### South Cambridgeshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Report August 2013

### Appendix 7i: Assessment of 2011 'Call for Sites' SHLAA sites

### **Index of Waterbeach Site Assessment Proforma**

| Site<br>Number | Site Address   | Site Capacity | Page |
|----------------|--|---------------|------|
| Site 001       | Land off Lode Avenue, Waterbeach   | 14 dwellings  | 1180 |
| Site 019       | Land adj to 35 Burgess Road, Waterbeach  | 30 dwellings  | 1188 |
| Site 043       | Land north of Glebe Road, Waterbeach (land north west of 1 Glebe Road, Waterbeach) | 120 dwellings | 1196 |
| Site 089       | Cody Road, Waterbeach  | 50 dwellings  | 1204 |
| Site 090       | Burgess Road, Waterbeach   | 19 dwellings  | 1211 |
| Site 091       | Saberton Close, Waterbeach   | 12 dwellings  | 1220 |
| Site 142       | Land north of Poorsfield Road, Waterbeach  | 5 dwellings   | 1228 |
| Site 155       | North side of Bannold Road, Waterbeach   | 29 dwellings  | 1235 |
| Site 189       | Land to the west of Cody Road, Waterbeach  | 50 dwellings  | 1243 |
| Site 190       | Land adjacent to Pieces Lane, Waterbeach   | 30 dwellings  | 1250 |
| Site 202       | