that impacts could be significant. Some sites were tested with more limited wider landscape impacts. Located outside the green belt they would have a lesser impact on townscape, and the setting of Cambridge. Sites tested were all outside the Green Belt. New settlements could provide opportunity to deliver significant green infrastructure.

Key to Sustainability Objectives

Further information on the objectives can be found in the individual districts sustainability appraisal scoping reports.

South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Objectives		Cambridge City Sustainability Objectives
LAND	1. Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, economic mineral reserves, productive agricultural holdings, and the degradation / loss of soils	1. Communities and Wellbeing
	2. Minimise waste production and support the reuse and recycling of waste products	
POLLUTION	3. Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution	4. Water 1. Communities and Wellbeing
BIODIVERSITY	4. Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	8. Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure
	5. Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	
	6. Improve opportunities for people to access and appreciate wildlife and green spaces	
LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE	7. Maintain and enhance the diversity and local distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character	7. Landscape, Townscape and Cultural Heritage
	8. Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings.	
	9. Create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look good	
CLIMATE CHANGE	10. Minimise impacts on climate change (including greenhouse gas emissions)	6. Climate change mitigation and renewable energy
	11. Reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects	5. Flood risk including climate change adaptation

More Sustainable Villages

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

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

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

Other Villages

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

HEALTH	12. Maintain and enhance human health	1. Communities and Wellbeing	
	13. Reduce and prevent crime and reduce fear of crime		
	14. Improve the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space.		
HOUSING	15. Ensure everyone has access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing		
INCLUSIVE COMMUNITIES	16. Redress inequalities related to age, disability, gender, race, faith, location and income		
	17. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities)		
	18. Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities		
ECONOMIC ACTIVITY	19. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy.		2. Economy
	20. Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence		
	21. Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and other infrastructure		
TRANSPORT	22. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices.	3. Transport.	
	23. Secure appropriate investment and development in transport infrastructure, and ensure the safety of the transport network.		

Appendix 2 Site Package Options for Sustainability Appraisal

In order to compare the sustainability of delivering the remaining housing needs for South Cambridgeshire at different locations, packages of sites have been identified and tested, to compare the cumulative impacts.

Eight different packages were identified, each with a different focus for the remaining development. It would not be reasonable to test every potential combination of options, but the aim has been to providing a good coverage of strategic alternatives that could be delivered with the site options available taking account of the issue and options and initial sustainability appraisal process.

Where new settlements have been considered, the deliverability and potentially longer lead in times have been taken into account. The phasing relative to other options has also been considered, in order to achieve the development needed in the plan period. In some cases different amounts of a site being developed in the plan period have been considered, with the remainder being developed later.

Further details of this assessment will be included in the South Cambridgeshire Final Sustainability Report, which will accompany the draft Local Plan.

Option 1 - Waterbeach New Town, Cambourne West and Village Focus

This option includes provision from the partial completion by 2031 of a new town at Waterbeach, with the remainder after 2031, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne and development at a range of villages down to the 'Better Served Group Village' level.

Option 2 - Bourn Airfield New Settlement and Village Focus

This option includes the completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield within the plan period, and limited development in Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centre villages to meet the remaining requirement.

Option 3 - Cambourne and Village Focus

This option is a village focused approach. It includes completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne, with the remainder of new development focused on other villages. At Waterbeach, there would be no new settlement, but the redevelopment of the barracks themselves would accommodate around 900 dwellings.

Option 4 - Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement, and Cambourne West Focus

This option includes provision from the partial completion by 2031 of a new town at Waterbeach, the partial completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne. This would be supported by selected development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.

Option 5 - Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement and Village Focus

This option includes provision from the partial completion by 2031 of a new town at Waterbeach, the partial completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield (but more than Option 4 assumes), and development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.

Comparing with Green Belt strategies

As detailed earlier, the assessment of 41 individual potential site options highlighted the potential harm to the Green Belt and the setting of the City of significant further development. Only 6 site options were identified, and all have been included within the proposed development strategy.

The sustainability appraisal earlier identified potential benefits on some sustainability objectives of further development in the Green Belt. In order to provide a comparison with other strategies, packages have been tested which include further development in the Green Belt, building on the assessments of tested but rejected sites. Testing has considered the overall impact of identifying the quantum of development in the broad locations available, rather than identifying specific rejected site options.

Option 6 - Cambridge Green Belt and Village Focus

This option assumes 2 or 3 large urban extensions to Cambridge on land currently in the Green Belt. This would accommodate around 4000 dwellings. This would be supported by selected village sites at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, with a focus on previously developed land.

Option 7 - Cambridge Green Belt, Waterbeach New Town, Cambourne West and Village Focus

This option assumes 1 or 2 large urban extensions to Cambridge on land currently in the Green Belt, accommodating around 2000 dwellings. The remaining development needs would be accommodated through the partial completion of a new town at Waterbeach, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne and limited development at villages.

Option 8 - Cambridge Green Belt, Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement, Cambourne West and Village Focus

This option assumes delivery of smaller sites on land currently in the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge, provision from the partial completion of a new town at Waterbeach, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne and selected development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.

Table 1 Development Packages for Sustainability Appraisal

Options by Development Sequence (South Cambs only)	Existing Supply	Opt 1		Opt 2		Opt 3		Opt 4 (was 9)	
		Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites Only	Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites	Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites	Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites
Cambridge urban area	309	309	0	309	0	309	0	309	0
Cambridge fringe sites	3,902	4,002	100	4,002	100	4,002	100	4,002	100
New settlement(s)	5,965	7,365	1,400	9,465	3,500	5,965	0	8,835	2,870
Rural Centres	1,779	4,314	2,535	2,444	665	4,314	2,535	3,969	2,190
Minor Rural Centres	1,082	2,182	1,100	1,597	515	3,477	2,395	1,287	205
Group Villages	846	846	0	846	0	846	0	846	0
Infill Villages	147	147	0	147	0	147	0	147	0
TOTAL	14,029	19,164	5,135	18,809	4,780	19,059	5,030	19,394	5,365

Options by Development Sequence (South Cambs only)	Existing Supply	Opt 5		Opt 6		Opt 7		Opt 8	
		Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites	Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites	Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites	Existing Supply & New Sites	New Sites
Cambridge urban area	309	309	0	309	0	309	0	309	0
Cambridge fringe sites	3,902	4,002	100	8,002	4,100	6,002	2,100	5,032	1,130
New settlement(s)	5,965	9,665	3,700	5,965	0	7,365	1,400	7,865	1,900
Rural Centres	1,779	2,444	665	1,999	220	3,479	1,700	3,499	1,720
Minor Rural Centres	1,082	1,422	340	1,422	340	1,082	0	1,597	515
Group Villages	846	846	0	846	0	846	0	846	0
Infill Villages	147	147	0	147	0	147	0	147	0
TOTAL	14,029	18,834	4,805	18,689	4,660	19,229	5,200	19,294	5,265

Each package of sites has been tested utilising the Sustainability Objectives developed through the South Cambridgeshire Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, by consultants Environ.