

APPENDIX 5: DETAILED ASSESSMENT SHEETS – POLICY OPTIONS

ASSESSMENTS KEY

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

3. Development Needs

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|--|-----------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 3 Employment Target i (low) | --- /? | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | --- /? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | -/? | ---/? | +/? | ? | ? |
| Issue 3 Employment Target ii (medium) | --- /? | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | --- /? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | +/? | +++ /? | ? | ? |
| Issue 3 Employment Target iii (High) | --- /? | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | --- /? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ /? | +++ /? | +++ /? | ? | ? |
| Issue 4 Housing i (low) | -/? | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | --- /? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ---/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | --- /? | ~ | +/? | +/? | ? |
| Issue 4 Housing ii (Medium) | --- /? | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | --- /? | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | +++ /? | +++ /? | ? |
| Issue 4 Housing iii (High) | --- /? | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | --- /? | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | +++ /? | +++ /? | ? |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|--|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 5 Windfalls | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 6 5 Year Land Supply i (5% buffer) | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 6 5 Year Land Supply ii (20% buffer) | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |

Issue 3: Jobs Target

Options concern the overall level of jobs growth that should be planned for in the district. Site specific impacts would depend on location and design of development, addressed by other options, it is therefore difficult to assess the impact on a number of objectives as a result of these options. Clearly planning for large scale jobs growth has absolute implications in terms of resource use such as land, water and waste creation. Planning for a smaller rate of growth could use less land, but all options effectively still plan for a large level of jobs growth. The Water Cycle Strategy identifies that growth would result in a significant increase in water use, although the scale of the impact will be determined by options regarding water efficiency.

In terms implications of for the land objectives, the need to use greenfield land will again depend on Site Specific issues, but given the limited stock of previously developed land, higher options are likely to have a greater impact. Higher levels of development could also put greater

pressure on transport infrastructure, and create higher numbers of journeys by car, but again this would to a great extent depend on where jobs are developed, and the relationship with housing growth.

Key impacts relate to economic objectives. Impacts depend to a significant extent on the wider economy, therefore there is some uncertainty, which has been reflected in the need to apply a number of economic growth scenarios. The 'low' option (i) would plan for a lower number of jobs than is actually predicted, taking a pessimistic view of the economy. This could hold back growth of the local economy by not providing enough land to meet demand, and potentially inhibit further development of the high technology clusters if this proved to be overly pessimistic. If it were combined with higher housing growth levels it could result in increased levels of unemployment, or higher levels of commuting to access jobs elsewhere.

Forecasting suggests the medium jobs growth scenario (ii) is the most likely. Planning to accommodate this level of jobs will benefit the local economy, and support access to jobs. If the economy were to develop faster it could hold back economic growth.

A higher jobs growth scenario (iii) would plan for higher levels of economic growth, and therefore provide even greater support to the local economy and availability of local jobs. Again the impact must be considered in combination with housing growth options, and planning for a higher number of jobs than is realistic could result in a higher housing target than needed given the amount of in-migration that would take place to support the creation of new jobs, again resulting in potentially higher unemployment levels or out commuting to jobs elsewhere. Conversely, a higher jobs target combined with a lower housing target could mean more commuting into the district. It could also result in over provision of employment land if the jobs are not actually created.

Issue 4: Housing Provision

Options concern the overall level of housing growth that should be planned for in the district. Similar to the jobs growth options, site specific impacts would depend on location and design of development, addressed by other options, it is therefore difficult to assess the impact on a number of objectives as a result of these options.

Clearly planning for large scale housing growth has absolute implications in terms of resource use such as land, water and waste creation, with larger options requiring more resources. The Water Cycle Strategy identifies that growth would result in a significant increase in water use, although the scale of the impact will be determined by options regarding water efficiency. A limited supply of previously developed land in the district also means higher options could have a higher impact on the land objectives, although this would depend on the package of sites selected.

Impact of housing growth options is also closely linked with the employment growth options, so to a significant extent the impact of the housing option depends on which employment option is taken.

The lowest growth option (i) would make the least contribution to addressing housing needs, particularly the high level of local need for affordable housing. However, if the lowest option for jobs is taken, it would reflect the needs of the area. If jobs growth is higher, it could also hinder the local economy, holding back the supply of local labour and result in higher levels of commuting.. It could make limited contribution to the objective of providing a better balance between jobs and home close to Cambridge.

The medium growth option (ii) would reflect the anticipated jobs growth, although it still would not address fully the specific needs for affordable housing.

The high option (iii) would make an even greater contribution to the delivery of affordable housing, but could mean more out commuting if the high jobs target were not delivered and therefore the numbers of new homes were not balanced with new jobs. Higher options would place additional pressure on transport and social infrastructure, but they would also provide resources to enable further investment.

In terms of transport infrastructure, and achieving sustainable transport, more homes could simply be more people on the networks and using cars. However, the relationship is not that straight forward, as delivery of homes in the right places, enabling more people to live close to jobs and services, could actually reduce the need to travel, and support use of sustainable modes. This would clearly depend on how growth is implemented, determined by other options.

Issue 5: Making an Allowance for Windfall Development

A largely technical issue, as to whether housing predicted to happen but not identified in plans should be counted towards supply.

Issue 6: Providing a 5 Year Housing Land Supply

Technical issue regarding land supply. Having a greater flexibility on 5 year land supply may provide greater flexibility to support delivery, but may not be necessary.

4. Spatial Strategy

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|--|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 7 Localism | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + / +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 8 Previously developed land | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++/? | ~ | ~ | +++ /? | ~ | +++ /? | ~ |
| Issue 9 Development Strategy i (edge of Cambridge) | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ? | ---/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | +++ | ~ |
| Issue 9 Development Strategy ii (new settlements) | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ? | ---/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/+++ | ~ | ~ | +++ /? | ~ | + | ~ |
| Issue 9 Development Strategy iii (more sustainable villages) | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ? | -/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ---/ ? | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|---|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 9 Development Strategy iv (combination) | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ? | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 9 Development Strategy v (Group or infill villages) | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ? | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ++ | ~ | ~ | ++ | ~ | ++ | ~ |
| Issue 10 Green Belt Purposes and Functions | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | +++ | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 11 Green Belt Review - Yes | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ? | ---/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ |
| Issue 11 Green Belt Review - No | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ? | -/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ---/-/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ---/? | ~ |
| Issue 13 Rural Settlement Categories | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | +++ | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|--|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 14 Scale of Development i (Existing Approach) | - | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ |
| Issue 14 Scale of Development ii (Increased Numbers) | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | -/? | ~ | ~ | -/? | ~ | -/? | ~ |
| Issue 14 Scale of Development iii (More flexibility larger villages) | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | +/? | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure | |
|---|---------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Issue 14 Scale of Development iv (No numerical limits) | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ---/? | ~ | ~ | ---/? | ~ | ---/? | ~ | |
| Issue 15 Frameworks i (retain) | + / +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | +++ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | |
| Issue 15 Frameworks ii (retain but greater flexibility) | - / ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | - / ? | - / ? | - / ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | - | ~ | |
| Issue 15 Frameworks iii (delete frameworks) | - / --- | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | - / ? | - / ? | - / ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | --- / - / ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | --- / - / ? | ~ |

Issue 7: Localism and Relationship with Neighbourhood Development Plans

A further step towards encouraging community involvement in planning, has potential to support achievement of the community involvement objective.

Issue 8: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development – Previously Developed Land

Primary goal of policy would be to seek to re-use previously developed land, it would therefore have potential to contribute significantly to the achievement of the land objective, although it is noted in the Scoping Report that previously developed land opportunities in the district are relatively limited. References to sustainable locations indicate a positive impact on the sustainable transport objective, and accessibility to services. Reference to 'not of high environmental value' also indicates biodiversity issue would be taken into account. Whether such principles are in a standalone policy, or a general sustainable development policy is largely a procedural matter.

Issue 9: Development Strategy

The option considers a range of broad strategies for growth. Actual impacts on many objectives would depend on the specific site options identified for development, and are explored elsewhere.

An edge of Cambridge (option i) would involve Green Belt development. As Green Belt is designated to protected landscape and townscape character, a significant negative impact on the objective has been identified, although the scale and nature of the impact would vary. In terms of sustainable transport this option has the best potential to support journeys by sustainable modes, by proving homes closest to the largest concentration of jobs (Cambridge). It also has a positive impact on the access to services and facilities objective.

The new settlement (option ii) has potential to address transport, as the quantity of development could enable significant transport investment. If designed as a sustainable settlement, it could also be developed with a mix of uses with both employment delivering jobs locally and its own services and facilities of higher order than with village focused development, although it will still provide homes a greater distance from Cambridge than the Cambridge focused option. Impact on landscape would again depend on the site, but the scale of a new settlement means in is likely to have a significant negative impact on the landscape objective.

The sustainable village focus (option iii) would focus development on the rural settlements where there is the best access to services and facilities and best public transport, rather than smaller villages where they would be less available. However, the distances to Cambridge would be greater than the Cambridge focused option. There are likely to be less opportunities to deliver sustainable transport than the new settlement option. Impact on the landscape could be less, as it may result in smaller sites and greater distribution of development, but village expansions could still impact on village character. The most sustainable villages are located in the Green Belt close to Cambridge. This could therefore mean a review of the Green Belt, or development in the next band of settlements, which have a lower level of services and facilities.

A combined approach (option iv) is more difficult to assess, as the balance between the options will determine how it performs against the sustainability objectives.

An option considering less sustainable villages (group and infill villages) was considered (option v). This would have significant adverse impacts on access to services and facilities, employment, and sustainable transport. This option has therefore been rejected.

Issue 10: Green Belt

Green Belt functions and purposes of the Green Belt are primarily focused on landscape and townscape setting.

Issue 11: Considering Exceptional Circumstances for a Green Belt Review

In order to provide comparison two options have been appraised, one considering general impacts or a review (yes), an another considering the impacts of not reviewing the green belt (no). The impacts of a Green Belt review are similar to those described in the development strategy options above. Development, depending on the scale and location, has potential for significant negative impact on the landscape and townscape. There could also be impact on biodiversity objectives. However, given the best access to services and facilities will be on the edge of Cambridge, or in rural centres located in the green belt, this has the most potential to address sustainable travel objectives.

