

Intended for

Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

Date

November 2015


Project Number

UK15-22172

CAMBRIDGE AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLANS SA ADDENDUM REPORT ANNEX 2

SA ADDENDUM REPORT ANNEX 2

Project No. **UK15-22172**
Issue No. **1**
Date **18/11/2015**
Made by **Emma Jones**
Checked by **Bram Miller**
Approved by **Matt Royall**
Description **Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans SA
Addendum Report Annex 2**

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Made by: |  |
| Checked/Approved by: |  |

This report has been prepared by Ramboll Environ with all reasonable skill, care and diligence, and taking account of the Services and the Terms agreed between Ramboll Environ and the Client. This report is confidential to the Client, and Ramboll Environ accepts no responsibility whatsoever to third parties to whom this report, or any part thereof, is made known, unless formally agreed by Ramboll Environ beforehand. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk.

Ramboll Environ disclaims any responsibility to the Client and others in respect of any matters outside the agreed scope of the Services.

Version Control Log

| Revision | Date | Made by | Checked by | Approved by | Description |
|----------|------------|---------|------------|-------------|---|
| 1 | 18/11/2015 | EJ | BAM | MR | Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans SA Addendum Report Annex 2 |

Ramboll Environ
8 The Wharf
Bridge Street
Birmingham
B1 2JS
United Kingdom
T +44 121 616 2180
www.ramboll-environ.com

CONTENTS

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| 1. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 | This Report | 1 |
| 2. | THE PLAN | 2 |
| 3. | SA METHODOLOGY | 4 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 4 |
| 3.2 | Stage C: Preparing the SA Addendum Report | 5 |
| 3.3 | Stage D: Consulting on the SA | 5 |
| 3.4 | Difficulties encountered | 5 |
| 4. | THE IDENTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES | 6 |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 6 |
| 4.2 | Process of identifying possible alternatives for the Abingtons | 6 |
| 4.3 | Process of identifying possible alternatives for Graveley | 8 |
| 5. | RESULTS OF THE SA | 11 |
| 5.1 | Introduction | 11 |
| 5.2 | Local Plan Policy new section to H/1 on Allocations for Residential Development at Villages | 12 |
| 5.3 | Site assessments | 15 |
| 5.4 | Housing Allocations at Villages | 64 |
| 5.5 | Cumulative assessment | 86 |
| 6. | MONITORING STRATEGY | 90 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 3.1: Key to the appraisal scoring table | 4 |
| Table 4.1: Reasonable Alternative Sites and Local Plan Policy Allocations | 7 |
| Table 4.2: Reasons for Selection and Rejection of alternative options | 8 |
| Table 4.3: Reasonable Alternative Sites and Local Plan Policy Allocations | 9 |
| Table 4.4: Reasons for Selection and Rejection of alternative options | 9 |
| Table 5.1: Key to the appraisal scoring table | 11 |
| Table 5.2: Results of the SA of Local Plan Policy H/1 new section on Allocations for Residential Development at Villages | 12 |
| Table 5.3: Site level assessment - Land at Linton Road, Great Abington (Policy H/1:i) | 16 |
| Table 5.4: Site level assessment - Land at High Street / Pampisford Road, Great Abington (Policy H/1:j) | 25 |
| Table 5.5: Site level assessment - Land at Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington (Policy H/1:k) | 34 |
| Table 5.6: Site level assessment - Land at Toseland Road, Graveley (Policy H/1:l) | 43 |
| Table 5.7: Site level assessment - Land at Manor Farm, Graveley | 55 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 5.8: Site allocation policies assessment summary..... | 64 |
| Table 5.9: Site allocation policies assessment commentary | 65 |
| Table 5.10: Potential cumulative sustainability effects | 87 |

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Report

This document is an Addendum to Part 3: of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report for the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan to take into account the proposed modifications to the Proposed Submission Local Plan. It should be read in conjunction with the following documents:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan – SA Report - Part 1: Introduction, setting the context for the SA, providing an outline of the contents and main objectives of the plan and identifying where the requirements of the SEA Regulations¹ have been met in the SA Report; and
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan – SA Report - Part 2: Scoping Report setting out the scope of the SA, baseline data, the sustainability objectives and targets of relevant other documents, key sustainability issues and the assessment framework to be used to assess the Local Plan.
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan – SA Report - Part 3: Results of the SA and Proposed Monitoring Strategy.

This SA Addendum documents the SA of a new policy under Chapter 7 Delivering High Quality Homes on Parish Council Led Allocations for Residential Development, and four site specific allocations made under this policy. The need for the Addendum has arisen as a result of joint work undertaken by the Parish Councils of Great Abington Parish and Little Abington Parish (the Abingtons) through the Housing Committee for the Abingtons, and a consultation undertaken by Graveley Parish Council. These Parish Councils wish to provide for their locally identified housing needs. These changes are the only changes requiring further SA work following a screening of the Schedule of Proposed Major Modifications to the Proposed Submission Local Plan and the Schedule of Proposed Minor Modifications to the Proposed Submission Local Plan which was undertaken by the Council and reviewed by ENVIRON.

The methodology of the site assessment and policy assessments follows that described in section 2 of Part 3 of the SA Report.

¹ Statutory Instrument 2004 No. 1633 The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004

2. THE PLAN

This section describes the additions to the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan which are being subject to assessment. It includes a new section to policy H/1, and four site specific allocations under that policy, for residential development. For information on the objectives and content of the Local Plan refer to Part 1 of the SA Report.

Policy H/1: Parish Council Led Allocations for Residential Development in Villages

The Parish Council led village residential development sites in policy H/1 have been proposed by Parish Councils to meet local aspirations for growth and as an alternative to their preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan. These have been included in the plan as an exception to the sustainable spatial strategy for the district set out in policy S/6 as local support has been demonstrated through local village consultations. Developers should work closely with the relevant Parish Council, and seek to fulfil the aspirations of the Parish Council for the site.

H/1:i Land at Linton Road, Great Abington

Area (ha.) and indicative dwelling capacity:

4.11 ha. 35 dwellings

Development requirements:

- Retention of the allotments
- Retention of boundary trees and hedges except as required to provide for access.
- Creation of a community orchard on the south of the site to provide a soft green edge.
- This is a Parish Council led proposal which has been included in the Local Plan because it has demonstrated local support. Developments should seek to fulfil the aspirations of the Parish Council for the site.

H/1:j Land at High Street / Pampisford Road, Great Abington

Area (ha.) and indicative dwelling capacity:

0.55 ha. 12 dwellings

Development requirements:

- Retention of boundary trees and hedges except as required to provide for access.
- Creation of a landscape buffer along the boundary of the site where it adjoins or could be seen from open countryside to provide a soft green village edge.
- This is a Parish Council led proposal which has been included in the Local Plan because it has demonstrated local support. Developments should seek to fulfil the aspirations of the Parish Council for the site.

H/1: k Land at Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington

Area (ha.) and indicative dwelling capacity:

0.42 ha. 6 dwellings

Development requirements:

- Enhancement of the Conservation Area with a high quality development of cottages suitable for 'downsizers' with generous room sizes.
- Retention of the flint boundary wall either as a boundary wall or as part of built development and except as required to provide for access.
- Creation of a landscape buffer along the rear of the site to provide a soft green village edge.

- This is a Parish Council led proposal which has been included in the Local Plan because it has demonstrated local support. Developments should seek to fulfil the aspirations of the Parish Council for the site.

H/1: I Land at Toseland Road, Graveley

0.4 ha. 6 dwellings

Development requirements:

- Consider if there could be impacts on residential amenity from the Cotton Wind Farm and design to mitigate as appropriate.
- Retention of mature trees and hedgerows and creation of a landscape buffer along the rear of the site to provide a soft green development edge.
- This is a Parish Council led proposal which has been included in the Local Plan because it has demonstrated local support. Developments should seek to fulfil the aspirations of the Parish Council for the site including a contribution to benefit the wider village community.

3. SA METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This SA Addendum Report used the SA Framework set out in section 2 of Part 3: Results of the SA and Proposed Monitoring Strategy as the methodology so as to ensure consistency in the assessment.

3.1.1 Sites Assessment

To assist in making the assessment of sites quantifiable, measurable and transparent, and for direct comparison between sites to be made, the Site Assessment Matrix developed through the scoping process (Table 9.3 in Part 2: Scoping Report) was used. This matrix indicates how the impact of the individual sites against each objective has been determined. For a number of objectives, quantifiable grading was identified to provide a means by which the relative sustainability of each site can be established in comparison with other sites. This framework was also used in the site package options assessment.

To ensure consistency in the assessment of sites with those already undertaken during the SA process, these site assessments were also carried out by officers of the South Cambridgeshire District Council using the same methodology as that used for all the identified reasonable alternatives sites.

3.1.2 Site Specific Policies Assessment

This documents the appraisal of the site specific policies for the four Parish led village housing allocations and the appraisal results are recorded in two tables:

1. An appraisal scoring table has been used to record the scores for the policies against the SA objectives. The key outlined below has been used to guide this appraisal. Where policies are found to have a neutral impact the assessment is taken no further, unless specific assumptions are made which need to be explained.
2. An appraisal commentary table, for those policies found to have a positive, negative or uncertain impact a fuller commentary is given. This assessment table also includes details of suggested mitigation and enhancement measures, where appropriate.

The key in Table 1.1 below sets out the scoring system used to appraise all the policies within this Addendum. It is the same as that used to assess the Draft Submission Local Plan.

Table 3.1: Key to the appraisal scoring table

| Table 1.1 Key to the appraisal scoring table | |
|---|--|
| Symbol | Likely effect against the SA objective |
| +++ | Potentially significant beneficial impact |
| + | Policy support this objective although it may have only a minor beneficial impact |
| ~ | Policy 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/base the assessment at this stage |
| - | Policy appears to conflict with the objective and may result in adverse impacts |
| --- | Potentially significant adverse impact |

To ensure consistency in the assessment of sites specific policies with those already undertaken during the SA process, these were carried out by ENVIRON Ltd using the same methodology as that used for all the site specific policy allocations in the Local Plan.

3.2 Stage C: Preparing the SA Addendum Report

This document is an SA Addendum Report for the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. It describes the significant effects on the environment, social and economic factors of the additional Policy H/1 and the village allocation policies H/1:i, H/1:j, H/1:k and H/1:l.

3.3 Stage D: Consulting on the SA

The sites were consulted upon as part of the main SA on the Local Plan. The Committee for Abington Housing undertook consultation on the three alternative site allocations with every household in the community at the beginning of November 2013. Graveley Parish Council consulted local people through a public meeting on Thursday 23rd January 2014 to discuss the proposals and through a leafleted consultation between January and 16th February 2014 about whether the two identified sites allocations should or should not be allocated for housing development.

3.4 Difficulties encountered

The purpose of SA is to assess the likelihood of sustainability effects. SA relies on expert judgement, which is guided by knowledge of the likely impacts of the plan, the available baseline data and responses and information provided by consultees and other stakeholders. The assessment was carried out and reported using an expert judgment-led qualitative assessment. A precautionary approach was taken, especially with qualitative judgments.

4. THE IDENTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES

4.1 Introduction

The SEA regulations require that the significant environmental effects of the plan and its reasonable alternatives are identified and described. Additionally, at post-adoption the decision-makers are required to explain “the reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt” (SEA Regulations, Regulation 16(4)).

This means that the SA process should set out the reasonable alternative options (both for the overall strategy and for sites) that were considered by the Council, what the sustainability effects of those reasonable alternative options were, and how these effects have been taken into account in the selection of the final approach.

This section is divided into two parts to document the approach to alternatives for the Parish-led allocations in the Abingtons and in Graveley. Section 4.2 documents the alternatives for the Abingtons and section 4.3 documents the alternatives for Graveley.

4.2 Process of identifying possible alternatives for the Abingtons

The purpose of this stage is to identify and test a range of reasonable alternatives and in doing so, identify their sustainability effects.

Sites were identified through the South Cambridgeshire District Council’s ‘call for sites’ for the Strategic Housing Land Allocation Assessment (SHLAA). This plan-wide process identified sites in the Parishes of Great and Little Abington². Site options were identified and their site-specific SAs underwent a number of stages of public consultation as part of the Local Plan consultation.

In 2011, Great Abington Parish Council and Little Abington Parish Council carried out a joint housing needs survey. This identified the extent of local housing need, in particular for smaller units, both market and affordable housing, for first time buyers and those wishing to downsize.

The identification of potential alternative sites for Great Abington and Little Abington Parishes was undertaken by the Committee for Abington Housing set up by the Great Abington Parish Council and Little Abington Parish Council. As part of its work the Committee identified possible sites to meet the local need identified in the housing needs survey.

4.2.1 Selecting reasonable alternatives for assessment for the Abingtons

Some of the identified sites in the Abingtons, which were previously identified in the ‘call for sites’ and the SHLAA, were rejected by South Cambridgeshire District Council on the grounds that they were in the flood plain and impacts could not be successfully mitigated. Three sites were identified as reasonable options for residential development. These sites were not considered to be large enough for strategic allocations, as the scale of development proposed by the Parish Council’s is smaller than that for strategic sites. Three sites were selected, from a long list which included all the SHLAA sites, as reasonable alternatives for the Abingtons.

The table below sets out the reasonable alternative sites to be dealt with in the assessment and their Local Plan policy allocations.

² See South Cambridge District Council, *South Cambridgeshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Report* (August 2013), in Appendix 7i Assessment of 2011 ‘Call for Sites’ SHLAA Sites

Table 4.1: Reasonable Alternative Sites and Local Plan Policy Allocations

| Table: 4.1 Reasonable Alternative Sites and Local Plan Policy Allocations | | | |
|--|-----------------------|---|---|
| | SHLAA Site No. | SHLAA site address | Local Plan policy |
| | 027 (part) | Land east of Great Abington, fronting Linton Road | H/1:i Land at Linton Road, Great Abington |
| | 028 | Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington | H/1:k Land at Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington |
| | 211 | Land at Pampisford Road / High Street, Great Abington | H/1:j Land at High Street / Pampisford Road, Great Abington |

All of these selected sites have been previously considered through the SHLAA process. The Little Abington site (SHLAA site 028) is for the same site area as identified in the SHLAA, whereas the two sites in Great Abington (SHLAA sites 027 and 211) are much smaller than previously proposed. For all of the sites, the SHLAA concluded that they were not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints including landscape impacts, heritage impacts (for the Bancroft Farm site 028 in Little Abington), and kennel noise for the Linton Road site 027 in Great Abington. Note that the Bancroft Farm site is currently designated as a Protected Village Amenity Area in adopted plans and proposed for designation as Local Green Space in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

The alternative allocation options considered by the Parish Councils were to:

3. Option 1 - Allocate no sites;
4. Option 2 - Allocate one site (within the development framework);
5. Option 3 – Proceed with the two sites as exception sites; or
6. Option 4 - Allocate all three sites;

4.2.2 Consultation on the reasonable alternative sites for the Abingtons

As an alternative to taking forward a Neighbourhood Plan the Abington Parish Councils consulted local people and key stakeholders by leaflet between October and December 2013 about whether the sites should or should not be allocated for housing development. 189 completed leaflets were returned as follows:

- Linton Road site (35 homes) – 72% support for development;
- High Street/Pampisford Road site (12 homes) – 76% support for development; and
- Bancroft Farm site in Little Abington (6 homes) – 86% support for development.

4.2.3 Decision by Great Abington and Little Abington Parish Council's

The table below sets out in brief the reasoning for the selection and rejection of site options by the Great Abington and Little Abington Parish Council's.

Table 4.2: Reasons for Selection and Rejection of alternative options

| Table: 4.2 Reasons for Selection and Rejection of alternative options | | |
|--|----------------------------|--|
| Option | Selected / Rejected | Reasoning |
| Option 1 - Allocate no sites | Rejected | Allocating no sites would lead to the identified local housing needs not being met. |
| Option 2 - Allocate one site (within the village development framework) | Rejected | Whilst one of these three sites is within the village framework (SHLAA site 028 in Church Lane, Little Abington) the other two are just outside. The site within the framework is the smallest of the three, the most sensitive and on its own would not meet the identified need. |
| Option 3 - Allocate a combination of sites | Rejected | Proceeding with the two sites outside the village development framework as exception sites with mainly affordable housing and minimal market housing would also result in the Parish's identified housing needs not meeting the identified need. Some social housing is needed but there is also a need for smaller, well designed, market housing particularly for those who want to downsize but stay within the community. The Parish also needs properties to enable younger residents to get onto the housing ladder. |
| Option 4 - Allocate all three sites | Selected | This option enables the locally identified housing needs to be met. Therefore the Parish Councils wishes to see all three allocated sites taken forward. |

4.2.4 Decision by South Cambridgeshire District Council to include the allocations in the Local Plan for the Abingtons

In the light of the Parish Councils' wish to proceed with the option to progress all the reasonable alternative sites in order to meet locally identified housing needs, South Cambridgeshire District Council has decided to include all three allocations within the Local Plan as Parish-led residential housing allocation sites under Policy H/1. This is in line with the newly emerging Planning Practice Guidance ³ which encourages Local Planning Authorities to include sites which have been identified by local communities to meet local needs and which have demonstrable local community support.

4.3 Process of identifying possible alternatives for Graveley

The purpose of this stage is to identify and test a range of reasonable alternatives and in doing so, identify their sustainability effects.

The Parish Council wishes to meet local housing needs, primarily for market housing but also including some affordable homes for rent that would be available to the community. The developments would allow for some natural growth in the community and should allow households now living in family homes too large for their current needs to 'downsize' within the same village.

³ National planning practice guidance Beta version < <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/> > N.B. This planning practice guidance has not been finalised and does not replace current planning guidance, but English local planning authorities are advised by Government to take it into account in developing current local plans.

The identification of potential alternative sites for Graveley Parish was undertaken by the Parish Council. In terms of possible alternatives, the village is small, and reasonable options are limited. The Parish Council focused on brown field land opportunities and identified two reasonable alternative options for development.

4.3.1 Selecting reasonable alternatives for assessment for Graveley

Two sites were identified as reasonable options for residential development. These sites were not large enough for strategic allocations and had therefore not been identified in the SCDC's SHLAA. The table below sets out the reasonable alternative sites to be dealt with in the assessment and their Local Plan policy allocations, where relevant.

Table 4.3: Reasonable Alternative Sites and Local Plan Policy Allocations

| Table: 4.3 Reasonable Alternative Sites and Local Plan Policy Allocations | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | SHLAA Site No. | Site Name | Local Plan policy |
| | N/A | Toseland Road, Graveley | Land at Toseland Road, Graveley H/1:l |
| | NA/ | Manor Farm, High Street/Papworth Road Graveley | N/A |

The alternative allocation options considered by the Parish Council were to:

1. Option 1 - Allocate no sites;
2. Option 2 - Allocate Manor Farm, High Street/Papworth Road, Graveley;
3. Option 3 – Allocate Toseland Road, Graveley;
4. Option 4 - Allocate both sites.

4.3.2 Consultation on the reasonable alternative sites for Graveley

As an alternative to taking forward a Neighbourhood Plan the Parish Council consulted local people by leaflet between January and 16th February 2014 about whether the sites should or should not be allocated for housing development. 68 completed leaflets were returned as follows:

- Manor Farm site (12 homes and public green area) – 29% support for development; and
- Toseland Road site (6 homes) – 75% support for development.

4.3.3 Decision by Gravely Parish Council

The table below sets out in brief the reasoning for the selection and rejection of site options by the Great Abington and Little Abington Parish Council's.

Table 4.4: Reasons for Selection and Rejection of alternative options

| Table: 4.4 Reasons for Selection and Rejection of alternative options | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|
| Option | Selected / Rejected | Reasoning |
| Option 1 - Allocate no sites | Rejected | Allocating no sites would lead to none of the identified local housing needs not being met. |
| Option 2 - Allocate Manor Farm, High | Rejected | The consultation received a majority of objections to the development of this site, with only 29% support |

| Table: 4.4 Reasons for Selection and Rejection of alternative options | | |
|--|----------|--|
| Street/Papworth Road, Graveley; | | given. The Parish Council does not wish to proceed with an allocation which does not have demonstrable local community support. |
| Option 3 - Allocate Toseland Road, Graveley; | Selected | Proceeding with this site will allow the provision of some market and affordable housing within the Parish to meet some of the identified need. |
| Option 4 - Allocate both sites | Rejected | This option was rejected on the grounds that the development of the Manor Farm site received a majority of objections. As a consequence, this option does not have demonstrable local community support. |

4.3.4 Decision by South Cambridgeshire District Council to include the site allocation in the Local Plan for Graveley

In the light of the Parish Council's wish to proceed with single site option in order to meet locally identified housing needs, South Cambridgeshire District Council has decided to include the Toseland Road allocation within the Local Plan as a Parish-led residential housing allocation site under Policy H/1. This is in line with the new Planning Practice Guidance which encourages Local Planning Authorities to include sites which have been identified by local communities to meet local needs and which have demonstrable local community support.

5. RESULTS OF THE SA

5.1 Introduction

This section of the Addendum Report reports the SA of the:

- new section to Local Plan Policy H/1;
- site assessments for the identified alternatives for site allocations;
- four site specific policies.

The assessment uses the scoring system set out below to appraise the policies. Unless otherwise stated the effects are considered to be over the short, medium and long-term, and permanent.

Table 5.1: Key to the appraisal scoring table

| Table 5.1 Key to the appraisal scoring table | |
|---|--|
| Symbol | Likely effect against the SA objective |
| +++ | Potentially significant beneficial impact |
| + | Policy support this objective although it may have only a minor beneficial impact |
| ~ | Policy 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/base the assessment at this stage |
| - | Policy appears to conflict with the objective and may result in adverse impacts |
| --- | Potentially significant adverse impact |

5.2 Local Plan Policy new section to H/1 on Allocations for Residential Development at Villages

Table 5.2: Results of the SA of Local Plan Policy H/1 new section on Allocations for Residential Development at Villages

| Table 5.2 Results of the SA of Local Plan Policy H/1 new section on Allocations for Residential Development at Villages | | | | |
|--|--------------|---|--|----------------------|
| SA Obj | Score | Potential effect | Mitigation and enhancement | SCDC response |
| 1. Land / soil | ~ | Neutral impact (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) because it provides for the allocation of small local housing sites developed in accordance with Local Plan policies which seek to reduce the use of agricultural land and development in the green belt and which could sterilise minerals reserves. The impacts of site allocations are more appropriately assessed separately. | Mitigation measure: The supporting text could make reference to the potential for loss of agricultural land. | |
| 2. Waste | ~ | Neutral impact (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) because provides for small local housing allocation sites to be developed in accordance with Local Plan policies. | | |
| 3. Pollution | ~ | Neutral impact (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) because provides for small local housing allocation sites to developed in accordance with Local Plan policies. | | |
| 4. Prot. Sites | ~ | Neutral impact (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) because provides for small scale housing allocation sites to developed in accordance with Local Plan policies including those on Biodiversity which cover the approach to protected sites. | | |
| 5. Habitats | ~ | Neutral impact (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) because provides for small scale housing allocation sites to developed in accordance with Local Plan policies including those on Biodiversity which create requirement for existing important habitats to be retained. | | |

| Table 5.2 Results of the SA of Local Plan Policy H/1 new section on Allocations for Residential Development at Villages | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| 6. Green spaces | ~ | Neutral impact (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) does not itself provide for green spaces, although specific allocations made under this policy could include requirements for green space. | | |
| 7. Landscape | ~ | Neutral impact (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) because provides for small scale local housing allocation sites to developed in accordance with Local Plan policies. | | |
| 8. Heritage | ~ | Neutral impact (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) because provides for small scale local housing allocation sites to developed in accordance with Local Plan policies. | | |
| 9. Places | + | Minor beneficial impact (Policy H1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) because provides for small scale housing allocation sites to developed in accordance with Local Plan policies which require high quality design and may include public open spaces. | | |
| 10. Climate mitig. | ~ | Neutral impact (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) because provides for housing allocation sites to developed in accordance with Local Plan policies. | | |
| 11. Climate adapt. | ~ | Neutral impact (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) because provides for small scale local housing allocation sites to developed in accordance with Local Plan policies. | | |
| 12. Health | ~ | Neutral impact (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) because provides for small scale local housing allocation sites to developed in accordance with Local Plan policies. | | |
| 13. Crime | ~ | Neutral impact (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) because provides for small scale local | | |

| Table 5.2 Results of the SA of Local Plan Policy H/1 new section on Allocations for Residential Development at Villages | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | housing allocation sites to be developed in accordance with Local Plan policies. | | |
| 14. Open space | ~ | Neutral impact (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) does not itself provide for open space, although specific allocations made under this policy could include requirements for open space. | | |
| 15. Housing | + | Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) provides for small scale local housing allocation sites to be developed in accordance with Local Plan policies. | | |
| 16. Inequalities | + | Minor beneficial impacts (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) as the policy allows for development to meet locally identified needs and the aspirations of the Parish Council which include the provision of dwellings for 'downsizers'. | | |
| 17. Services | | Neutral impacts (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) as the policy does not require developments to make financial contributions to necessary infrastructure requirements. | | |
| 18. Community | + | Minor beneficial impacts (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) as the policy enables local community-led development site choices to be brought forward. The policy also requires that developers should work with the Parish Council and seek to meet the Parish Council's aspirations. | | |
| 19. Economy | ~ | Neutral impact (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) as the policy is unlikely to have discernable impacts on the local economy. | | |
| 20. Work | ~ | Neutral impact (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) as the policy does not provide for employment opportunities. | | |

| Table 5.2 Results of the SA of Local Plan Policy H/1 new section on Allocations for Residential Development at Villages | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| 21. Investment | ~ | Neutral impact (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) as the policy does not specifically require infrastructure improvements. | | |
| 22. Travel | ~ | Neutral impact (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) as the policy in itself will not reduce the need for travel. | | |
| 23. Trans. Infr. | | Neutral impacts (Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages) as it does not require developments to make financial contributions to necessary infrastructure requirements. | | |

5.3 Site assessments

These site assessments are undertaken on the attributes of the site only, they do not take into account the accompanying site based policy, (which is shown in brackets in the headings, where relevant). These site level assessments were completed by South Cambridgeshire District Council.

5.3.1 Land at Linton Road, Great Abington (Policy H/1:i)

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Site No. | Site 027 (part) |
| Address | Land east of Great Abington, fronting Linton Road |
| Location | Great Abington |
| Category of site | Group Village |
| Site area | 4.11ha (updated) |
| Updated | 28/1/2014 |

Table 5.3: Site level assessment - Land at Linton Road, Great Abington (Policy H/1:i)

| Table 5.3 Site level assessment - Land at Linton Road, Great Abington (Policy H/1:i) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| Land & Soil Resources | Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, economic mineral reserves, and productive agricultural holdings and the degradation / loss of soils | Will it use land that has been previously developed? | 0 | No previously developed land. |
| | | Will it use land efficiently? | | |
| | | Will it protect and enhance the best and most versatile agricultural land? | - | Minor loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2) – small site but all Grade 2. |
| | | Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves? Will it minimise the degradation/loss of soils due to new development'? | 0 | Site within an area designated in the Minerals and Waste LDF but development would not have a negative impact |
| | Minimise waste production and support the reuse and recycling of waste products | Will it encourage reduction in household waste, and increase waste recovery and recycling? | | |
| Air Quality and | Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate | Will it maintain or improve air quality? | 0 | Development unlikely to impact on air quality. Site lies in an area where air quality acceptable. |

| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
|--------------|--|---|--------------|---|
| | against sources of environmental pollution | Minimise, and where possible improve on, unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour and vibration? | - | Development compatible with neighbouring uses. Environmental Health has concerns about traffic noise from busy Linton Rd and from dog kennels nearby that can generate unpredictable noise. Some minor to moderate additional road traffic noise generation impact on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance. |
| | | Will it minimise, and where possible address, land contamination? | 0 | Development not on land likely to be contaminated. Previous agricultural use can be mitigated. |
| | | Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment? | 0 | Development unlikely to affect water quality. The site within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3 which does not rule out development but may influence land use or require pollution control measures. Assumptions for a neutral impact are that appropriate standards and pollution control measures will be achieved through the development process and will mitigate any impact on groundwater, |
| Biodiversity | Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species | Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest and geodiversity? | 0 | No impact on protected sites and species (or impacts could be mitigated). |
| | Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species | Will it reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan Targets)? | 0 | Assumptions for a neutral impact are that existing features that warrant retention can be retained or appropriate mitigation will be achieved through the development process. |

| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
|--|--|---|--------------|---|
| | Improve opportunities for people to access and appreciate wildlife and green spaces | Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery and access to green infrastructure? | 0 | Neutral impact (existing features retained, or appropriate mitigation possible). Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process. |
| Landscape, Townscape and Cultural Heritage | Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character | Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character? | - | Minor negative Impact (Development conflicts with landscape character, with minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation). Prominent site on this approach into the village and development would result in the loss of openness and the rural character of this area. Retention of boundary trees and hedges and creation of a community orchard would mitigate impacts. (Updated) |
| | | Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character? | 0 | Neutral impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local townscape character). Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process. |
| | Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings. | Will it protect or enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments)? | - | Minor negative Impact on historic Assets (incapable of satisfactory mitigation). Minor impact on the setting of a number of listed buildings and Conservation Area. Archaeological potential will require further information but it is likely appropriate mitigation can be achieved through the development process. (Updated) |

| Table 5.3 Site level assessment - Land at Linton Road, Great Abington (Policy H/1:i) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | Create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look good | Will it lead to developments built to a high standard of design and good place making that reflects local character? | | |
| Climate Change | Minimise impacts on climate change (including greenhouse gas emissions) | Will it support the use of renewable energy resources? | 0 | Standard requirements for renewables would apply. |
| | | Will it promote energy efficiency? | | |
| | | Will it minimise contributions to climate change through sustainable construction practices? | | |
| | Reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects | Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding, and incorporate sustainable drainage measures? | 0 | Flood Zone 1 and no drainage issues that cannot be appropriately addressed. |
| | | Will it minimise the likely impacts of climate change on the development through appropriate design? | | |

| Table 5.3 Site level assessment - Land at Linton Road, Great Abington (Policy H/1:i) | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------|--|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | | Will it use water in a sustainable manner, and enable and encourage high levels of water efficiency? | | |
| Health | Maintain and enhance human health | Will it promote good health, encourage healthy lifestyles, and reduce health inequalities? | | |
| | Reduce and prevent crime and reduce fear of crime | Will it reduce actual levels of crime, and will it reduce fear of crime? | | |
| Inclusive Communities - Housing | Improve the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space. | Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space? | 0 | Neutral impact (existing features retained or appropriate mitigation). |
| | Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing | Will it support the provision of a range of housing types and sizes, including affordable and key worker housing, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community? | | |
| | | Will it provide for housing for the ageing population? | | |

| Table 5.3 Site level assessment - Land at Linton Road, Great Abington (Policy H/1:i) | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | | Will it provide for the housing accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople? | 0 | No effect on pitch or plot provision. |
| Inclusive Communities - Redressing inequalities and involving the community | Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities) | Will it improve accessibility to key local services and facilities, including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs, sports facilities etc?) | - | Group Village |
| | | Sub-Indicator: Distance to centre | + | 316 m ACF to the village Post Office - location represents of central point in relation to other services and facilities. (Updated) |
| | | Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?) | 0 | No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development. |
| | | Will improve relations between people from different backgrounds or social groups? | | |
| | | Will it redress inequalities? | | |

| Table 5.3 Site level assessment - Land at Linton Road, Great Abington (Policy H/1:i) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | Redress inequalities related to age, disability, gender assignment race, faith, location and income | Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions, including 'hard to reach' groups? | | |
| | Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities | Will it encourage engagement with community activities? | 0 | No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development. |
| Economic Activity | Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy. | Will it support business development and enhance competitiveness, enabling provision of high-quality employment land in appropriate locations to meet the needs of businesses, and the workforce? | 0 | Development would have no effect on employment land or premises. |
| | | Will it promote the industries that thrive in the district – the key sectors such as research and development /high tech/ Cambridge university related particularly through the development and expansion of clusters? | | |

| Table 5.3 Site level assessment - Land at Linton Road, Great Abington (Policy H/1:i) | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|--|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | | Will it protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres? | 0 | Development would have no effect on vitality or viability of existing centres. The indicator is likely to apply particularly to sites which include retail, offices, or leisure uses. |
| | Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence | Will it encourage the rural economy and diversification, and support sustainable tourism? | | |
| | | Will it contribute to providing a range of employment opportunities, in accessible locations? | + | 20.98 minutes from site to nearest employment area with 2000+ employees. 3 employment areas with 2000+ employees that can be accessed in less than 30mins - 1.6km walk. |
| | Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and other infrastructure | Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including broadband? | + | Minor Utilities Infrastructure improvements required, but constraints can be addressed. There is insufficient spare mains water capacity within the distribution zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and will require mitigation. |
| | | Will it improve access to education and training, and support provision of skilled employees to the economy? | - | School capacity not sufficient, but significant issues can be adequately addressed |

| Table 5.3 Site level assessment - Land at Linton Road, Great Abington (Policy H/1:i) | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|--|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| Transport | Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices. (Updated) | Will it enable shorter journeys, improve modal choice and integration of transport modes to encourage or facilitate the use of modes such as walking, cycling and public transport? | + | Total score of 16 |
| | | Sub-indicator: Distance to bus stop / rail station | +++ | 319 m ACF from the centre of the site to the nearest bus stop. |
| | | Sub-indicator: Frequency of Public Transport | 0 | 30 minute service. |
| | | Sub-indicator: Typical Public Transport Journey Time to Cambridge City Centre or Market Town | + | 28 Minutes from Great Abington to Cambridge. |
| | | Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre or Market Town | 0 | 10.03 km ACF from the centre of the site to Saffron Walden Market. |
| | Secure appropriate investment and development in transport infrastructure, and ensure the safety of the transport network. | Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity? | --- | Insufficient capacity or access constraints that cannot be adequately mitigated. Highway Authority has concerns about accident record of the A1307 and therefore before the proposed scheme comes forward a detailed analysis of access points onto the A1307 and A11 will need to be completed. |
| | | Will it make the transport network safer for and promote use of non-motorised modes? | 0 | No impact |

5.3.2 Land at High Street / Pampisford Road, Great Abington (Policy H/1:j)

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Site No. | Site 211 (part) |
| Address | Land at Pampisford Road / High Street, Great Abington |
| Location | Great Abington |
| Category of site | Group Village |
| Site area | 0.55 ha (updated) |
| Updated | 28/1/2014 |

Table 5.4: Site level assessment - Land at High Street / Pampisford Road, Great Abington (Policy H/1:j)

| Table 5.4 Site level assessment - Land at High Street / Pampisford Road, Great Abington (Policy H/1:j) | | | | |
|--|---|--|-------|--|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| Land & Soil Resources | Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, economic mineral reserves, and productive agricultural holdings and the degradation / loss of soils | Will it use land that has been previously developed? | 0 | No previously developed land. |
| | | Will it use land efficiently? | | |
| | | Will it protect and enhance the best and most versatile agricultural land? | - | Minor loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2) – small site but all Grade 2. |
| | | Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves? Will it minimise the degradation/loss of soils due to new development'? | 0 | Site not within an area designated in the Minerals and Waste LDF . |

| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
|---|--|--|--------------|---|
| | Minimise waste production and support the reuse and recycling of waste products | Will it encourage reduction in household waste, and increase waste recovery and recycling? | | |
| Air Quality and Environmental Pollution | Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution | Will it maintain or improve air quality? | 0 | Development unlikely to impact on air quality. Site lies in an area where air quality acceptable. |
| | | Minimise, and where possible improve on, unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour and vibration? | - | Development compatible with neighbouring uses. Environmental Health has concerns about noise from nearby industrial uses. Some minor to moderate additional road traffic noise generation impact on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance. |
| | | Will it minimise, and where possible address, land contamination? | 0 | Development not on land likely to be contaminated. Previous agricultural use can be mitigated. |
| | | Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment? | 0 | Development unlikely to affect water quality. The site within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 2 which does not rule out development but may influence land use or require pollution control measures. Assumptions for a neutral impact are that appropriate standards and pollution control measures will be achieved through the development process and will mitigate any impact on groundwater, |
| Biodiversity | Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species | Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest and geodiversity? | 0 | No impact on protected sites and species (or impacts could be mitigated). |

| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
|--|--|---|--------------|---|
| | Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species | Will it reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan Targets)? | 0 | Assumptions for a neutral impact are that existing features that warrant retention can be retained or appropriate mitigation will be achieved through the development process. |
| | Improve opportunities for people to access and appreciate wildlife and green spaces | Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery and access to green infrastructure? | 0 | Neutral impact (existing features retained, or appropriate mitigation possible). Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process. |
| Landscape, Townscape and Cultural Heritage | Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character | Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character? | - | Minor negative Impact (Development conflicts with landscape character, with minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation). Prominent site on this approach into the village and development would result in the loss of openness and the rural character of this area. Retention of boundary trees and hedges would mitigate impacts. (Updated) |
| | (Updated)r | Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character? | 0 | Neutral impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local townscape character). Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process. |

| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
|----------------|---|---|--------------|---|
| | Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings. (Updated) | Will it protect or enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments)? | - | Minor negative Impact on historic Assets (incapable of satisfactory mitigation) . Minor adverse harm to listed buildings due to loss of farmland settings and backdrop to former farmstead and due to loss of visual link between adjacent farmsteads. Archaeological potential will require further information but it is likely appropriate mitigation can be achieved through the development process. |
| | Create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look good | Will it lead to developments built to a high standard of design and good place making that reflects local character? | | |
| Climate Change | Minimise impacts on climate change (including greenhouse gas emissions) | Will it support the use of renewable energy resources? | 0 | Standard requirements for renewables would apply. |
| | | Will it promote energy efficiency? | | |
| | | Will it minimise contributions to climate change through sustainable construction practices? | | |

| Table 5.4 Site level assessment - Land at High Street / Pampisford Road, Great Abington (Policy H/1:j) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | Reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects | Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding, and incorporate sustainable drainage measures? | 0 | Flood Zone 1 and no drainage issues that cannot be appropriately addressed. |
| | | Will it minimise the likely impacts of climate change on the development through appropriate design? | | |
| | | Will it use water in a sustainable manner, and enable and encourage high levels of water efficiency? | | |
| Health | Maintain and enhance human health | Will it promote good health, encourage healthy lifestyles, and reduce health inequalities? | | |
| | Reduce and prevent crime and reduce fear of crime | Will it reduce actual levels of crime, and will it reduce fear of crime? | | |
| Inclusive Communities - Housing | Improve the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space. | Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space? | 0 | Neutral impact (existing features retained or appropriate mitigation). |

| Table 5.4 Site level assessment - Land at High Street / Pampisford Road, Great Abington (Policy H/1:j) | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing | Will it support the provision of a range of housing types and sizes, including affordable and key worker housing, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community? | | |
| | | Will it provide for housing for the ageing population? | | |
| | | Will it provide for the housing accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople? | 0 | No effect on pitch or plot provision. |
| Inclusive Communities - Redressing inequalities and involving the community | Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities) | Will it improve accessibility to key local services and facilities, including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs, sports facilities etc?) | - | Group Village |
| | | Sub-Indicator: Distance to centre | 0 | 661 m ACF to the village Post Office - location represents of central point in relation to other services and facilities. (Updated) |
| | | Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?) | 0 | No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development. |

| Table 5.4 Site level assessment - Land at High Street / Pampisford Road, Great Abington (Policy H/1:j) | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | | Will improve relations between people from different backgrounds or social groups? | | |
| | Redress inequalities related to age, disability, gender assignment race, faith, location and income | Will it redress inequalities? | | |
| | | Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions, including 'hard to reach' groups? | | |
| | Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities | Will it encourage engagement with community activities? | 0 | No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development. |
| Economic Activity | Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy. | Will it support business development and enhance competitiveness, enabling provision of high-quality employment land in appropriate locations to meet the needs of businesses, and the workforce? | 0 | Development would have no effect on employment land or premises. |

| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
|--------------|---|--|--------------|--|
| | | Will it promote the industries that thrive in the district – the key sectors such as research and development /high tech/ Cambridge university related particularly through the development and expansion of clusters? | | |
| | | Will it protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres? | 0 | Development would have no effect on vitality or viability of existing centres. The indicator is likely to apply particularly to sites which include retail, offices, or leisure uses. |
| | Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence | Will it encourage the rural economy and diversification, and support sustainable tourism? | | |
| | | Will it contribute to providing a range of employment opportunities, in accessible locations? | + | 17.86 minutes from site to nearest employment area with 2000+ employees. 4 employment areas with 2000+ employees that can be accessed in less than 30mins - 1.6km walk. (Updated) |
| | Support appropriate investment in people, places, | Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including broadband? | + | Minor Utilities Infrastructure improvements required, but constraints can be addressed. There is insufficient spare mains water capacity within the distribution zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and will require mitigation. |

| Table 5.4 Site level assessment - Land at High Street / Pampisford Road, Great Abington (Policy H/1:j) | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------|--|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | communications and other infrastructure | Will it improve access to education and training, and support provision of skilled employees to the economy? | - | School capacity not sufficient, but significant issues can be adequately addressed |
| Transport | Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices. (Updated) | Will it enable shorter journeys, improve modal choice and integration of transport modes to encourage or facilitate the use of modes such as walking, cycling and public transport? | + | Total score of 17 |
| | | Sub-indicator: Distance to bus stop / rail station | +++ | 99 m ACF from the centre of the site to the nearest bus stop. |
| | | Sub-indicator: Frequency of Public Transport | 0 | 30 minute service. |
| | | Sub-indicator: Typical Public Transport Journey Time to Cambridge City Centre or Market Town | + | 29 Minutes from Great Abington to Cambridge. |
| | | Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre or Market Town | 0 | 9.69 km ACF from the centre of the site to Saffron Walden Market. |
| | Secure appropriate investment and development in transport | Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity? | --- | Insufficient capacity or access constraints that cannot be adequately mitigated. Highway Authority has concerns about accident record of the A1307 and therefore before the proposed scheme comes forward a detailed analysis of access points onto the A1307 and A11 will need to be completed. |

| Table 5.4 Site level assessment - Land at High Street / Pampisford Road, Great Abington (Policy H/1:j) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|--------------|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | infrastructure, and ensure the safety of the transport network. | Will it make the transport network safer for and promote use of non-motorised modes? | 0 | No impact |

5.3.3 Land at Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington (Policy H/1:k)

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Site No. | Site 028 |
| Address | Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington |
| Location | Little Abington |
| Category of site | Group Village |
| Site area | 0.42 ha |
| Updated | 28/1/2014 |

Table 5.5: Site level assessment - Land at Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington (Policy H/1:k)

| Table 5.5 Site level assessment - Land at Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington (Policy H/1:k) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| Land & Soil Resources | Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, | Will it use land that has been previously developed? | + | Partly PDL, farmyard buildings. (Updated with corrected information) |
| | | Will it use land efficiently? | | |

| Table 5.5 Site level assessment - Land at Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington (Policy H/1:k) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|--|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | economic mineral reserves, and productive agricultural holdings and the degradation / loss of soils | Will it protect and enhance the best and most versatile agricultural land? | - | Minor loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2) – small site but all Grade 2. |
| | | Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves? | 0 | Site not within an area designated in the Minerals and Waste LDF |
| | | Will it minimise the degradation/loss of soils due to new development'? | | |
| | Minimise waste production and support the reuse and recycling of waste products | Will it encourage reduction in household waste, and increase waste recovery and recycling? | | |
| Air Quality and Environmental Pollution | Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution | Will it maintain or improve air quality? | 0 | Development unlikely to impact on air quality. Site lies in an area where air quality acceptable. |
| | | Minimise, and where possible improve on, unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour and vibration? | 0 | Development compatible with neighbouring uses. |
| | | Will it minimise, and where possible address, land contamination? | 0 | Development not on land likely to be contaminated. Previous agricultural use can be mitigated. |

| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
|--------------------------|--|---|--------------|---|
| Biodiversity | | Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment? | 0 | Development unlikely to affect water quality. The site within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3 which does not rule out development but may influence land use or require pollution control measures. Assumptions for a neutral impact are that appropriate standards and pollution control measures will be achieved through the development process and will mitigate any impact on groundwater, |
| | Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species | Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest and geodiversity? | 0 | No impact on protected sites and species (or impacts could be mitigated). |
| | Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species | Will it reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan Targets)? | 0 | Assumptions for a neutral impact are that existing features that warrant retention can be retained or appropriate mitigation will be achieved through the development process. |
| | Improve opportunities for people to access and appreciate wildlife and green spaces | Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery and access to green infrastructure? | 0 | Neutral impact (existing features retained, or appropriate mitigation possible). Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process. |
| Landscape, Townscape and | Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of | Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character? | --- | Significant Negative Impact (Development conflicts with landscape character, with significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation) - . Site has a distinctly rural character and would result in the loss of an open space within the village. |

| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
|----------------|--|---|--------------|---|
| | landscape and townscape character | Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character? | --- | Significant Negative Impact (Development conflicts with townscape character, with significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation) -Major adverse effect on Conservation Area due to potential loss of buildings and loss of rural context to Bancroft Farm. If the farm buildings were removed the setting of Church Lane would lose its intimate rural backdrop. |
| | Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings. | Will it protect or enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments)? | --- | Significant Negative Impact on historic Assets (incapable of satisfactory mitigation). Major impact on the setting of a number of listed buildings including the Parish Church of Little Abington and properties in Church Lane. Archaeological potential will require further information but it is likely appropriate mitigation can be achieved through the development process. |
| | Create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look good | Will it lead to developments built to a high standard of design and good place making that reflects local character? | | |
| Climate Change | Minimise impacts on climate change (including greenhouse gas emissions) | Will it support the use of renewable energy resources? | 0 | Standard requirements for renewables would apply. |
| | | Will it promote energy efficiency? | | |
| | | Will it minimise contributions to climate change through sustainable construction practices? | | |

| Table 5.5 Site level assessment - Land at Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington (Policy H/1:k) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | Reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects | Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding, and incorporate sustainable drainage measures? | 0 | Flood Zone 1 and no drainage issues that cannot be appropriately addressed. |
| | | Will it minimise the likely impacts of climate change on the development through appropriate design? | | |
| | | Will it use water in a sustainable manner, and enable and encourage high levels of water efficiency? | | |
| Health | Maintain and enhance human health | Will it promote good health, encourage healthy lifestyles, and reduce health inequalities? | | |
| | Reduce and prevent crime and reduce fear of crime | Will it reduce actual levels of crime, and will it reduce fear of crime? | | |
| Inclusive Communities - Housing | Improve the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space. | Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space? | 0 | Neutral impact (existing features retained or appropriate mitigation). |

| Table 5.5 Site level assessment - Land at Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington (Policy H/1:k) | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing | Will it support the provision of a range of housing types and sizes, including affordable and key worker housing, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community? | | |
| | | Will it provide for housing for the ageing population? | | |
| | | Will it provide for the housing accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople? | 0 | No effect on pitch or plot provision. |
| Inclusive Communities - Redressing inequalities and involving the community | Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities) | Will it improve accessibility to key local services and facilities, including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs, sports facilities etc?) | - | Group Village |
| | | Sub-Indicator: Distance to centre | +++ | 197m ACF from the centre of the site to Church Lane, central in relation to services and facilities within the village. |
| | | Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?) | 0 | No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development. |

| Table 5.5 Site level assessment - Land at Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington (Policy H/1:k) | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | | Will it improve relations between people from different backgrounds or social groups? | | |
| | Redress inequalities related to age, disability, gender assignment race, faith, location and income | Will it redress inequalities? | | |
| | | Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions, including 'hard to reach' groups? | | |
| | Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities | Will it encourage engagement with community activities? | 0 | No facilities lost, and no new facilities proposed directly as a result of the development. |
| Economic Activity | Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy. | Will it support business development and enhance competitiveness, enabling provision of high-quality employment land in appropriate locations to meet the needs of businesses, and the workforce? | 0 | Development would have no effect on employment land or premises. |

| Table 5.5 Site level assessment - Land at Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington (Policy H/1:k) | | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------|--|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | | Will it promote the industries that thrive in the district – the key sectors such as research and development /high tech/ Cambridge university related particularly through the development and expansion of clusters? | | |
| | | Will it protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres? | 0 | Development would have no effect on vitality or viability of existing centres. The indicator is likely to apply particularly to sites which include retail, offices, or leisure uses. |
| | Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence | Will it encourage the rural economy and diversification, and support sustainable tourism? | | |
| | | Will it contribute to providing a range of employment opportunities, in accessible locations? | + | 16.99 minutes from site to nearest employment area with 2000+ employees. 4 employment areas with 2000+ employees that can be accessed in less than 30mins - 1.6km walk. |
| | Support appropriate investment in people, places, | Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including broadband? | + | Minor Utilities Infrastructure improvements required, but constraints can be addressed. There is insufficient spare mains water capacity within the distribution zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and will require mitigation. |

| Table 5.5 Site level assessment - Land at Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington (Policy H/1:k) | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------|--|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | communications and other infrastructure | Will it improve access to education and training, and support provision of skilled employees to the economy? | - | School capacity not sufficient, but significant issues can be adequately addressed |
| Transport | Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices. | Will it enable shorter journeys, improve modal choice and integration of transport modes to encourage or facilitate the use of modes such as walking, cycling and public transport? | + | Total score of 16. |
| | | Sub-indicator: Distance to bus stop / rail station | +++ | 256m ACF from the centre of the site to the nearest bus stop (Cambridge Road). |
| | | Sub-indicator: Frequency of Public Transport | 0 | 30 minute service. |
| | | Sub-indicator: Typical Public Transport Journey Time to Cambridge City Centre or Market Town | + | 27 Minutes from Little Abington to Cambridge. |
| | | Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre or Market Town | 0 | 10.85km ACF from the centre of the site to Saffron Walden Market. |
| | Secure appropriate investment and development in | Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity? | 0 | No capacity constraints identified, safe access can be achieved. |

| Table 5.5 Site level assessment - Land at Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington (Policy H/1:k) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|--------------|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | transport infrastructure, and ensure the safety of the transport network. | Will it make the transport network safer for and promote use of non-motorised modes? | 0 | No impact |

5.3.4 Land at Toseland Road, Graveley (Policy H/1:l)

| | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Site No. | n/a |
| Address | Toseland Road, Graveley |
| Location | Graveley |
| Category of site | Infill Village |
| Site area | 0.40 ha |

Table 5.6: Site level assessment - Land at Toseland Road, Graveley (Policy H/1:l)

| Table 5.6 Site level assessment - Land at Toseland Road, Graveley (Policy H/1:l) | | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------|----------------------------|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| Land & Soil Resources | Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, economic mineral | Will it use land that has been previously developed? | +++ | Previously developed land. |
| | | Will it use land efficiently? | | |

| Table 5.6 Site level assessment - Land at Toseland Road, Graveley (Policy H/1:l) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | reserves, and productive agricultural holdings and the degradation / loss of soils | Will it protect and enhance the best and most versatile agricultural land? | 0 | Development would not affect best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2) |
| | | Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves? | 0 | Site not within an area designated in the Minerals and Waste LDF. |
| | | Will it minimise the degradation/loss of soils due to new development'? | | |
| | Minimise waste production and support the reuse and recycling of waste products | Will it encourage reduction in household waste, and increase waste recovery and recycling? | | |
| Air Quality and Environmental Pollution | Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution | Will it maintain or improve air quality? | 0 | Development unlikely to impact on air quality. Site lies in an area where air quality acceptable. |
| | | Minimise, and where possible improve on, unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour and vibration? | 0 | Development compatible with neighbouring uses. |

| Table 5.6 Site level assessment - Land at Toseland Road, Graveley (Policy H/1:l) | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | | Will it minimise, and where possible address, land contamination? | 0 | Development not on land likely to be contaminated. |
| | | Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment? | 0 | Development unlikely to affect water quality. Assumptions for a neutral impact are that appropriate standards and pollution control measures will be achieved through the development process, e.g. as part of Sustainable Drainage Systems (Suds). |
| Biodiversity | Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species | Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest and geodiversity? | 0 | No impact on protected sites and species. |
| | Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species | Will it reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan Targets)? | 0 | Assumptions for a neutral impact are that existing features that warrant retention can be retained or appropriate mitigation will be achieved through the development process. |

| Table 5.6 Site level assessment - Land at Toseland Road, Graveley (Policy H/1:l) | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------|--|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | Improve opportunities for people to access and appreciate wildlife and green spaces | Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery and access to green infrastructure? | 0 | Neutral impact (existing features retained, or appropriate mitigation possible). Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process. |
| Landscape, Townscape and Cultural Heritage | Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character | Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character? | 0 | Neutral impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local landscape character). Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process. |
| | | Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character? | + | Minor Positive Impact (Development would relate to local townscape character and offer opportunities for enhancement) |
| | Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings. | Will it protect or enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments)? | 0 | Neutral impact (existing features retained, or appropriate mitigation possible). |

| Table 5.6 Site level assessment - Land at Toseland Road, Graveley (Policy H/1:I) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|----------------------|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | Create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look good | Will it lead to developments built to a high standard of design and good place making that reflects local character? | | |
| Climate Change | Minimise impacts on climate change (including greenhouse gas emissions) | Will it support the use of renewable energy resources? | 0 | |
| | | Will it promote energy efficiency? | | |
| | | Will it minimise contributions to climate change through sustainable construction practices? | | |
| | Reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects | Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding, and incorporate sustainable drainage measures? | 0 | Flood zones (Tier 1) |

| Table 5.6 Site level assessment - Land at Toseland Road, Graveley (Policy H/1:I) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | | Will it minimise the likely impacts of climate change on the development through appropriate design? | | |
| | | Will it use water in a sustainable manner, and enable and encourage high levels of water efficiency? | | |
| Health | Maintain and enhance human health | Will it promote good health, encourage healthy lifestyles, and reduce health inequalities? | | |
| | Reduce and prevent crime and reduce fear of crime | Will it reduce actual levels of crime, and will it reduce fear of crime? | | |
| Inclusive Communities - Housing | Improve the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space. | Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space? | 0 | Standard requirements for open space would apply. |

| Table 5.6 Site level assessment - Land at Toseland Road, Graveley (Policy H/1:I) | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing | Will it support the provision of a range of housing types and sizes, including affordable and key worker housing, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community? | | |
| | | Will it provide for housing for the ageing population? | | |
| | | Will it provide for the housing accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople? | 0 | |
| Inclusive Communities - Redressing inequalities and involving the community | Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, | Will it improve accessibility to key local services and facilities, including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs, sports facilities etc?) | --- | Infill village |
| | | Sub-Indicator: Distance to centre | +++ | 192m ACF to Graveley Village Centre (High Street) |

| Table 5.6 Site level assessment - Land at Toseland Road, Graveley (Policy H/1:I) | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------|--------------|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | leisure opportunities) | Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?) | 0 | No impact. |
| | | Will improve relations between people from different backgrounds or social groups? | | |
| | Redress inequalities related to age, disability, gender assignment race, faith, location and income | Will it redress inequalities? | | |
| | | Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions, including 'hard to reach' groups? | | |
| | Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities | Will it encourage engagement with community activities? | 0 | No impact. |

| Table 5.6 Site level assessment - Land at Toseland Road, Graveley (Policy H/1:l) | | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------|--|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| Economic Activity | Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy. | Will it support business development and enhance competitiveness, enabling provision of high-quality employment land in appropriate locations to meet the needs of businesses, and the workforce? | - | Development would have a minor negative effect on employment opportunities, as a result of the loss of existing employment land. |
| | | Will it promote the industries that thrive in the district – the key sectors such as research and development /high tech/ Cambridge university related particularly through the development and expansion of clusters? | | |
| | | Will it protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres? | 0 | Development would have no effect on vitality or viability of existing centres. |

| Table 5.6 Site level assessment - Land at Toseland Road, Graveley (Policy H/1:l) | | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence | Will it encourage the rural economy and diversification, and support sustainable tourism? | | |
| | | Will it contribute to providing a range of employment opportunities, in accessible locations? | --- | No public transport through village on Monday to Friday which would connect to an employment area |
| | Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and other infrastructure | Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including broadband? | +++ | Development can use existing capacity in utilities infrastructure. |
| | | Will it improve access to education and training, and support provision of skilled employees to the economy? | +++ | The village is served by Eltisley Primary School, and Longsands Secondary School. Impact of a development of this scale would be minimal. |

| Table 5.6 Site level assessment - Land at Toseland Road, Graveley (Policy H/1:I) | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------|--|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| Transport | Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices. | Will it enable shorter journeys, improve modal choice and integration of transport modes to encourage or facilitate the use of modes such as walking, cycling and public transport? | --- | Total score of 4. |
| | | Sub-indicator: Distance to bus stop / rail station | --- | 408 m ACF from the centre of the site to the nearest bus stop (Church Lane). However, there is only a bus service on Saturdays (with 2 bus journeys each way to Huntingdon). In light of the lack of a regular service it has not been scored. |
| | | Sub-indicator: Frequency of Public Transport | --- | Less than hourly service. |
| | | Sub-indicator: Typical Public Transport Journey Time to Cambridge City Centre or Market Town | --- | 32 Minutes from Graveley to Huntingdon. |
| | | Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre or Market Town | + | 7.19km ACF from the centre of the site to Huntingdon Market. |

| Table 5.6 Site level assessment - Land at Toseland Road, Graveley (Policy H/1:I) | | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------|--|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | Secure appropriate investment and development in transport infrastructure, and ensure the safety of the transport network. | Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity? | 0 | No capacity constraints identified, safe access can be achieved. |
| | | Will it make the transport network safer for and promote use of non-motorised modes? | 0 | No impact |

5.3.5 Land at Manor Farm, Graveley

| | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Site No. | n/a |
| Address | Manor Farm, Graveley |
| Location | Graveley |
| Category of site | Infill Village |
| Site area | 1.46 ha |