Issue 12: Cambridge Green Belt Locations

Addressed below.

Issue 13: Rural Settlement Hierarchy

The focus of this appraisal has been the principle of including the settlement hierarchy. It is difficult to consider in detail the individual positions. The options have been identified reviewing the access to public transport, education, services and facilities and employment, with a detailed review in a separate evidence paper. Taking on board these issues means that the hierarchy has been designed to reflect a number of the sustainability objectives: access to services and facilities, access to work, and sustainable travel. Location and scale of development is addressed by other options.

Issue 14: Scale of Housing Development at Villages

Option i. Existing Approach - Would continue to restrict the scale of development in smaller villages, which indicates a positive impact for access to services, facilities and employment by focusing development into more accessible areas. By restricting the scale of development proposals in many villages, it could be restricting the use of previously developed land opportunities.

Option ii. Increased Numbers – proposes to increase thresholds, allowing larger developments at minor rural centres, but also would result in potentially larger scale developments in smaller villages. This could have negative impacts on access to services, employment, and use of sustainable travel objectives, as services and facilities in these smaller villages are limited.

Option iii. More Flexibility at larger villages - proposes a greater flexibility for minor rural centres and potentially better served group villages, retaining the higher limits from option ii in Group and Infill villages. Public transport services are limited in some of these villages, but they do have a range of basic services.

Option iv. Remove Numerical limits for all categories - could enable significant scale of development in smaller villages, although this is mitigated by the requirement to have regard to village character. Providing greater flexibility in smaller villages does have greater potential to meet rural housing needs, and to make the most of opportunities to utilise previously developed land. Option would create significant potential for larger scales of development in more rural areas where there are limited public transport services, services and facilities. It therefore has potential for significant negative impact on objectives relating to access to services and facilities, access to employment, and sustainable travel.

Issue 15: Approach to Village Frameworks

Option i. Retain village frameworks - Development frameworks restrict growth on the outer edges of settlements, they therefore perform a role in minimising loss of agricultural land. They protect the character of settlements by preventing gradual expansion of villages, and loss of historic character. They also play a role in restricting the scale of development taking place at villages, particularly smaller ones, which has a positive impact on the sustainable transport objective by focusing development into more accessible locations.

Option ii. Retain village frameworks but include policies that allow small scale development adjacent to village frameworks where certain criteria are met - Retaining frameworks but allowing small scale development if certain criteria are met could have a cumulative impact on scale of development in less sustainable villages. Impact of individual developments would to a great extent depend on the criteria, but if not applied appropriately there could be negative impact on landscape and townscape objectives.

Option iii. Delete the current village frameworks entirely and provide greater flexibility for some development on the edge of villages controlled through a written policy - If frameworks were removed, the impact would depend on other policy controls to address potential negative impact of

unconstrained growth on the edges of villages. Without controls it could impact on landscape and settlement character. It could potentially enable more development, but equally could negatively impact on the delivery of affordable housing exception sites. It could also have cumulative impacts on the scale of development taking place in the less sustainable villages, where there is limited access to services and facilities is a consideration, which could have a negative impact on the sustainable transport objective. Additional development could potentially make some contribution towards helping to support retention and investment in services and facilities in smaller villages, but it is uncertain whether the low quantity of development envisaged would make any significant difference given national trends.

Green Belt Locations (issue 12)

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|------------|-------------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Location 1 | - / - -- | ~ | ? | ? | ? | ? | --- | ~ | ~ | ~ | --- / ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ~ | +++ | ~ | ? | +++ | ? | + / +++ | ? |
| Location 2 | - / - -- | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ? | --- | ? | ~ | ~ | --- / ~ | ~ | ~ | -- /? | ? | ~ | +++ | ~ | ? | +++ | ? | +++ | ? |
| Location 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Location 4 | - / - -- | ~ | ? | ~ | ? | ? | --- | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ~ | +++ | ~ | ? | +++ | ? | +++ | ? |
| Location 5 | - / - -- | ~ | ? | ? | ? | ? | --- / - | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ~ | +++ | ~ | ? | +++ | ? | +++ | ? |
| Location 6 | - / - -- | ~ | ? | ? | ? | --- / ? | --- | ? | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ~ | +++ | ~ | ? | +++ | ? | +++ | ? |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|-------------|-------------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Location 7 | - / - -- | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ? | --- / - | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ~ | +++ | ~ | ? | +++ | ? | + / +++ | ? |
| Location 8 | - / - -- | ~ | ? | ~ | ? | ? | -- | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ~ | +++ | ~ | ? | +++ | ? | +++ | ? |
| Location 9 | - / - -- | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ? | --- | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ~ | +++ | ~ | ? | +++ | ? | + / +++ | ? |
| Location 10 | - / - -- | ~ | - / ? | ~ | ? | ? | --- | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ~ | +++ | ~ | ? | +++ | ? | +++ | ? |

Issue 12: Green Belt Locations

The Sustainability Appraisal focuses on general locations around the edge of Cambridge. As general locations, the scale or location of development could vary considerably, and therefore this could impact on specific impacts. This is reflected in the sustainability appraisal findings, with the uncertainty reflected in many of the impacts. Specific issues that could be relevant are highlighted in the appraisal test below, or the issues and options report itself. A further consultation on specific site options within the general locations will take place later in 2012, and these specific sites will be subject to sustainability appraisal. The appraisal also does not consider sites wholly within Cambridge City. These are addressed by the Sustainability appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan.

NOTE: Detailed site assessments, and maps can be found in appendix 2 of the Issues and Options Report.

Some general issues apply to the sites:

- All the general locations could involve development of agricultural land grades 2 or 3, with the scale of impact dependent on the scale of development.
- Large scale development has the potential to contribute to green infrastructure, and therefore the access to green spaces objective, but this cannot be determined at this stage. Similar issues apply to the public open space objective, although where the location includes existing open spaces within Cambridge City, this has been highlighted as a potential negative impact.
- A number of heritage assets have been identified in and around the general locations. Impact would depend on location and site design.
- All the sites have potential to deliver housing, or employment, but contribution would depend on scale and nature of site specific proposals.
- The benefits of a Cambridge Edge location are apparent with all sites, indicated by positive impacts on access to services and facilities, and access to work objectives.
- The Issues and Options assessments identify further infrastructure requirements dependent on the scale of development. Equally information for highways authorities indicates further information would be required to assess detailed site impacts, but it would be likely all could require investment in public transport and road infrastructure.

Broad Location 1: Land to the North & South of Barton Road

North of Barton Road there is an area of land in Flood Zone 3, but in the broad location there is land that avoids this area. Air quality and noise issues near to the M11 could need mitigation, but impact on any mitigation required would depend on any specific site location. Hedgerows east of M11 are a County Wildlife Site and several hedgerows within this location are designated as a City Wildlife Site. It would be possible to appropriately locate a site and mitigate impact. Archaeological remains of various dates have been noted. Landscape assessments identify that development would have a high landscape impact.

Being close to Cambridge means it has potential to promote sustainable travel, although services along Barton Road are currently limited (less than hourly). It is several hundred metres to existing local centre at Newnham, but larger development could incorporate new local centre. Development could put pressure on existing transport infrastructure, particularly M11 junction. This would need investment in transport infrastructure to support travel by sustainable modes.

Broad Location 2: Playing Fields off Granchester Road Newnham

Areas near to the city boundary are in flood zone 3. Development would result in loss of public open space within Cambridge. The site assessment notes that the hedgerows and river meadows are important for wildlife, and there are several protected trees in the area and a listed building. Landscape assessments identify that the location is very important to the setting of the City and for the purposes of Green Belt. Existing highway access constraints would require mitigation, additional information would be required before the extent of mitigation required could be identified.

Broad Location 3: Land West of Trumpington Road

Entirely within Cambridge City.

Broad Location 4: Land West of Hauxton Road

Traffic on the M11 generates noise and affects local air quality, further assessment would be required, taking account of the extent of any development. There is a Scheduled Monument (Romano British settlement) just outside the site to the north west. Landscape assessment notes that views from the M11 are important in Green Belt terms, the landscape foreground between the M11 and the new urban edge increases in importance in terms of setting of the City. The location is around 400m from existing centre. It is reasonably well served by public transport, road infrastructure would require further investigation.

Broad Location 5: Land South of Addenbrooke's Road

Traffic on the M11 generates noise and affects local air quality, which could require significant mitigation measures, and further assessment would be required. There is a County Wildlife Site (River Cam) on the southern boundary of the area., and a Scheduled Ancient Monument on southern part of the site. The Shelford Road frontage opposite Walden Way and Hobsons Acre, in the south east corner of the location, is designated an Important Countryside Frontage. There are several Tree Preservation Orders along the boundary with Great Shelford. Development would need to consider impact on existing properties on Shelford Road. The River Cam flood plain lies at southern extreme of the location, north of Great Shelford, so it would be capable of development whilst avoiding this area. Landscape impact is again identified as significant, but identifies areas that there areas where impacts would be lower. The area has good access to public transport, but improvements would be required. Impact on road infrastructure would need further investigation.

Broad Location 6: Land South of Addenbrooke's & between Babraham Road and Shelford Road

The hedgerows, drainage ditches and tree belts are important for wildlife. Public Rights of Way runs to the south west of this location towards Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve. The area is adjacent to a number of nature conservation designations including the hedgerow to the north, which is a City Wildlife site. The area is of strategic importance for Countywide Green Infrastructure. This is a project, which proposes the restoration of part of the area to chalk grassland under the adopted 2011 Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy. Predetermination works are required to obtain information on the character and significance of the archaeology in this area. The area was characterised in landscape assessments as essential to the special character and setting of Cambridge, and development could therefore have a significant negative impact on the landscape objective.

The Highways Agency have commented that this location has the potential advantage of dispersed trip-making patterns in relation to the Strategic Road Network, is likely to be well related to central Cambridge for much of its trip-making. There will be a requirement for transport modelling to consider wider strategic impact.

Broad Location 7: Land between Babraham Road & Fulbourn Road

The location is adjacent to the Limekiln Pit & East Pit Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Roadside verges of Limekiln Hill & Worts Causeway are a County Wildlife Site as is Netherhall Farm. There are areas of Archaeological interest nearby. The area was noted as of Strategic Importance in 2011 Green Infrastructure Strategy. The area was characterised in landscape assessments as essential to the special character and setting of Cambridge, and development could therefore have a significant negative impact on the landscape objective. However it also notes that the low lying flat land on the southwest and northeast fringes of the location has the least significance for landscape quality and for Green Belt purposes. Site is beyond 400 metres to nearest local centre, but large scale development would be likely to require new facilities.

Broad Location 8: Land east of Gazelle Way

There are two Scheduled Monuments in the vicinity, to north east (moated site at Manor Farm), and to the south east (settlement site at Caudle Farm). South Cambridgeshire's Green Belt Study identifies that the land is essential to the special character and setting of Cambridge. Its development has therefore been classified as a significant negative impact on the landscape objective. The nearest local facilities are within 400m, but large scale development would be likely to require new facilities.

Broad Location 9: Land at Fen Ditton

Traffic on the A14 generates noise and affects local air quality, which would require further assessment. Some parts of the location form an important part of the setting of Fen Ditton Conservation Area and several Listed Buildings (Grades II* and II). Fleam Dyke Scheduled Monument and SSSI lies to the east of the village. There are archaeological remains from various periods. Areas of Important Countryside Frontages have been designated along Ditton Lane, High Ditch Road and High Street. South Cambridgeshire's Green Belt assessment identified the area as landscape essential to the setting and special character of Cambridge. Development would reduce the separation of the village from the city. The nearest services would be in Fen Ditton. There are very limited existing public transport facilities, that would need improvement. Development could increase pressure on road infrastructure, and further assessment would be required.

Broad Location 10: Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road

The A14 runs along the northern boundary, with associated traffic noise and air quality issues. Parts of site are within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). This has been reflected in the potential negative impact on the air quality objective. The location adjoins an existing planned major development, known as NIAB2. Development would result in coalescence of Girton with NIAB 2. This makes the openness of landscape in this area important in green belt and landscape terms. Development could also reduce countryside access available to the new residents.

5. Development Options

See separate site appraisal annex.

6. Climate Change

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|---|------|---------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 17 Climate Change | ~ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | +++ | +++ | + | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ? | + | + | + | ~ |
| Issue 18 Renewable Energy Ai | + | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | + | + | ~ | +++ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 18 Renewable Energy Aii | + | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | +/ +++ | + | ~ | +/ +++ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 18 Renewable Energy B | ? | +/ ? | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | +/ +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 19 i On Site Renewable Energy | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ~ | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|--|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 19 ii On Site Renewable Energy | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 19 iii On Site Renewable Energy | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 20 Community Energy Fund i (Yes) | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + / +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 20 Community Energy Fund ii (no) | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 21 Sustainable Design i (Building Regs) | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|--|----------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 21 Sustainable Design ii (Code 4) | + | + | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | + | ~ | + | ~ | ? | + | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | + | ~ |
| Issue 21 Sustainable Design iii (Code 5 for major sites) | + | + | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | +++ | +++ | ~ | + | ~ | ? | + | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | + | ~ |
| Issue 22 Sustainable Showhomes i | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 22 Sustainable Showhomes ii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 22 Sustainable Showhomes iii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 23 Construction Methods i | + / ++++ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|--|-------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 23 Construction Methods ii | - / ? | - / ? | - / ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | - / ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 24 Water Efficiency i (building regs) | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 24 Water Efficiency ii (code 4) | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 24 Water Efficiency iii (code 5) | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | + / +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | - / ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 25 Water Quality | ~ | ~ | +++ | +++ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 26 SuDS | ? | ~ | + | ~ | + / +++ | + | + | ~ | + | ? | +++ | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 27 Flood Risk | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |

Issue 17: Mitigation and Adaption to Climate Change

An overarching policy option, that would seek to integrate the principles climate change mitigation and adaptation into development decisions. Such a policy clearly has potential to have a significant positive impact on a range of the sustainability objectives.

Issue 18: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Developments

Both options seek to maximise the generation of renewable and low carbon energy in the district, contributing to the climate change mitigation objective, whilst seeking environmental protection, and therefore contributing to a range of other objectives. The criteria proposed includes impact on high grade agricultural land, and has therefore been scored as a positive impact, although given limited amount of previously developed land available in the district, if renewable energy is to be maximised, it could require use of greenfield land. The key difference is the 2km separation distance for wind farms (Aii). This could apply a greater level of protection to residential amenity and the built environment, but it could also rule out larger areas of the district from being suitable for wind farms. As the Cambridgeshire Renewable Infrastructure Framework identified wind as a major source of renewable energy in the district, it could impact on the ability to achieve the highest levels of renewable energy.

Identification of future growth areas and new settlements as potentially suitable locations for the inclusion of renewable or low carbon district heating systems (B) could support delivery of renewable energy. Actual scale of impact would depend on implementation, and the opportunities created by the particular package of sites identified, but there is potential for significant positive impact on the climate change mitigation objective. Impact on air quality has been identified as uncertain, as it would depend on the form of renewable energy, and implementation. Impact biomass on air quality would need to be considered and managed. Some types of combined heat and power could reuse waste streams, and therefore have potential to support the re-use of waste. Supporting renewable energy also relates to the clean-tech sector, a developing cluster in the area, so there could be a positive impact on economic objectives.

Issue 19 Renewables in New Developments

Seeking 10% or more on-site renewables (option i) has the potential to contribute significantly to the climate change objective given the scale of development options proposed. Given the majority of development is likely to come from larger sites, applying a size threshold (option ii) would reduce the overall scale of renewables achieved, but across the district it would still be significant. Uncertainty has been identified in the townscape and landscape and historic environment objective, due to the visual impact, but other options, such as securing good design would mitigate this. The evidence base suggests that going beyond 10% would require technologies in addition to solar water heating, and could cause issues regarding viability, which could impact on the delivery of housing objective. Not including a policy (option iii) would not secure these benefits.

Issue 20: Community Energy Fund

Offers a specific method of delivering renewable energy off site, which has the potential to have a positive impact on delivery of renewable energy locally, and therefore climate change mitigation. Including the scheme (option i) could mean more benefits are secured locally, and offer a higher degree of local control regarding how renewable energy is implemented. Scale of impact would depend on take up, as there are likely to be alternative schemes available.

Issue 21: Sustainable Design and Construction

The Code for Sustainable Homes and the BREEAM standard for non-domestic buildings set a range of requirements for standard of development. The most significant differentiation of higher levels of the code is higher standards for water and energy efficiency. Higher levels of the code set more stringent standards, but also result in higher development costs, this uncertainty of the impact on developments reflected against the housing and economy objectives. The impact of high code levels may be particularly apparent on small developments. The Sustainability appraisal has considered the impacts of requiring code 4 (option ii), or code 5 on the Code for sustainable homes in major developments (option iii), and equivalent standards using the BREEAM rating for non-domestic buildings. The Code does not just address energy and water, but points are available for a range of other issues which would positively impact on a range of other sustainability objectives. Requiring code 5 (option ii) would have the most potential for significant positive impacts, although it would depend on the development strategy, and how much development is planned at major sites.

If the plan instead relied on building regulations (option i), there are already national plans to increase energy standards up to 2016, but as these would be achieved anyway, the impact has been scored as neutral.

Issue 22: Sustainable Showhomes

Requiring sustainable showhomes (option ii) could have a positive impact on climate change mitigation and adaption objectives. Scale of benefit would depend on uptake of additional sustainability measures, but it is likely to be minor compared with options that would require higher standards in the construction process. Setting a size threshold (option iii) would mean smaller sites would not be required to provide sustainable showhome, but the low threshold would still mean the majority of development would be supported by a sustainable showhome.

Issue 23: Construction Methods

Including a policy (option i) has the potential to provide greater protection to amenity and health, and would seek to protect soils, contributing to achievement of the land objective. If the issues were not addressed in the plan (option ii) there could potentially be negative impacts on achievement of the objectives.

Issue 24: Water efficiency of New Housing

Relying on building regulations (option i) offers some benefits over the average usage, but does not respond to the evidence base highlighted in the Scoping Report that the district sits within an area of serious water stress. 105 litres per day (option ii) offers additional savings at relatively low cost, but does not offer the water saving benefits of 80 litres per day (option iii). Requiring 80 litres per day would significantly reduce the water use of new dwellings, although actual usage will still be influenced by behaviour, i.e. how people choose to use water. The Water Cycle Strategy illustrated that there may be increased carbon emissions, due to pumping of water in water recycling measures, but using less also means less has to be supplied and heated in the home. Delivering higher standards would also have implications for development costs, which could impact on viability and achievement of the housing objective. Seeking water efficiency from non-domestic buildings offers benefits for water saving and therefore the adapting to climate change objective.

Issue 25 Water Quality

Option proposes to support achieving requirements of the Water Framework Directive. This is an important issue in the district given the existing water quality issues identified in the Scoping Report. It aims to ensure appropriate infrastructure is in place, to avoid water pollution and protect water quality, but improvements to hydromorphology could impact positively on habits and species, and also improve the appearance of places.

Issue 26 Sustainable Drainage Systems / Managing Flooding

Given the scale of new planned development, implementation of SUDS could have significant positive impacts. There is a clear positive contribution to achieving the climate change adaptation objective by managing water effectively, but as described in the option, SUDS can offer a host of benefits to biodiversity, and providing amenity. There is an uncertain impact on land objective because SUDS could require more space than piped systems, but with good design and dual use of space this could be minimised.

Issue 27: Flood Risk

Managing flood risk is a key element of climate change adaptation, but there are consequential benefits to other objectives, including human health. Given the scale of issues identified in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, the impact of ensuring flood risk is properly assessed is a significant positive impact on the climate change adaptation objective.