Table 5.7: Site level assessment - Land at Manor Farm, Graveley

| Table 5.7 Site level assessment - Land at Manor Farm, Graveley | | | | |
|--|--|--|-------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| Land & Soil Resources | Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, economic mineral reserves, and productive agricultural holdings and the degradation / loss of soils | Will it use land that has been previously developed? | 0 | Part of the site contains a barn, but most of the land is undeveloped. |
| | | Will it use land efficiently? | | |
| | | Will it protect and enhance the best and most versatile agricultural land? | 0 | Development would not affect best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2) |
| | | Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves? Will it minimise the degradation/loss of soils due to new development'? | 0 | Site not within an area designated in the Minerals and Waste LDF. |
| | Minimise waste production and support the reuse and recycling of waste products | Will it encourage reduction in household waste, and increase waste recovery and recycling? | | |
| Air Quality and Environmental Pollution | Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution | Will it maintain or improve air quality? | 0 | Development unlikely to impact on air quality. Site lies in an area where air quality acceptable. |
| | | Minimise, and where possible improve on, unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour and vibration? | 0 | Development compatible with neighbouring uses. |

| Table 5.7 Site level assessment - Land at Manor Farm, Graveley | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | | Will it minimise, and where possible address, land contamination? | 0 | Development not on land likely to be contaminated. |
| | | Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment? | 0 | Development unlikely to affect water quality. Assumptions for a neutral impact are that appropriate standards and pollution control measures will be achieved through the development process, e.g. as part of Sustainable Drainage Systems (Suds). |
| Biodiversity | Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species | Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest and geodiversity? | 0 | No impact on protected sites and species. |
| | Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species | Will it reduce habitat fragmentation, enhance native species, and help deliver habitat restoration (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan Targets)? | 0 | Assumptions for a neutral impact are that existing features that warrant retention can be retained or appropriate mitigation will be achieved through the development process. |
| | Improve opportunities for people to access and appreciate wildlife and green spaces | Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery and access to green infrastructure? | 0 | Neutral impact (existing features retained, or appropriate mitigation possible). Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process. |

| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
|--|--|---|--------------|--|
| Landscape, Townscape and Cultural Heritage | Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character | Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character? | 0 | Neutral impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local landscape character). Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process. |
| | | Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character? | 0 | Neutral impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local townscape character). Assumptions for a neutral impact include that appropriate design and mitigation measures would be achieved through the development process. |
| | Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings. | Will it protect or enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments)? | 0 | Neutral impact (existing features retained or appropriate mitigation possible). |
| | Create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look good | Will it lead to developments built to a high standard of design and good place making that reflects local character? | | |
| Climate Change | Minimise impacts on climate change (including greenhouse gas emissions) | Will it support the use of renewable energy resources? | 0 | |
| | | Will it promote energy efficiency? | | |
| | | Will it minimise contributions to climate change through sustainable construction practices? | | |

| Table 5.7 Site level assessment - Land at Manor Farm, Graveley | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | Reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects | Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding, and incorporate sustainable drainage measures? | 0 | Flood zones (Tier 1) |
| | | Will it minimise the likely impacts of climate change on the development through appropriate design? | | |
| | | Will it use water in a sustainable manner, and enable and encourage high levels of water efficiency? | | |
| Health | Maintain and enhance human health | Will it promote good health, encourage healthy lifestyles, and reduce health inequalities? | | |
| | Reduce and prevent crime and reduce fear of crime | Will it reduce actual levels of crime, and will it reduce fear of crime? | | |
| Inclusive Communities - Housing | Improve the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space. | Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space? | 0 | Standard requirements for open space would apply. |

| Table 5.7 Site level assessment - Land at Manor Farm, Graveley | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing | Will it support the provision of a range of housing types and sizes, including affordable and key worker housing, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community? | | |
| | | Will it provide for housing for the ageing population? | | |
| | | Will it provide for the housing accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople? | 0 | |
| Inclusive Communities - Redressing inequalities and involving the community | Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities) | Will it improve accessibility to key local services and facilities, including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs, sports facilities etc?) | --- | Infill village |
| | | Sub-Indicator: Distance to centre | + | 517m ACF to Graveley Village Centre (High Street) |
| | | Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?) | 0 | No impact. |

| Table 5.7 Site level assessment - Land at Manor Farm, Graveley | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------|--|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | | Will it improve relations between people from different backgrounds or social groups? | | |
| | Redress inequalities related to age, disability, gender assignment race, faith, location and income | Will it redress inequalities? | | |
| | | Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions, including 'hard to reach' groups? | | |
| | Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities | Will it encourage engagement with community activities? | 0 | No impact. |
| Economic Activity | Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy. | Will it support business development and enhance competitiveness, enabling provision of high-quality employment land in appropriate locations to meet the needs of businesses, and the workforce? | - | Development would have a minor negative effect on employment opportunities, as a result of the loss of existing employment land. |

| Table 5.7 Site level assessment - Land at Manor Farm, Graveley | | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------|---|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | | Will it promote the industries that thrive in the district – the key sectors such as research and development /high tech/ Cambridge university related particularly through the development and expansion of clusters? | | |
| | | Will it protect the shopping hierarchy, supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres? | 0 | |
| | Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence | Will it encourage the rural economy and diversification, and support sustainable tourism? | | |
| | | Will it contribute to providing a range of employment opportunities, in accessible locations? | --- | No public transport through village on Monday to Friday which would connect to an employment area |
| | Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and other infrastructure | Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including broadband? | +++ | Development can use existing capacity in utilities infrastructure. |

| Table 5.7 Site level assessment - Land at Manor Farm, Graveley | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------|--|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | | Will it improve access to education and training, and support provision of skilled employees to the economy? | +++ | The village is served by Eltisley Primary School, and Longsands Secondary School. Impact of a development of this scale would be minimal. |
| Transport | Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices. | Will it enable shorter journeys, improve modal choice and integration of transport modes to encourage or facilitate the use of modes such as walking, cycling and public transport? | --- | Total score of 4. |
| | | Sub-indicator: Distance to bus stop / rail station | --- | 117 m ACF from the centre of the site to the nearest bus stop (Manor Close). However, there is only a bus service on Saturdays (with 2 bus journeys each way to Huntingdon). In light of the lack of a regular service it has not been scored. |
| | | Sub-indicator: Frequency of Public Transport | --- | Less than hourly service. |
| | | Sub-indicator: Typical Public Transport Journey Time to Cambridge City Centre or Market Town | --- | 33 Minutes from Graveley to Huntingdon. |
| | | Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre or Market Town | + | 7.89km ACF from the centre of the site to Saffron Walden Market. |

| Table 5.7 Site level assessment - Land at Manor Farm, Graveley | | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------|--|
| THEME | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria | Score | Notes |
| | Secure appropriate investment and development in transport infrastructure, and ensure the safety of the transport network. | Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity? | 0 | No capacity constraints identified, safe access can be achieved. |
| | | Will it make the transport network safer for and promote use of non-motorised modes? | 0 | No impact |

5.4 Housing Allocations at Villages

This appraisal table shows the assessment of the individual housing allocation sites under Local Plan Policy H/1: Allocations for Residential Development at Villages, with the further commentary table below.

5.4.1 Policy elements assessed

H/1:i Land at Linton Road, Great Abington

H/1:j Land at High Street / Pampisford Road, Great Abington

H/1:k Land at Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington

H/1:l Land at Toseland Road, Graveley

Table 5.8: Site allocation policies assessment summary

| Table 5.8 Site allocation policies assessment summary | | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| SA Obj | H/1:i | H/1:j | H/1:k | H/1:l |
| 1. Land / soil | - | - | ~ | + |
| 2. Waste | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| 3. Pollution | ~ | ~/- | ~ | ~ |
| 4. Prot. Sites | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ |
| 5. Habitats | + | + | + | + |
| 6. Green spaces | + | + | ~ | + |
| 7. Landscape | - | - | - | + |
| 8. Heritage | - | - | - | ~ |
| 9. Places | + | ~ | + | ~ |
| 10. Climate mitig. | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| 11. Climate adapt. | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| 12. Health | + | - | ~ | ~ |
| 13. Crime | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| 14. Open space | + | + | ?/- | + |
| 15. Housing | + | + | + | + |
| 16. Inequalities | + | + | + | + |
| 17. Services | + | + | + | ~ |
| 18. Community | + | + | + | + |
| 19. Economy | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| 20. Work | + | + | + | - |
| 21. Investment | + | + | + | ~ |
| 22. Travel | + | + | + | - |
| 23. Trans. Infr. | ?/- | ?/- | ~ | ~ |