7. Delivering High Quality Places

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|---|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 28 Securing High Quality Design A | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | +++ | + | +++ | +++ | +++ | + | + | +++ | +++ | + | + | +++ | +++ | + | + | + | ~ | +++ | +++ |
| Issue 28 Securing High Quality Design B | -/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 29 Public Art | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |

Issue 28 Securing High Quality Design

Option A proposes the inclusion of comprehensive policies to set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area, and that development must be of high quality design and make a positive contribution to its local and wider surroundings. It includes seven design principles. Principles address a wide range of issues with the overall aim of achieving good design, but good design has implications for delivery of most of the sustainability objectives. Given the scale of development proposed, impacts of such a policy could be significant. Wider economic benefits have been noted, as a high quality environment can contribute to economic development, contributing to what makes the area special. The contribution to human health objective is also notable, with the support of the Health Impact Assessment process to aid its

implementation. Ensuring environments are accessible to all will support delivery of the redressing inequalities objective. The delivery, and the significance of the impact, will depend on site specific implementation, but there are potential significance positive impacts for a range of objectives.

Option B seeks views on whether the Local Plan provides guidance on design of streets to improve the public realm, including minimum street widths and street trees. This has the potential to support the landscape and townscape objective, and the creation of good spaces that work well. It could impact on density, and therefore the amount of land to deliver the level of development selected, although the scale of impact is uncertain, as it would depend on site specific implementation through the design process. The planting of trees could support biodiversity. It could also create areas of shade, which could aid adaptation to climate change.

Option C seeks views on the District Design Guide. This has the potential to support achievement of good design and the benefits identified by option A.

Issue 29 Public Art

The existing policy has secured public art for a range of developments, contributing to objective of improving spaces and the built environment. The issue largely seeks views on the form public art should take.

8. Protecting and Enhancing the Historic and Natural Environment

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|--|---------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 30 Landscape Character | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | +++ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 31 Agricultural land | +++ / ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 32 Biodiversity | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | +++ | + | + | + | + | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 33 Green Infrastructure | ? | ~ | ~ | +++ | +++ | +++ | + | + | + | + | + | + | ~ | + | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | + | + | ~ |
| Issue 34 Impact of Development on Green Belt | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 35 Redevelopment in Green Belt i | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|---|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 35 Redevelopm ent in Green Belt ii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 36 Recreation in Green Belt | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 37 Protected Village Amenity Area | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | +++ | + | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 38 Local Green Space | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ? | ? | ? | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 39 Important Countryside Frontage | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | +++ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 40 Community Orchards | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | + | ~ | + | + | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 41 River Cam | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|--|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 42 Historic Assets | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 43 Assets of local importance | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 44 Heritage and Climate | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |

Issue 30: Landscape Character

The district has a varied landscape character, identified by five different National Character Areas. A policy to ensure landscape character is addressed would have significant positive impact on landscape character objective, but related positive impacts on wider environmental objectives.

Issue 31: Agricultural land

Including a policy to protect agricultural land would have positive benefits to the land objective, however the scale of impact will depend on implementation, as the issue notes this has to be balanced with other sustainability considerations, which will include meeting development needs. Much of the district is made up of high grade agricultural land. Retaining agricultural land may have wider benefits to other objectives, such as habitats and species.

Issue 32: Biodiversity

A policy would have significant positive impact on biodiversity objectives, but related positive impacts on wider environmental objectives.

Issue 33: Green Infrastructure

Green Infrastructure can contribute to delivery of a range of sustainability objectives. The Green Infrastructure Strategy identifies a number of large scale projects, with potential for significant positive benefits for achievement of the biodiversity objectives, but also providing access to the countryside and promoting healthy communities. There is an uncertain impact on land objective, as impact depends whether Green Infrastructure projects require the loss of agricultural land. It could also increase cost of development, which could impact on housing objectives, although viability issues are addressed in the issue.

Issue 34: Impact of Development on the Green Belt

The option would have a positive impact on achievement of landscape and townscape objectives, by seeking to mitigate impact of development of the Green Belt.

Issue 35: Redevelopment in the Green Belt

The National Planning Policy Framework addresses the issue of redevelopment in the Green Belt (option i), and its principles could be applied alongside other policies options proposed in this report, including those addressing high quality design, and landscape character. Providing more detailed design policy (option ii) could deliver extra protection for the qualities of the Green Belt, although the scale of the additional impact is unclear.

Issue 36: Green Belt and Recreation Uses

Avoiding over concentration of pitches could contribute to maintaining landscape character of the Green Belt, but it could impact on the delivery of pitches, or the delivery of housing numbers in development sites if those sites are constrained. The scale of such an impact would depend on site specific factors.

Issue 37: Protected Village Amenity Area

PVAA policy is a constraint to development which could harm settlement amenity. The scoping report identifies that a wide range of sites, of varying character have been identified using this designation. It would therefore have positive impacts on landscape and townscape character objective and other objectives which benefit from the protection of open spaces.

Issue 38: Local Green Space

The local green space designation offers protection to valuable open spaces, in some ways similar to the Protected Village Amenity policy. It could therefore have similar positive impacts, although the scale is currently uncertain, as it would depend on which sites were identified.

Issue 39: Important Countryside Frontage

Important Countryside Frontages aim to protect settlement character where the link to the open countryside is an important element. It therefore contributes primarily to the achievement of the landscape and townscape character objective.

Issue 40: Community Orchards

Positive impacts are identified for a range of environmental objectives, with benefits for wildlife as well as landscape and townscape. Trees also have benefits for climate change adaptation, providing shade. Additional benefits for health objective, as a source of healthy food. Orchards have a particular historic link to the district.

Issue 41: River Cam and other waterways

The option would support biodiversity and landscape objectives, whilst acknowledging wider role rivers play for recreation. As noted in the Scoping Report, the rivers play an important role in the district as wildlife corridors. The policy would need to consider the appropriate balance.

Issue 42: Heritage Assets

This option has a direct link to achieving the historic environment objective. Due to the volume of historic assets present in the district, including listed buildings, scheduled monuments, and many other undesignated assets, a policy ensuring impacts are properly assessed could have a significant positive impact. There would be wider impacts on achieving the landscape and townscape objective. It is not possible to differentiate between the impacts of having a single policy, and the benefits of individual topic related policies.

Issue 43: Heritage assets of local importance

Providing information to support consideration of locally important heritage assets would support achievement of the historic environment objective. Wide range of heritage assets in the district was noted in the Scoping Report.

Issue 44: Heritage Assets and Adapting to Climate Change

The option seeks to balance the need for climate change mitigation with the protection of heritage assets. It therefore seeks to achieve both relevant sustainability objectives. References to least harm could mean compromise, albeit minor, to the heritage assets objective. Views are sought on where the balance lies, the appraisal therefore reflects this uncertainty.

9. Delivering High Quality Homes

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|--------------------------------------|---------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 45 Housing Density i | +++ / ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | +++ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 45 Housing Density ii | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + / +++ | ~ | +++ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ |
| Issue 45 Housing Density iii | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + / +++ | ~ | +++ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | +++ | ~ |
| Issue 46 Housing Mix i – no guidance | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | - / ? | - / ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 46 Housing Mix ii - market | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + / +++ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 46 Housing Mix iii 10 or more | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + / +++ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 46 Housing Mix iv - Balance | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + / +++ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|---|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|-----------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 47 Mobility i | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | - | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 47 Mobility ii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | +/ +++ | +/ +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 48 Affordable Housing A i | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 48 Affordable Housing A ii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | +++ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 48 Affordable Housing B Threshold | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | +++ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 49 Exception Sites A i | - | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | +/ ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | +++ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 49 Exception Sites A ii | - | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | -/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | +++ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 49 Exception Sites B | - | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|--|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 50 Space Standards i | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 50 Space Standards ii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 50 Space Standards iii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 51 Extensions in countryside i | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 51 Extensions in countryside ii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 51 Extensions in countryside iii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 52 Replacement Dwellings i | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 52 Replacement Dwellings ii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|---------------------------------|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 53 Gardens i | -/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | -/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 53 Gardens ii | ~/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 54 Reuse i | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 54 Reuse ii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 55 Home Working i | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | +/? | ~ | + | ~ |
| Issue 55 Home Working ii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | + | ~ |
| Issue 56 Exceptional Quality i | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | - | ~ |
| Issue 56 Exceptional Quality ii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | - | ~ |
| Issue 57 G&T i | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | ~ | +++ | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 57 G&T ii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++/? | ~ | ~ | +++/? | +++/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++/? | ~ | + | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|------------------------------|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 57 G&T iii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 57 G&T iv | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | ~ | +++ | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | + / +++ | ~ |
| Issue 58 Rural Enterprise i | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 58 Rural Enterprise ii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ |

Issue 45: Housing Density

All three options seek efficient use of land, therefore contributing to achievement of the land objective, although there is a higher degree of uncertainty associated with providing no specific guidance (option i), as it would not establish a minimum. By using land efficiency, the option could contribute to the landscape and townscape objective. Given the requirements to deliver good design, proposed in other options, it cannot be assumed that higher densities would have a negative impact on the creating good spaces objective. All options appear to offer flexibility to reflect local townscape character. Alongside this density needs to be balanced with climate change mitigation, and the delivery of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although with good design and dual use of spaces both should be achievable. Seeking higher densities in accessible locations (option iii) would contribute to focusing development where sustainable travel can be achieved, and support access to employment.

Issue 46: Housing Mix – House types

Not including a policy regarding housing mix (option i) could risk achievement of the housing objective, as it could mean the mix is not adequate to ensure housing needs are met for the range of needs identified, particularly for smaller dwellings, as the trend historically in the district has been for delivery of larger dwellings unless policy required a greater mix. This could have wider impacts for the inclusive communities objectives, as it could impact on equalities related to income. Seeking to balance demographic trends with preferences for smaller homes (option iv) would address a number of these issues, and could positive impact on achievement of the housing objective, by seeking deliver of appropriate house types and sizes.

Applying mix to market housing only (option ii) would leave the mix of the affordable housing to be determined by actual identified needs on housing lists, which could therefore provide some additional benefit that actual needs are being reflected.

Not applying to developments under 10 (option iii) would miss opportunities to address smaller sites, and as a result could impact on mix achieved in smaller villages, but overall it is likely the bulk of housing will be delivered through larger sites. It could give additional flexibility to address viability issues on smaller sites, or flexibility to reflect the character of the local area (for example an infill plot or redevelopment).

Issue 47: Housing Mix – Flexible Housing to Support Reduced Mobility

Requiring 5% of market and all affordable housing to be lifetime homes standard (option ii) would have a significant positive impact on the redressing inequalities objective. This option would create higher costs for developers, and could increase the cost of new homes. Not setting a specific requirement (option i) and relying on building regulations could therefore have a negative impact on the redressing inequalities objective, by not requiring any provision in response to specific evidence identified in the Scoping Report that the population structure is ageing.

Issue 48: Affordable Housing

The highest option for delivery of affordable homes (option i) would make the greatest contribution to the housing objectives, reflecting the level of affordable housing need present in the district, however this has to be balanced with viability and deliverability. The alternative option (option ii) could provide greater flexibility to address viability, and could therefore actually support higher levels of housing delivery overall, although the proportion of affordable could be lower.

The threshold of two or more homes contributing to affordable housing also seeks to maximise contributions, therefore delivering a significant positive impact against the housing objective. Setting a slightly higher threshold of 3 dwellings (option iii) could support delivery of very small housing schemes, but overall impact on affordable housing would be relatively small, given the majority of development comes from larger schemes.

Issue 49: Exception Sites Affordable Housing

Exception sites are a mechanism of delivering affordable housing in rural communities, they therefore contribute to the housing and redressing inequalities objectives. If market housing could facilitate the delivery of higher numbers of affordable homes by addressing viability, this could have a greater impact, although the scale of this is not clear at this stage. All options could involve use of greenfield land on the edges of villages. Allowing a higher level of market housing (option Aii) could involve a greater scale of development to achieve the same number of affordable dwellings, although impact on landscape and townscape would be addressed by other policy options.

Option B could provide greater flexibility to enable housing needs to be met more effectively.

Issue 50: Residential Space Standards

Setting residential space standards could help to deliver spaces that work well, meeting housing needs more effectively and promote healthy communities. It is difficult to quantify the scale of the impact beyond what the market would deliver anyway, but a policy would ensure a minimum standard is met. Including standards in a local plan (option ii) may provide greater certainty regarding implementation than including standards in a supplementary planning document (option iii), but less ability to adapt if circumstances change.

Issue 51: Extensions to dwellings in the Countryside

All three options propose to control the impact of extensions to dwellings, therefore have a positive impact on the landscape and townscape objective. Option iii would have a positive impact on housing objectives by allowing buildings to be used more flexibly to create an additional dwelling, although there could be consequential impacts on promoting sustainable travel.

Issue 52: Replacement dwellings in the countryside

Both options propose to enable replacement dwellings in the countryside, but offer alternative methods of ensuring protection of the landscape. Keeping a size restriction (option i) would provide greater certainty, but a more flexible policy (option ii) with appropriate policy guidance could also achieve the objectives, whilst enabling greater flexibility regarding the design of homes.

Issue 53: Development of residential gardens

Both options propose methods of ensuring redevelopment of residential gardens contributes to creating good spaces and enhancement of the townscape. It is assumed that other policies in the plan will address landscape and townscape issues. The first option (option i) appears to set a stronger presumption against development. This could mean additional land may be needed to accommodate the scale of development needed in the district as there could be less recycling of land within villages. It could mean less garden land is developed, which could have a positive impact for biodiversity, although this will be balanced if other land is required elsewhere to compensate.

Issue 54: Re-use of buildings in the countryside

Having a specific policy (option ii) may create greater certainty that impact on landscape and townscape would be taken into account. Enabling reuse for residential could impact on availability of such buildings for employment uses. A policy could provide greater certainty regarding the circumstances when a residential use will be acceptable. A policy could also consider wider issues, including access to services and facilities, and transport.

Issue 55: Working at Home

Both options propose different ways of supporting home working. Home working could reduce the need to travel, supporting achievement of the sustainable travel objective. It is difficult to differentiate impacts, but having a policy (option ii) may create additional certainty that negative impacts would be considered.

Issue 56: Countryside dwellings of exceptional quality

Both options propose different ways of addressing proposals for countryside dwellings of exceptional quality. It is difficult to differentiate impacts, but having a policy (option ii) may create additional certainty. Enabling executive homes has been noted in studies of the local economy as necessary to support economic growth, but it will also create dwellings in less accessible locations which would have a negative impact on achieving sustainable transport. Impact on landscape and townscape would also need to be a key consideration in the design process.

Issue 57: Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople accommodation

Meeting the housing needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, as identified in needs assessments, would contribute significantly to the objective of ensuring that everyone has access to decent homes, and redressing inequalities. Enabling provision of

accommodation will also support achievement of the human health objective, and access to employment. Relying on windfalls for travelling Showpeople accommodation (option ii) would create less certainty.

Due to high numbers of existing pitches in the district and low numbers in some surrounding areas, delivery of some pitches in surrounding areas (option iii) could provide greater equity, and choice for the travelling community. It could also mean needs are met further from where they were identified, or deliver greater uncertainty.

Delivery of pitches in association with major developments (option iv) mean they are delivered in accessible locations (subject to site selection), and could further help redress inequalities by supporting community interaction.

Issue 58: Dwellings to support a Rural Based Enterprise

Both options would enable dwellings to support a rural based enterprise, thus supporting economic objectives. It is difficult to differentiate between the two options, although including a policy within the local plan (option i) may create greater certainty that impacts will be fully addressed.

10. Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|--|---------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 59 New Employment Cambridge i | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + / ? | ~ | + / ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | +++ | ? | +++ | + |
| Issue 59 New Employment Cambridge ii | - / --- | ~ | ? | ? | ? | ? | - / --- | ? | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ / ? | +++ / ? | ? | +++ / ? | + / ? |
| Issue 59 New Employment Cambridge iii | ? | ~ | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ / ? | +++ / ? | ? | +++ / ? | + / ? |
| Issue 59 New Employment Cambridge iv | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | - / ? | - / ? | ? | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 60 Employment Allocations A | ~ / + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | ? | ~ |
| Issue 60 Employment Allocations B | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | - | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|---------------------------------|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 61 LDO | ? | ? | ? | ~ | ? | ~ | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | +/? | ? | ? | ? |
| Issue 62 Limitations Option i | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ? | ? | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 62 Limitations Option ii | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ? | ? | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 62 Limitations Option iii | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ? | ? | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 62 Limitations Option iv | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ? | ? | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 62 Limitations Option v | -/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | -/? | ? | ? | ~ | -/? |
| Issue 63 Promotion of Clusters | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | +++ | + | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 64 Social Spaces | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | + | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 65 Broadband | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | + | + | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|---------------------------------------|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 66 Established Employment | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | +++ | + | ? | ~ |
| Issue 67 Employment in villages i | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | +++ | +++ | + | + | ~ |
| Issue 67 Employment in villages ii | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | +++ | +++ | + | +/? | ~ |
| Issue 68 Edge of Settlements A i | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | + | + | + | +/? | ~ |
| Issue 68 Edge of Settlements A ii | - | ~ | ~ | ~ | -/? | ~ | -/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | + | + | + | +/? | ~ |
| Issue 69 Extensions businesses i | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | -/? | -/? | -/? | + | ~ |
| Issue 69 Extensions businesses ii | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | + | + | + | - | ~ |
| Issue 70 Conversion | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | + | + | + | -/? | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|--|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Rural Buildings for employment A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Issue 70 Conversion Rural Buildings for employment B | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | -/? | ~ |
| Issue 71 Farm Diversification | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | + | + | + | + | ~ |
| Issue 72 Retention of employment sites A i | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | -/? | + | ~ | ~ | + / +++ | + / +++ | ? | + | ~ |
| Issue 72 Retention of employment sites A ii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | -/? | + | ~ | ~ | + / +++ | + / +++ | ? | + | ~ |
| Issue 73 Tourist Accommodation | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | + | + | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure | |
|--|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|
| ion A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Issue 73 Tourist Accommodat ion B | + | ~ | ~ | -/? | ~ | ~ | -/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | + | - | ~ | |
| Issue 74 Tourist facilities A | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ? | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | + | ~ | ~ | |
| Issue 74 Tourist facilities B | -/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ? | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | + | -/? | ~ | |
| Issue 75 Retail Hierarchy | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | +++ | ~ | +++ | + | + | +++ | ~ | |
| Issue 76 Assessing impact of retail Proposals i | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | -/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | -/? | -/? | ~ | ? | ? | ? | -/? | ~ | |
| Issue 76 Assessing impact of retail Proposals ii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | +++ | ~ | + | + | + | +++ | ~ | |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|--|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 76 Assessing impact of retail Proposals iii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | +++ | ~ | + | + | + | +++ | ~ |
| Issue 77 Meeting Retail Needs | - | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | + | ~ | + | + | ~ |
| Issue 78 Village Shops | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | +++ | ~ | + | ~ | + | + | ~ |
| Issue 79 Retail in the Countryside | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | + | ~ | + | + | ~ |

Issue 59: New Employment Provision near Cambridge

Cambridge Northern Fringe East and Cambridge Science park provide an opportunity to deliver employment provision on previously developed land, in a highly accessible location. Reflecting the Employment Land Review, there are particular benefits to this location for supporting the continued success of the Cambridge area economy, hence the opportunity for significant positive impact on the economic objectives. Impacts on a number of objectives would depend on the form development would take, which would be addressed by other policies in the plan. There would be potential benefits to landscape and townscape and creating good places, as much of the land near Chesterton sidings is currently of poor quality. Opportunities to improve the science park could also be used to enhance the quality of the site.

Impact of additional employment land through development on the edge of Cambridge would depend on site specific issues. The general locations have been considered in the Spatial Strategy chapter, and those impacts, particularly on landscape and townscape (the Green Belt), and land, are identified against individual broad location options. In general employment land on the edge of Cambridge could provide highly accessible employment, and depending on scale could have a significant positive impact on economic objectives.