5.4.2 Detailed assessment table

Table 5.9: Site allocation policies assessment commentary

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|---|---|----------------------|
| SA Obj | Potential effect | Mitigation and enhancement | SCDC response |
| 1. Land / soil | <p>Minor negative impact (Policy H/1:i) the site is small at 4.11 ha and the potential negative impacts of the permanent irreversible loss of previously undeveloped high grade agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2) is partly mitigated by the requirement that proposals retain the allotments which will preserve some of the good quality soil area along with the community orchard which is to be created. These combined with the green buffers required by the policy therefore reduce the overall loss of agricultural land and soils. The site lies within an area designated in the Minerals and Waste LDF but its development would not have a negative impact.</p> <p>Minor negative impact (Policy H/1:j) and the area likely to be lost (permanent irreversible) also is slightly reduced by the requirement for a green buffer at the countryside edge. The site's development will have a neutral effect on minerals reserves as it is not within an area designated in the Minerals and Waste LDF.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:k) the site is small at 0.42 ha and the site has a minor positive performance for the use of previously developed land as it partly consists of farm buildings. Therefore the permanent irreversible loss of areas of Grade 2 agricultural land over part the small site is minimised. Additionally, the site's development will</p> | No further mitigation identified at the plan level. | |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>have a neutral effect on minerals reserves as it is not within an area designated in the Minerals and Waste LDF.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:l) as the 0.4ha site is previously developed land and is therefore efficient use of land and will not lead to loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1 and 2). Additionally, the site's development will have a neutral effect on minerals reserves as it is not within an area designated in the Minerals and Waste LDF</p> | | |
| 2. Waste | Neutral impact for all policies on waste production, recovery and recycling. | | |
| 3. Pollution | <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:i) the site is unlikely to be contaminated. Development is unlikely to lead to poor air quality and it lies in an area where air quality is acceptable.</p> <p>Neutral to minor negative (Policy H/1:j) the site is unlikely to be contaminated. Development is unlikely to lead to poor air quality and it lies in an area where air quality is acceptable. There is some industrial use nearby which has the potential to cause noise pollution which may affect the residents on site. There is the potential for minor negative noise impacts on surrounding residential areas from increased traffic movements, but these impacts depend upon the location of the site's entrance.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:k) the site is unlikely to be contaminated. Development unlikely to lead to poor air quality and it lies in an area where air quality is</p> | | |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| | <p>acceptable. Development is unlikely to affect water quality. The site within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3 which does not rule out development but may influence land use or require pollution control measures. A neutral impact is assumed because other policies within the Local Plan will ensure that appropriate standards and pollution control measures are implemented. Residential development is compatible with surrounding uses and therefore should not create any significant additional noise pollution impacts.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:l) this site is in an area of acceptable air quality and the scale of the development is unlikely to affect local air quality. The site is unlikely to be contaminated. Development is unlikely to affect water quality, so a neutral effect is assumed based on the application of appropriate standards and pollution control measures which will be achieved through application of relevant Local Plan policies such as those on Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).</p> | | |
| 4. Prot. Sites | <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:i) no impacts are likely as there are no designated sites on the site. Impacts on nearby sites is unlikely and would be controlled though other Local Plan policies and legislation.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:j) no impacts are likely as there are no designated sites on the site. Impacts on nearby sites is unlikely and would be controlled though other Local Plan policies and legislation.</p> | <p>Mitigation for Policy H/1:k - The policy should require a protected species survey in particular for bats, barn owl. A general ecological survey should be required, in particular to assess the use of buildings as nest sites for birds such as swallow, swift and house martin.</p> | <p>Local Plan policy NH/4 provides policy for protected species in relation to development ,and for enhancement opportunities in general.</p> |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>Uncertain impact (Policy H/1:k) no impacts on protected sites are likely as there are no designated sites. Impacts on nearby sites is unlikely and would be controlled through other Local Plan policies and legislation. The presence of farm buildings on site raises the possibility of legally protected species, in particular barn owls and bats being on site and using the building. Birds such as swallows or house martins may also use barns for nest sites and these will also need to be considered in any proposal and appropriate mitigation implemented.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:l) no impacts are likely as there are no designated sites on the site. Impacts on nearby sites are unlikely given the nature and scale of the development, and possible impacts on protected species would be controlled through other Local Plan policies and legislation relating to biodiversity.</p> | | |
| 5. Habitats | <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:i) as the development is required to create a community orchard and to retain the allotments which can contain characteristic species. Additionally, existing habitat features will be retained, or appropriate mitigation will be achieved, through the application of the Local Plan's Biodiversity policy.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:j) as the policy requires a landscape buffer along the edge of the site where the it adjoins open countryside.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:k) as the policy requires a landscape buffer along the edge of the site where the it adjoins open space.</p> | | |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:l) as the policy requires the retention of mature trees and hedgerows and the creation of a landscape buffer along the rear of the site to provide a green edge to the development. | | |
| 6. Green spaces | <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:i) because the development is required to retain allotments and provide a community orchard which will serve as community green space.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:j) as the policy requires the creation of a landscape buffer along the boundary of the site where it adjoins or could be seen from open countryside to provide a soft green village edge. Benefit only minor as these are likely to be visual amenity value only, rather than publically accessible.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:k) as the development will result in the loss of part of an area of natural greenspace within the centre of the village. However, the policy requires the creation of a green landscape buffer along the rear of the site, but the benefit of these is only minor as these are likely to be visual amenity value only, rather than publically accessible.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:l) the scale of the development means that on site green space provision is likely to be very limited. The policy requires the creation of a green landscape buffer along the rear of the site, but the benefit of these is only minor as these are likely to be of visual amenity value only, rather than publically accessible. However, the policy requires that development</p> | | |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| | should contribute to benefits for the wider village community and the Parish Council is seeking to provide green space for the community. | | |
| 7. Landscape and Townscape | <p>Minor negative impact (Policy H/1:i) has the potential for negative impacts on landscape because the site is prominent on the edge of the village in the and development conflicts with the local landscape character, resulting in the loss of openness and rural character. As mitigation the policy requires that boundary trees and hedges are retained as a green edge to soften the development and to mitigate visual intrusiveness. Additionally the creation of a community orchard could mitigate impacts. However, there will be minor residual negative impacts as some impacts are incapable of mitigation. With regards townscape impacts on the village these are likely to have a neutral impact as development is generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local townscape character as appropriate design and mitigation measures would be required through the application of other Local Plan policies.</p> <p>Minor negative impacts (Policy H/1:j) has the potential for negative landscape impacts but the policy requires the creation of a landscape buffer along the boundary of the site where it adjoins or could be seen from open countryside to provide a soft green village edge. There are also negative landscape impacts in terms of the loss of the visual link between adjacent farmsteads.</p> <p>Minor negative impacts (Policy H/1:k) there is the potential for adverse impacts on a Conservation Area from</p> | <p>Mitigation Policy H/1i: the policy could additionally require that the community orchard is sighted so as to provide a landscape buffer to the development.</p> <p>Mitigation for Policy H/1k: the policy should require that the current condition of local landscape and townscape character is enhanced by requiring the retention and restoration of the older farm buildings and traditional farm layout within any scheme.</p> | <p>The policy requires the community orchard to be sited on the south of the site where it will provide a landscape buffer to the development.</p> |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| | <p>development which conflicts with townscape character owing to the potential loss of buildings and the loss of a rural context to Bancroft Farm. If the farm buildings were to be removed, the setting of Church Lane would lose its intimate rural backdrop which would have adverse effects. The existing condition of the townscape character is poor owing to the poor condition of some of the existing farm buildings. Landscape and townscape 'condition' is distinct from its 'character' and can be restored/enhanced to enable good condition. Development in a Conservation Area would be required to maintain and enhance the historic environment under Local Plan policies.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impacts (Policy H/1:l) the development would be on previously developed land and would be required to relate to townscape character. Development would offer opportunities for enhancement of character through the relevant Local Plan policies. The policy requires the creation of a landscape buffer along the rear boundary of the site to provide a soft green edge to the development.</p> | | |
| 8. Heritage | <p>Minor negative impact (Policy H/1:i) on historic assets, for which mitigation is unlikely to reduce the impact to neutral. There will be minor residual impacts on the setting of a number of listed buildings and a Conservation Area. Impacts on archaeological potential are uncertain as the site's potential is not currently known. It is considered likely that appropriate mitigation can be achieved through the application of relevant Local Plan policies.</p> | <p>Mitigation for all policies – Proposals should be accompanied by an archaeological desk study, and should be required to submit survey information where desk study indicates the potential for underground archaeology.</p> | <p>Policy NH/14: Heritage Asses already addresses archaeology.</p> |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| | <p>Minor negative impact (Policy H/1:j) on historic assets which are unlikely to be capable of mitigation to neutral impact. There is likely to be residual minor adverse harm to Listed Buildings due to loss of farmland settings and backdrop to former farmstead and due to loss of visual link between adjacent farmsteads. Archaeological potential will require further information but it is likely that appropriate mitigation can be achieved through the application of relevant Local Plan policies.</p> <p>Minor negative impact (Policy H/1:k) as the site has a distinctly rural character and development would result in the loss of an open space within the village. The existing site is occupied by derelict and ruinous farm buildings which also have a negative impact upon the setting of landscape character. There is the potential for adverse impacts on the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings, including the Little Abington Church (Grade 2*) and properties in Church Lane (Grade 2). However, the policy specifically requires that the Conservation Area is enhanced and demands a high quality development. The policy requires the retention of the flint boundary wall (except for access) which will assist with maintaining local character. In addition other policies within the Local Plan will seek to ensure that impacts on heritage assets are avoided and minimised. Archaeological potential will require further information to be submitted with proposals, and it is likely that appropriate mitigation can be achieved through the application of relevant Local Plan policies.</p> | <p>Mitigation for Policy H/1k – the policy should specifically require the retention of</p> | |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | Neutral impact (Policy H/1:l) is assumed as any existing features will be identified and retained, or appropriate mitigation secured, through the application of other relevant Local Plan policies. | | |
| 9. Places | <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:i) the policy requires retention of boundary trees and hedges (except as required to provide for access) which will assist with the maintenance of local character whilst the creation of a community orchard on the south of the site to provide a soft green edge will help to reflect local character. High quality design will be required through the application of other Local Plan policies.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:j) the policy requires retention of boundary trees and hedges (except as required to provide for access) which will assist with the maintenance of local character. High quality design will be required through the application of other Local Plan policies.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:k) as the policy requires development to be of high quality and retain the flint boundary wall (except for access) which will assist with maintaining local character. High quality design will be required through the application of other Local Plan policies.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:l) as high quality design will be required through the application of other Local Plan policies.</p> | | |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| 10. Climate mitig. | <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:i) development proposals will be subject to the application of relevant Local Plan policies on renewable energy, energy efficiency and sustainable construction.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:j) development proposals will be subject to the application of relevant Local Plan policies on renewable energy, energy efficiency and sustainable construction.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:k) development proposals will be subject to the application of relevant Local Plan policies on renewable energy, energy efficiency and sustainable construction.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:l) development proposals will be subject to the application of relevant Local Plan policies on renewable energy, energy efficiency and sustainable construction.</p> | | |
| 11. Climate adapt. | <p>Neutral impacts (Policy H/1:i) the site is in Flood Zone 1 and there are no drainage issues that cannot be appropriately addressed. Development proposals will be subject to the application of Local Plan policies on water use.</p> <p>Neutral impacts (Policy H/1:j) the site is in Flood Zone 1 and there are no drainage issues that cannot be appropriately addressed. Development proposals will be subject to the application of Local Plan policies on water use.</p> | | |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | <p>Neutral impacts (Policy H/1:k) the site is in Flood Zone 1 and there are no drainage issues that cannot be appropriately addressed. Development proposals will be subject to the application of Local Plan policies on water use.</p> <p>Neutral impacts (Policy H/1:l) the site is in Flood Zone 1 and there are no drainage issues that cannot be appropriately addressed. Development proposals will be subject to the application of Local Plan policies on water use.</p> | | |
| 12. Health | <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:i) as the policy requires the retention of the allotments which are already recognised by the Parish Council as being of benefit to the community. The addition of the community orchard provides further opportunities for outdoor recreation and participation in community activities.</p> <p>Minor negative impact (Policy H/1:j) there is the potential for a minor adverse effects on the wellbeing of residents from noise related impacts from nearby industrial uses. This is unlikely to be significant as other Local Plan policies will seek to mitigate these impacts through the design of the development.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:k) the development is unlikely to have impacts on health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:l) the development is generally unlikely to have impacts on health and wellbeing. The policy requires developers to consider the potential for impacts on residential amenity from the Cotton Wind</p> | | |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | Farm and design is to include mitigation as appropriate. Therefore the likely impacts are assessed as neutral on the assumption that mitigation measure can be effective. | | |
| 13. Crime | <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:i) development of the site is unlikely to impact on perceptions of crime. All developments will be required to implement good design which includes designing out crime.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:j) development of the site is unlikely to impact on perceptions of crime. All developments will be required to implement good design which includes designing out crime.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:k) development of the site is unlikely to impact on perceptions of crime. All developments will be required to implement good design which includes designing out crime.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:l) development of this small site is unlikely to impact on perceptions of crime. All developments will be required to implement good design which includes designing out crime.</p> | | |
| 14. Open space | <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:i) as the policy requires the creation of a community orchard which will be additional community space. Additionally, all development is required to contribute to open space either to provide further open spaces or enhance existing ones where land for open space is limited.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:j) as all development is required to contribute to open space either to provide</p> | | |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>further open spaces or enhance existing ones where land for open space is limited.</p> <p>Minor negative impact (Policy H/1:k) as the development of the site would result in the permanent, irreversible loss of part of an area of amenity open space within the centre of the village. However, all development is required to contribute to open space either to provide further open spaces or enhance existing ones where land for open space is limited.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:l) as all development is required to contribute to open space, as opportunities on the site are restricted, this requirement is most likely to be delivered through enhancements to existing open space within the village.</p> | | |
| 15. Housing | <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:i) because housing allocations are being made to meet locally identified needs. Although of locally significant benefit, the low numbers of dwellings means the benefit in terms of the plan area is minor. Development will be subject to the other strategic housing policies within the Local Plan meaning that affordable homes will be provided.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:j) because housing allocations are being made to meet locally identified needs. Although locally significant, the low numbers of dwellings means the benefit in terms of the plan area is minor. Development will be subject to the other strategic housing policies within the Local Plan meaning that affordable homes will be provided.</p> | | |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:k) as the policy provides for six (6) dwellings of a type required to meet locally identified needs which might otherwise not be met. Although locally of significant benefit, the benefit in terms of the plan area is very minor.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:l) as the policy provides for six (6) dwellings of a type required to meet locally identified needs which might otherwise not be met. Although locally of significant benefit, the benefit in terms of the plan area as a whole is very minor.</p> | | |
| 16. Inequalities | <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:i) as the policy will provide homes for people who wish remain in the local community.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:j) as the policy will provide homes for people who wish to remain in the local community.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:k) as the policy will provide homes suitable for downsizers and first time buyers who wish to remain in the local community.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:k) as the policy will provide homes suitable for downsizers who wish to remain in the local community, thus freeing up larger properties for new families..</p> | | |
| 17. Services | <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:i) no facilities will be lost as a result of development but no new facilities are proposed directly as a result of the development. It is 316m to the village Post Office. There is from a bus stop</p> | | |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>319m away with a good frequency of service (30 minute service) with Cambridge only a 28 minute bus journey. The site is 10.03km from Saffron Walden Market. The additional housing could lead to additional pressure on local facilities including education, although mitigation is possible.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:j) no facilities will be lost as a result of development but no new facilities are proposed directly as a result of the development. The site is 661m from the village Post Office and approximately 99m from a bus stop, on High Street, with a good frequency of service (30 minute service) with a 29 minute bus ride from Great Abington to Cambridge where a range of main services are available. The site is 9.69km from Saffron Walden Market. The additional housing could lead to additional pressure on local facilities including education, although mitigation is possible.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:k) no facilities will be lost as a result of development but no new facilities are proposed directly as a result of the development. The site is around 197m to Church Lane and is central in relation to services and facilities within the village. The small scale of the development is unlikely to put pressure on existing village services. The site is located 10.85km from Saffron Walden Market. It's a 27 minute bus journey from Little Abington to Cambridge where major services can be accessed. The additional housing could lead to additional pressure on local facilities including education, although mitigation is possible.</p> | | |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:l) no facilities will be lost as a result of development but no new facilities are proposed directly as a result of the development. The small scale of the development is unlikely to put pressure on existing village services. The site is 192m to Graveley Village Centre (High Street). There is no public transport, through the village on Monday to Friday, therefore accessing work opportunities are likely to require a private car.</p> | | |
| 18. Community | <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:i) the policy specifically requires that development seeks to meet the aspirations of the Parish Council, though which local people can have direct influence on the development proposals. Additionally, the policy requires the retention of the allotments which have been identified by the Parish Council as being of great benefit to individuals and to community development.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:j) the policy specifically requires that development seeks to meet the aspirations of the Parish Council, though which local people can have direct influence on the development proposals.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:k) the policy specifically requires that development seeks to meet the aspirations of the Parish Council, though which local people can have direct influence on the development proposals.</p> | | |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:l) the policy specifically requires that development seeks to meet the aspirations of the Parish Council, though which local people can have direct influence on the development proposals. | | |
| 19. Economy | <p>Neutral (Policy H/1:i) development would have no effect on vitality or viability of existing centres.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:j) development would have no effect on vitality or viability of existing centres.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:k) development would have no effect on vitality or viability of existing centres.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:l) development would have no effect on vitality or viability of existing centres owing to its small scale.</p> | | |
| 20. Work | <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:i) It is only a 28 minute bus journey to Cambridge which would provide major employment opportunities.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:j) It is only a 26 minute bus journey from Great Abington to Cambridge which would provide major employment opportunities.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:k) the site is 16.99 minutes from the nearest employment area with 2000+ employees. 4 employment areas with 2000+ employees that can be accessed in less than 30mins - 1.6km walk. It is only a 26 minute bus journey to Cambridge which would provide major employment opportunities.</p> | | |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | Minor negative impact (Policy H/1:l) as the development would result in the loss of existing employment land. It is a 32 minute bus journey to Huntingdon, which could provide job opportunities, however bus services do not operate on Monday to Friday so access would rely on the private car. | | |
| 21. Investment | <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:i) as minor Utilities Infrastructure improvements are needed, but constraints can be addressed. as the policy does not require proposals to invest in</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:j) as minor Utilities Infrastructure improvements are needed, but constraints can be addressed.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:k) as minor Utilities Infrastructure improvements are needed, but constraints can be addressed.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:l) as the development can use existing utilities infrastructure, therefore no additional investment is required.</p> | | |
| 22. Travel | Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:i) with regards sustainable travel for employment opportunities the site is 20.98 minutes from site to nearest employment area with 2000+ employees. There are 3 employment areas with 2000+ employees that can be accessed in less than 30mins - 1.6km walk. The site is approximately 319m from a bus stop with a good frequency of service (30 | | |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | <p>minute service) with Cambridge only a 28 minute bus journey from Great Abington.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:j) with regards sustainable travel for employment opportunities the site is a 17.86 minute walk from the nearest employment area with 2000+ employees. There are 4 employment areas with 2000+ employees that can be accessed in less than 30mins - 1.6km walk. The site is approximately 99m from a bus stop with a good frequency of service (30 minute service) with Cambridge only a 29 minute bus journey from Great Abington. The site is 9.69km from Saffron Walden Market.</p> <p>Minor beneficial impact (Policy H/1:k) with regards sustainable travel for employment opportunities the site is a 16.99 minute walk from the nearest employment area with 2000+ employees. There are 4 employment areas, with 2000+ employees, that can be accessed in less than 30 mins by a 1.6km walk. The site is close to a bus stop (256m) with a good frequency of service (30 minute service). Cambridge is a 27 minute bus journey from Little Abington. The site is 10.85km from Saffron Walden Market.</p> <p>Minor negative impact (Policy H/1:l) with regards sustainable travel for employment opportunities the village has no public transport on Mondays to Fridays so commuting for work is likely to rely upon the private car. The only bus service is on Saturdays (with 2 bus journeys each way to Huntingdon) and is a 32 minute journey so access to higher level services is also likely to be by</p> | | |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | private car. The site is 7.19km (as the crow flies) from its centre to Huntingdon. Overall the site's development is unlikely to enable shorter journeys or improve modal choice but given the small scale of the development it is unlikely to lead to significant effects. | | |
| 23. Trans. Infr. | <p>Uncertain/ minor negative impact (Policy H/1:i) as there the Highway Authority has raised concerns about the accident record of the A1307. Therefore the effects on the safety of the highway network is uncertain / minor negative to reflect the potential safety issues and that further information is required. Therefore before the proposed scheme comes forward a detailed a detailed analysis of access points onto the A1307 and A11 will need to be completed.</p> <p>Uncertain / minor negative impact (Policy H/1:j) as there the Highway Authority has raised concerns about the accident record of the A1307. Therefore the effects on the safety of the highway network is uncertain / minor negative to reflect the potential safety issues and that further information is required. Therefore before the proposed scheme comes forward a detailed a detailed analysis of access points onto the A1307 and A11 will need to be completed.</p> <p>Neutral impact (Policy H/1:k) there a no identified capacity constraints for the site and safe highway access can be achieve so the impacts on safety of the transport network are neutral.</p> | Mitigation for Policies H/1:i and H/1:j – the policy should require information on highways access design and mitigation to be submitted as part of any proposals. This should be required to include detailed analysis of the access points to the A1037 and the A11, in particular in relation to safety. | Suitable policy guidance is already included in the Local Plan by policy TI/2: Planning for Sustainable Travel. |