The need for employment provision in or on the edge of Cambridge was highlighted in the Employment Land Review. Not making provision (option iv) could therefore have negative impacts for the economic objectives.

Issue 60: Employment Allocations

Where development is partially complete the sites form the remaining part of existing employment parks (option A). These are largely integral to existing employment developments, minimising any wider impacts on landscape etc. On each of the sites the land is no longer used for agriculture. The Pampisford site is actually on the edge of Sawston, making it relatively accessible by sustainable transport. Over and Papworth sites are on the edge of better served group villages (subject to other options). Their relatively small remaining scale result in minor impacts.

Longstanton (option B) is the only site where development has not commenced. The site has been put forward through the 'call for sites', but is not identified as a site option in the Issues and Options Report. Development would have minor negative impacts on the landscape, that could not be fully mitigated. It is relatively close to the village, and also now relatively close to the Northstowe site. It was originally planned to provide mixed use development at Home Farm. The residential elements have now been completed, so the site could support local access to jobs. A further factor is Northstowe has been identified since the original planning of this site, which could provide an alternative source of employment.

Issue 61: Local Development Orders

Local Development Orders have the potential to support achievement of the economic objectives. Scale of the impact would depend on the nature of the site, and whether it has a direct impact on its delivery and success. Conditions may be required as part of the LDO, in order to ensure potential for negative impacts on a range of other objectives were appropriately addressed.

Issue 62: Limitations on the Occupancy of New Premises in South Cambridgeshire

Focus of the options is the measures that could be put in place to control the types of employment development permitted in the district. It is difficult to measure the scale of the impact of the selective management policy, although the local economy has developed successfully with the policy in place, it is not clear how it would have developed without it. Overall, a policy which reserves employment land to uses that need to be in the area would

minimise use of land and resources. There is some evidence that the current policy may hold back development of the high tech economy, and therefore permitting greater flexibility could have a more positive economic impact.

The impacts identified focus on the economic objectives, but the scores reflect the uncertainty regarding the scale of impact. Removal of the policy (option v) could have implications for warehousing and distribution, which is land intensive and could have transport implications, but the scale would depend on whether such firms chose to locate in the district, and the controls applied by other options.

Issue 63: The Promotion of Clusters

Clear focus of the option is to help to facilitate development and support the Cambridge area as an internationally recognised high tech centre. Potential for significant positive impacts on the achievement of economic objectives are therefore identified.

Issue 64: Shared social spaces as part of employment areas

Inclusion of social spaces in employment areas could support their development and vitality, and depending on the facility provide wider benefits, such as to health of workers.

Issue 65: Broadband

Ensuring developments can accommodate broadband, would have a positive impact on economic objectives. It could also support home working, which could have a positive impact on sustainable travel by reducing the need to travel to work.

Issue 66: Established Employment Areas in the Countryside

A policy identifying and supporting development in established areas in the countryside would enable the reuse and development of existing sites, therefore positive impacts on achievement of economic objectives, and also making best use of land. Cumulative impact of additional development on a site or district wide, would need to be considered, and the impacts of development on objectives such as landscape and townscape, are again addressed by other options. A negative impact has been identified against sustainable travel objective, due to the rural location of a number of sites. As they are all existing sites, the impact has not been classified as significant, but it would depend on the scale of development permitted. Other options regarding planning for sustainable travel would also be a consideration when considering proposals. Adding additional sites would have similar impacts.

Issue 67: New Employment Development in Villages

Both options support delivery of appropriately scaled employment in villages. This scores positively for efficient use of land, and the range of potential employment opportunities is reflected in potential for significant positive impacts on achievement of the economic objectives. It could also support sustainable transport, although there is some uncertainty, as delivery of jobs in villages may allow people to work where they live, but it may also encourage travel to villages where they may not have good public transport services. The options make a positive contribution to the inequalities objective, as supporting rural employment may contribute to addressing rurality issues identified in the Scoping Report, particularly for people who do not have access to a car, or need access to local jobs due to childcare commitments for example. The difference in the options is a strict limit in scale versus a site by site approach reflecting scale character and function of the villages. A single scale limit (option i) may not be appropriate to all villages, therefore its removal could better support economic growth, but the scale of difference in impact is unclear. There is greater uncertainty on the impact on the landscape and townscape objective without the specific scale criteria (option ii), but it refers to development being in keeping with scale and character.

Issue 68: New employment buildings on the edge of settlements

Flexibility to utilise previously developed land on the edge of and very close to villages (option Ai) would support land objectives, and further contribute to the economic objectives identified in issue 66. Impact on transport objectives is uncertain, as sites could be less accessible than more central sites in villages, but the options aim for sites that remain accessible by means other than the car.

Permitting use of greenfield land adjoining better served villages (option Aii) would have negative impact on the land objective. The more flexible option could further enable economic development. Controls identified on other options will be important to secure other objectives, such as biodiversity and landscape and townscape, as allowing further development on the edges of villages has potential for negative impact.

Requiring proposals to demonstrate there is no site available in the village (option B) could provide even greater support for the land objective, and sustainable transport. It could also support retention of existing employment sites, identified in issue 71.

Issue 69: Extensions to existing businesses in the countryside

A key difference of not including a policy to support extensions (option i) is a potentially negative effect on the growth of existing businesses, which could harm achievement of economic objectives. The scale of that impact is unclear, but there are a significant number of businesses located in the countryside.

If a policy supporting the extension of existing businesses is included (option ii), there are potential site by site impacts on biodiversity and landscape and townscape, and historic environment objectives. Appropriate criteria would need to be included in the policy or the wider plan to ensure these objectives are not compromised. There are potential negative impacts on achievement of sustainable transport objectives as more flexible option could create jobs in areas with limited alternatives to the car. It will be important that scale of impacts are considered if the option is selected.

If option ii is taken forward and a policy is developed, it will be important to refer to other objectives, or to issues addressed elsewhere, in particular, landscape, biodiversity and transport.

Issue 70: Conversion or replacement of Rural Buildings for Employment Uses

Allowing conversion or replacement of rural buildings (option A) has a positive impact on the land objective, by reusing existing land and buildings. There is potential support for heritage objectives if employment uses support retention of historic or character buildings. There is also positive impact on employment objectives, although impacts likely to be minor due to scale of the resource available, as many buildings have already been converted. However there could be a negative impact on sustainable transport objectives, as some buildings may be located in isolated areas. It will be important that any policy requires consideration of the scale of the transport impact (although this is addressed by other options). Equally there are potential site specific impacts on landscape and townscape, biodiversity and other objectives, addressed by other options.

Benefits of employment rather than residential relate to transport, as employment may generate less trips, although this depends on the scale of and nature of individual proposals. They also mean buildings are used to continue to support the rural economy.

Option B regarding extensions could help make buildings work better, whilst the option also refers to appropriate safeguards to protect rural character.

Issue 71: Farm Diversification

Potential to support reuse of existing buildings, making good use of existing farm resources, by supporting working farms. Positive support for economic objectives, by supporting the viability of working farms. Potential negative impact on sustainable transport, policies will need to ensure proposals are an appropriate scale for their location.

Issue 72: Retention of employment sites

Including a policy protecting village employment sites would benefit maintenance of mixed communities, by promoting retention of employment sites in villages. The Scoping Report identified a gradual loss of employment land and buildings occurring even with the policy. If no policy were included this rate could increase. Many settlements have relatively low level of jobs to economically active people, meaning high levels of out commuting is a necessity. If this balance was to worsen it would reduce access to local jobs further. Positive impact has been identified on the redressing inequalities objectives, as supporting retention of local jobs would help address rurality issues. However, it reduces flexibility regarding reuse of employment sites, and could impact on delivery of housing, although it is the wider role of the plan to meet housing needs.

Widening to encompass land on the edges of villages (option ii) could make the policy more effective where there is employment located on the edge of a village, therefore having a marginally greater impact on the economy objectives.

Changing the tests is a largely operational issue, proposed to make the policy more effective without altering its overall aim.

Issue 73: Tourist Accommodation

Both options support reuse of existing land and buildings. They would support economic objectives by delivering new accommodation, and a variety of jobs in rural areas. The key difference in the second option (option ii) is allowing use of previously developed land in the countryside, which would deliver greater flexibility. This flexibility could result in further small scale development in the countryside, in areas where there are limited alternatives to the car, which could have negative impact on the sustainable transport objective. There are a range of potential impacts that would depend on the location, but development in the countryside could negatively impact on landscape and townscape and biodiversity objectives if not appropriately located, and designed. This would need to be addressed carefully in any policy.

Issue 74: Tourist Facilities

The Scoping Report identified the important role of tourism in the South Cambridgeshire economy. Supporting development of attractions would therefore support the economic objectives. Similar to a number of options relating to development in the countryside, the option supporting development in the countryside could impact on sustainable transport objectives as it could increase journeys of visitors by car. Impact would depend on the scale of the development and the location. The Issues and Options Report makes specific reference to proposals not detrimentally impact on landscape, and that they must be in scale with the location.

Issue 75: Retail Hierarchy

Delivering a hierarchy of centres supports sustainable travel objectives, by ensuring large scale facilities are delivered in appropriately accessible locations where alternatives to the car are available.

Issue 76: Assessing the Impact of Retail Development

Ensuring the impact of significant retail development on viability and viability of existing centres is appropriately considered has positive benefits for the access to services and facilities objective, and creation places which work well by ensuring facilities an appropriate scale for their location. All three options are aiming to address this, but their effectiveness would vary. The default threshold (option i) may be too high to achieve the established goals in the South Cambridgeshire context, and could even have a negative impact by not requiring the impact of large stores to be

appropriately assessed. The lowest threshold (option iii) would provide the greatest certainty, but could also create additional cost for relatively small proposals.

Issue 77: Meeting Retail Needs

There is an identified need for improved provision of convenience shopping in North West Cambridge which this option should address. By enabling people to access food shopping locally it will contribute to sustainable transport objectives. Delivering appropriately scaled stores will also contribute to creating good spaces that work well.

Issue 78: Village Shops

Enabling development of appropriately scaled village shops would support a range of objectives particularly access to services and facilities. It would also support the redressing inequalities objectives by supporting development of services in rural areas.

Issue 79: Retail in the Countryside

The option proposes to restrict retail development in the countryside, with the aim of supporting vitality of existing centres, but giving flexibility to support rural businesses. It would contribute positively to the sustainable transport objective by restricting development in less accessible locations.

11. Promoting Successful Communities

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|--|-------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 80 Health Impact Assessments | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ |
| Issue 81 Protection of Village Services and Facilities | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | +++ | ~ | + | + | ~ | + | ~ |
| Issue 82 Developing New Communities | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | +++ | +++ | ~ | + | +++ | + | ~ |
| Issue 84: Community Stadium | - / ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | + / ? | ~ | ~ | + | + | + | ~ | + | ? | ~ |
| Issue 85 Ice Rink | - / ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | + | ? | ~ |
| Issue 86 Concert Hall | - / ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | + | ? | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|---|-------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 87 Openspace | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | +++ | ~ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ |
| Issue 88 Allotments | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ |
| Issue 89 On Site Provision | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ |
| Issue 90 Openspace Allocations | - / ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ |
| Issue 91 Protection of Existing Recreation Areas | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ |
| Issue 92 Indoor Community Facilities | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ |
| Issue 93 Lighting, noise, Odour | ~ | ~ | +++ | + | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|-----------------------------------|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 94 Land Contamination | ~ | ~ | +++ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 95 Air Quality | ~ | ~ | +++ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 96 Low Emissions Strategies | ~ | ~ | +++ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ |

Issue 80: Health Impact Assessments

The clear aim of the option is to support delivery of the health objective. There are wider benefits through its implementation to other objectives, by ensuring the built environment is good for people. Raising the threshold when they are required (option Bii) would mean less developments would be required to prepare an HIA, but given the evidence that appraisals are most effective on larger developments, and if issues for smaller developments are adequately addressed by other mechanisms, the difference would not be significant.

Issue 81: Protection of Village Services and Facilities

The option regarding protection of village services and facilities would aim to preserve access to services and facilities, contributing to the redressing inequalities objective by ensuring those less able to travel can access amenities. Local facilities contribute to the economy, and also the way spaces work by providing a mix of uses. Alternative tests outlined in the option would provide an alternative means of achieving the same goals, although the scale of the additional benefit is not clear.

Issue 82: Developing New Communities

New communities will generate a wide range of needs, and provision of services and facilities to meet these will clearly have significant positive impact on a range of objectives, in particular access to services, health and redressing inequalities. The principles directly reflected a number of objectives, and this is reflected in the significant positive impacts identified. There are also benefits to sustainable travel, meaning people have to travel less to access services.

Issue 83: Provision for Sub Regional Sporting, Cultural and Community Facilities

As there are no specific proposals, an assessment has not been completed.

Issue 84: Community Stadium

This appraisal considers the inclusion of a stadium proposal in the Local Plan. A community stadium would require land, and therefore has a potentially negative impact on minimising loss of undeveloped land, but this, like impact on many objectives, would depend on the location identified. The benefits of a community stadium would depend on the facilities included, but there are potential positive contributions to the human health and open space objectives. It could also benefit the economy. Impact on transport objectives is uncertain, as it would depend on the location selected.

Issue 85: Ice Rink

This appraisal considers the inclusion of an ice rink proposal in the Local Plan. An Ice Rink would require land, and therefore has a potentially negative impact on minimising loss of undeveloped land, but this, like impact on many objectives, would depend on the location identified. Positive contribution towards community involvement, health, and economic objectives. Impact on transport objectives is uncertain, as it would depend on the location selected.

Issue 86: Concert Hall

This appraisal considers the inclusion of a concert hall proposal in the Local Plan. A concert hall would require land, and therefore has a potentially negative impact on minimising loss of undeveloped land, but this, like impact on many objectives, would depend on the location

identified. There would be a positive contribution towards community involvement and economic objectives. Impact on transport objectives is uncertain, as it would depend on the location selected.

Issue 87: Open space Standards

Requiring delivery of open space with appropriate space standards has a clear positive link to achievement of the open space objective.. The Scoping Report, and the recent update to the Recreation Study identified shortages of open space in terms of quantity and quality in many villages. Open space standards would ensure needs are addressed in new developments, and also contribute to good place making. The importance of promoting healthy lifestyles was also identified in the Scoping Report, and providing opportunities to access open space and support sports and other activities will contribute to achievement of the health objective. Making spaces accessible can reduce the need to travel and promote access by sustainable modes.

Issue 88: Allotments

A key benefit of requiring allotments is to support healthy communities by enabling people to grow their own food. The issue was highlighted in the Scoping Report.

Issue 89: Scale of Development where Open Space should be Provided On-site

The option considers when different types of open space should be required to be delivered on site in a new development. Similar impacts are identified to the open space provision option (option 82). Clear positive impact on achievement of open space objective, and consequential benefits to human health. Open spaces offer wider benefits to good place making and townscape. Making spaces accessible can reduce the need to travel and promote access by sustainable modes. Standards address when it is practical to deliver certain types of space on site, therefore considering how places will function, and avoiding deliver of spaces that could not practically perform their intended function.

Issue 90: Allocations for Open Space

Identifies a range of sites for open space uses, that were identified in previous plans. All the sites located in areas where there is an existing shortage of space, and could therefore contribute to achieving a range of objectives similar to those identified with the general open space options. Given the time they have been allocated, there are question marks over the deliverability of some of the sites. A number of the site would require the loss of agricultural land.

Issue 91: Protection of Existing Recreation Areas

Protecting existing open spaces contributes significantly to the open space objective, by maintaining the level of openspaces and protecting this valuable resource. Again there are wider benefits to health, and creating successful places. It can also mean people have to travel less distance to access open space, supporting sustainable travel.

Issue 92: Indoor Community Facilities

Including a standard would seek to ensure appropriate provision of indoor community facilities, contributing to the community involvement objective by providing meeting places which support local activities. . Ensuring facilities are accessible also contributes to sustainable transport objectives.

Issue 93: Light, noise and odour issues

Including appropriate policy to address these types of pollution would directly address the sustainability objective to minimise pollution. There are also significant health benefits, and benefits to biodiversity, which can also be affected by these issues.

Issue 94: Land Contamination

Ensuring sites are fit for development contributes positively to health objectives, and also addresses the risk of pollution.

Issue 95: Air Quality

Issue proposes a policy to address problems of air pollution, to ensure development is appropriately located, or would not have an unacceptable impact on air quality, therefore directly supporting the objectives to improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution. Due to health impacts of air quality a significant positive impact on the 'maintain and enhance human health' objective is also identified.

Issue 96: Low Emissions Strategies

Low emissions strategies seek to address air quality issues in major developments or other areas with significant air quality issues. Air quality was identified as a significant issue in the Scoping Report, particularly related to the Air Quality Management Areas on the A14 north of

Cambridge, and in Cambridge City Centre. The option therefore has potential for significant positive impacts on the objective to improve air quality, and as a result objectives to health human health. Most of the measures in the low emissions strategy relate to transport, therefore having a positive impact on the sustainable transport objective.

12. Transport and Infrastructure

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|---|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 97 Planning for Sustainable Travel | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | +++ | + | ~ | ~ | + | +++ | ~ | + | + | + | +++ | +++ |
| Issue 98 Transport assessments | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | + | + | + | +++ | +++ |
| Issue 99 Car Parking Standards Aii | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ |
| Issue 99 Car Parking Standards Aii | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ |
| Issue 99 Car Parking Standards Aiii | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | +++ /? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ |
| Issue 100 Parking Allocation Aii | - | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 100 Parking Allocation Aii | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 100 Parking Allocation Aiii | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 101 Garages i | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 101 Garages ii | ~ / ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ / ? | ~ | ~ / ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ / ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 102 Non-Residential Parking | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ |
| Issue 103 Cycle Parking Standards Ai | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + |
| Issue 103 Cycle Parking Standards Aii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure | |
|---|------|--------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|--------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------|
| Issue 103 Cycle Parking Standards Aiii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ /? | + | |
| Issue 104 Freight | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | +/? | +/? | |
| Issue 105 Aviation | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | |
| Issue 106 Cambridge Airport | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | |
| Issue 107 Provision of Infrastructure | ? | +++ /? | +++ /? | + | +++ /? | +++ /? | +++ /? | +++ /? | +++ /? | +++ /? | +++ /? | +++ /? | +++ /? | +++ /? | +++ /? | +++ /? | +++ /? | +++ /? | +++ /? | +++ /? | +++ /? | +++ /? | +++ /? | +++ /? |

Issue 97: Planning for More Sustainable Travel

The principles established in this option would be a key element in achieving sustainable travel and transport infrastructure objectives, by seeking to ensure development that would harm these objectives would not be permitted. It would promote modal shift away from the private car, insuring that infrastructure for sustainable modes is integral with development. As such its significant positive impacts will be on securing transport infrastructure and enabling travel by sustainable modes. There are also benefits for accessing services and facilities, and redressing inequalities. There is also potential to reduce the dominance of the private car on the streetscape, therefore contributing to spaces which work

well and look good. It also refers to the mitigation of other impacts related to transport, which could support achievement of air quality and health objectives.

Issue 98: Transport Assessments and Travel Plans

The assessment of travel impacts, and the longer term measures to support sustainable travel offered by Travel Plans, again have potential to contribute significantly to achievement of the transport objectives. Continued use of sustainable modes could also contribute to health objectives.

Issue 99: Residential Car Parking Standards

The impact on objectives such as achieving sustainable transport depends on whether parking standards actually curb car use or discourage car ownership, balanced with the negative impact on creating places which work well if there is inadequate provision. This uncertainty is reflected in the scoring. Options setting maximum standards have positive impact on land objective, as they reduce the land taken up potentially by parking. The option proposing higher levels would require additional land, but it would still be subject to a specific limit. A design led approach (option iii) would deliver less certainty, although it could actually use land more efficiently by adding flexibility to reflect site specific circumstances.