| Table 5.9 Site allocation policies assessment commentary | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | Neutral impact (Policy H/1:l) there are no identified capacity constraints for the site and safe highway access can be achieved so the impacts on safety of the transport network are neutral. | | |

5.5 Cumulative assessment

The SEA Regulations require an assessment of cumulative effects. Cumulative effects arise, for instance, where several developments each have insignificant effects but together have a significant effect; or where several individual effects of the plan (e.g. noise, dust and visual) have a combined effect. The term can also be used to describe synergistic effects, which interact to produce a total effect greater than the sum of the individual effects.

The cumulative assessment is presented in Table 5.10 which identifies the potential for cumulative effects on sustainability from the allocations made under policy H/1. The effects which have been identified relate to the allocations in the Abingtons.

It is not considered that the identified effects of the allocations of these four sites alter the conclusions of the cumulative effects assessment of the Local Plan as a whole which was presented in Part 3 of the SA Report.

| Table 5.10: Potential cumulative sustainability effects | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| Table 5.10: Potential cumulative sustainability effects | | | | |
| Sustainability Issue | Commentary on potential cumulative effects | Mitigation / enhancement measures | Response within the Local Plan | Residual effects |
| <p>Cumulative effects on landscape character in the Abingtons</p> <p>(Policies H1/i, H1/j, H1/k)</p> | <p>Potential for cumulative negative impacts on the landscape character around the Abingtons. The site based policies all require landscape buffers to create a soft green edge between the built development and the existing countryside. If these mitigation measures are successful the cumulative impact on the local landscape character is likely to be neutral.</p> | <p>Local Plan policies on landscape character should be applied to development proposals.</p> | <p>Relevant Local Plan policies will be applied to development proposals.</p> | <p>There should be neutral effects on local landscape character provided the mitigation within the policies are implemented.</p> |
| <p>Cumulative effects on heritage assets and townscape in the Abingtons</p> <p>(Policies H1/i, H1/j, H1/k)</p> | <p>The level of development in Great Abington has the potential for negative effects on heritage assets, in particular Conservation Area and Listed Buildings and consequent impacts on townscape character. Development at Little Abington is has the potential to for negative effects on heritage assets and consequent impacts on townscape character. This could lead to cumulative minor negative effects in heritage with consequent negative impacts on townscape in the Abingtons.</p> | <p>Local Plan policies covering heritage, design and townscape character should be applied to development proposals.</p> | <p>Relevant Local Plan policies will be applied to development proposals.</p> | <p>With the policy requirements there are likely to be residual minor negative impacts on the heritage assets and / or townscape character of the Abingtons</p> |
| <p>Cumulative effects on biodiversity and green infrastructure in the Abingtons</p> | <p>There is the potential for local cumulative adverse impacts on biodiversity, including in particular farmland biodiversity, the potential for habitat loss and fragmentation, resulting from the level of growth proposed around the Abingtons.</p> | <p>Local Plan policies on biodiversity should be applied to development proposals.</p> | <p>Relevant Local Plan policies will be applied to development proposals.</p> | <p>With the policy requirements there are likely to be positive synergistic effects on biodiversity in particular with regards the provision</p> |

| Table 5.10: Potential cumulative sustainability effects | | | | |
|---|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| Table 5.10: Potential cumulative sustainability effects | | | | |
| Sustainability Issue | Commentary on potential cumulative effects | Mitigation / enhancement measures | Response within the Local Plan | Residual effects |
| (Policies H1/i, H1/j, H1/k) | <p>The Local Plan requires all development to consider impacts on biodiversity through Policy NH/4 Biodiversity which requires ecological assessments to be provided with proposals with likely impacts on biodiversity, as would be the case for all these sites. Site allocation policy H/1i requires the retention of allotments and the creation of a community orchard which would support national Biodiversity Action Plan targets.</p> <p>With the implementation of these and any other mitigation and enhancement measures arising from the ecological surveys, there are likely to be positive synergistic effects on biodiversity in particular with regards the provision of green infrastructure networks</p> | | | of green infrastructure networks |
| <p>Cumulative effects on Housing in the Abingtons</p> <p>(Policies H1/i, H1/j, H1/k)</p> | <p>Policy H/1 and its site allocations seek to deliver housing to meet the objectively locally assessed needs of the village, by delivering the types of housing needed.</p> <p>Cumulative minor positive effects are likely.</p> | None proposed. | N/A | There will be cumulative minor positive effects on the provision of decent homes |
| <p>Cumulative effect of development at the Abingtons</p> | <p>The development of additional dwellings in the Abingtons could have potentially negative impacts on the access to services and facilities, in particular with</p> | The Local Education Authority should | | There should be neutral effects on local services and |

| Table 5.10: Potential cumulative sustainability effects | | | | |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Table 5.10: Potential cumulative sustainability effects | | | | |
| Sustainability Issue | Commentary on potential cumulative effects | Mitigation / enhancement measures | Response within the Local Plan | Residual effects |
| Potential for negative effects on services and facilities (Policies H1/i, H1/j, H1/k) | regards access to education. If mitigation measures are successful the cumulative effects on access to services and facilities should be neutral. | plan for additional capacity in local schools. | | facilities provided mitigation is implemented. |

6. MONITORING STRATEGY

No additional monitoring requirements to those already proposed in the SA of the Local Plan, contained in Part 3 of the SA Report, are required to address any effects identified in this SA Addendum.