Setting a slightly higher standard could have a positive impact on creating good spaces, as it could lead to better management of the car. The same is true of the design led approach. It would give less certainty given the greater flexibility, but it would allow parking to be tailored to the location and the opportunities of the site.

Issue 100: Allocation of parking within residential developments

The non-allocation of parking spaces would support the land objective, as it would deliver the most efficient use of land. It could contribute to objectives regarding townscape and creating good spaces, as it could lead to environments which manage parking well, integrated with the design of the development, but this would depend on implementation. There is also uncertainty over the crime objective, as it could result in cars parked away from properties, but again this could be addressed by effective design.

Issue 101: Residential garages

There are clear benefits to ensuring garages can accommodate cars, for the efficient use of land, and for townscape and creating places, as it could reduce the need for cars to be parked elsewhere.

Issue 102: Car Parking Standards and Non-Residential Developments

Controlling parking at the destination could encourage use of sustainable modes. It also supports efficient use of land, and environments less dominated by the car.

Issue 103: Cycle Parking Standards

Requiring cycle parking clearly contributes to sustainable transport, and objectives for improving health. The design led approach (option Aiii) introduces a greater level of uncertainty, but provides the opportunity to tailor the provision to the circumstances and opportunities of the individual development. It is not clear whether the higher standards (option Aii) would significantly improve achievement of the objectives, but they would reflect the more significant opportunities available where shorter travelling distances are required.

Issue 104: Rail freight interchanges and rail freight

Retains infrastructure with potential to get freight off the roads, which could benefit a number of objectives as a result of reduced road traffic, although no specific development is proposed.

Issue 105: Airfields and public safety zones

Aim of the option is to address noise and environmental issues, and therefore impacts on health.

Issue 106: Cambridge Airport – Aviation Development

Primary goals of a policy would be to protect amenity and health, it would therefore have a positive benefit compared with having no policy.

Issue 107: Provision of Infrastructure and Services

A policy would seek to mitigate the impact of development by ensuring appropriate investment in infrastructure. Infrastructure could address a wide variety of issues, potentially most of the issues addressed by the sustainability objectives.

13. Site Specific Policies

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|-----------------------------------|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 108 Cambridge East i | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ /? | +++ /? | ---/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | +++ /? | ~ | +++ /? | +++ /? | -/? | +++ /? | +++ /? |
| Issue 108 Cambridge East ii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 108 Cambridge East iii | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 109 North of Newmarket Road | -- | ~ | ~ | ~ | + / +++ / ? | + | - | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ / ? | ? | ~ | +++ | ~ | ~ | +++ | - | +++ | + / +++ / ? |
| Issue 110 CNF East | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | +++ | ~ | +++ | +++ |
| Issue 111 Papworth Hospital i | + | ~ | -/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ / + | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 111 Papworth Hospital ii | + | ~ | +/? | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ / + | +++ / + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | +++ / + | ~ | ~ | ~ |

| | Land | Waste | Air quality and environmental pollution | Designated sites and protected species | Habitats and species | Access to wildlife and green spaces | Landscape and townscape character | Historic Environment | Good Spaces | Climate Change Mitigation | Climate Change Adaptation | Human health | Crime | Public Openspace | Housing | Inequalities | Services and Facilities | Involvement | Economy | Access to Work | Infrastructure | Sustainable Travel | Transport infrastructure |
|---|------|-------|---|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Issue 111 Papworth Hospital iii | + | ~ | +++/+ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++/+ | +++/+ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~/+ | ~ | - / --- | + | -/+ | + | - |
| Issue 112 Papworth West Central i | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | + | ~ | + | + | + | + | ~ |
| Issue 112 Papworth West Central ii | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ? | ? | ~ | ? | ? | ? | ? | ~ |
| Issue 113 Fen Drayton LSA | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ? | ~ | ? | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | - | ~ |
| Issue 114 Great Abington LSA | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 115 Linton Special Policy Area | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| Issue 116 Duxford | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | +++ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | + | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |

Issue 108: Cambridge Airport

Retaining the Cambridge East AAP means that the wider airport site could still come forward for development, but there is considerable doubt whether it would actually be delivered, with Marshalls stating their intention to remain on the site. Cambridge East offers an opportunity to make a significant contribution to housing needs in a location close to Cambridge.

It would also deliver significant employment development. A development of this scale would have a significant impact on the landscape, but the AAP includes policies requiring mitigation measures. The site offers opportunities for biodiversity improvements in association with the development. Additional development would increase scale of resource use, such as demand for water, above the planned level of development. Cambridge East was to provide employment development equivalent to 5,000 jobs on the edge of Cambridge. This loss could impact on the economy objectives, although the Employment Land Review 2012 identified that land availability and changes in the economy meant the loss was not critical. It recommended further employment opportunities may be needed on the edge of Cambridge.

As the site is not expected to come forward, this would actually create uncertainty for developers of other sites, and potentially create uncertainty regarding the scale of development that will take place in the district up to 2031.

If the land is safeguarded (option ii) the site specific impacts of development will not take place during the plan period, but the location would be reserved for development beyond the plan period. This could have positive benefits in the future, but still no certainty it would be developed.

Returning land to the Green Belt (option iii) would restrict inappropriate development, and offer protection to the setting of Cambridge.

Issue 109: North of Newmarket Road

If the site was not relied upon, it would be addressed in the same way as the wider airport site covered by Issue 108. It is therefore not appraised separately here.

The second option would be to rely on the existing Area Action Plan to provide policy guidance. This contains a range of policies, and has been subject to Sustainability Appraisal prior to its adoption. A direct comparison is difficult, as contrast with the third option to include a policy, as the wider policy framework of the Local Plan is dependent on a range of options at this stage.

The third option for Cambridge East would be to include a policy for the site in the Local Plan allocated the land for a housing led development. The site specific impacts of an allocation have been considered in this appraisal. Cambridge East is on the edge of Cambridge, at the top of the Core Strategy search sequence.

Development would include more than 20 hectares of existing agricultural land, mostly grade 2. The site lies within an area of search for waste recycling and recovery facilities. The AAP identifies potential sources of noise, but requires appropriate mitigation measures. It does not lie within an Air Quality Management Area.

The AAP identifies opportunities for improvement to landscape and townscape character, particularly along the frontage with Newmarket Road. It identifies that it is crucial that the existing tree belt around the edge of the site is retained and enhanced as part of the development to provide strategic landscaping.

The AAP includes a number of policies seeking high quality design, but this option is only considering the option to allocate. The site is located within flood zone 1, the lowest risk zone.

Development would be required to include open space to meet needs, it is not clear at this stage whether there would be additional opportunities. On the edge of Cambridge and with access to high quality public transport there would be significant positive impacts from delivering residential development in the area, to achieving sustainable transport, access to services, and access to employment, so long as appropriate measures were included as part of any proposal. The AAP identifies a range of transport improvements that would be required from development north of Newmarket Road, including measures to support cycling and public transport.

Issue 110: Cambridge Northern Fringe East

The option would contribute to addressing the wider needs of north east Cambridge. The option's focus on public transport led growth should have significant effects on reducing the reliance on the private car and help mitigate related transport emissions. Provision for an interchange between local buses and the Guided Bus as well as improved access for cyclist and pedestrians should also contribute significantly to transport objectives. The Option's identified key principles require high standards of sustainability and design quality which should help address key sustainability issues relating to the need for high standards of water efficiency, minimising landscape impacts and improving the quality of the built environment. It also primarily involves the redevelopment of previously developed land.

Issue 111: Papworth Everard – Hospital Site

Papworth Hospital comprises a previously developed land. Key differences in the appraisal relate to the retention of employment on the site versus the delivery of housing. Retaining employment would maintain access to employment in the local area, with a particular advantage for maintaining medical uses to reflect the existing employment profile. Much of the employment would be lost if it was developed as a residential site, although the proposal submitted to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment includes some non-residential uses e.g.

employment, retail and community uses. There would be consequential impacts on the village as a whole as a result of losing a major employer. There are opportunities to improve the site, and its relationship with the historic environment by replacing some of the unattractive modern buildings. It is unclear whether retention of medical uses on the site would hinder this process as their use would be retained. Redevelopment for residential would create particular infrastructure needs, particularly in relation to highway access. A residential use would address noise issues related to the medical uses of the site and the surrounding existing residential areas.

Issue 112: Papworth Everard – West Central

The site comprises a number of previously developed sites within the village centre. Policy guidance could help ensure that they will deliver residential development whilst contributing to access to services and facilities objectives by further enhancing the village centre. Considering proposals on their merits could risk achievement of these goals, and provide fewer enhancements to the village centre, although this would clearly depend on the individual proposals.

Issue 113: Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate

The option proposes to enable sustainable forms of development, utilising the built footprint of existing buildings, reflecting exiting policy. It is difficult to scale the impact of the policy as it depends on the level of uptake in this unusual site. Developments have the potential to contribute towards climate change mitigation and adaptation, in order to meet the specific requirements of the policy. Landscape and biodiversity impacts will depend on individual developments, but other requirements of the development plan to address these issues are assumed to apply. Access to alternative transport modes is limited, although the guided bus is within cycling distance. The Supplementary Planning Document seeks to address transport issues by promoting sustainable travel.

Issue 114: Great Abington Former Land Settlement Association Estate

The option would support the housing objective, allowing greater flexibility to deliver decent homes on this unusual site. There could be negative impact on landscape and townscape if development is out of scale with the rural character, but this is addressed specifically in the option to ensure this is appropriately addressed.

Issue 115: Linton Special Policy Area

By restricting development south of the A1307 the option aims to ensure appropriate access to services, and acknowledges that an isolated area would not work well as a residential location.

Issue 116: Duxford Imperial War Museum

Policy contributes to preservation of historic assets, whilst acknowledging the role of the museum as a tourist attraction. Given the importance of the asset it is considered to have potential for significant positive impact. Supporting continued use of this successful tourist attraction also have positive implications for the economic objectives.

-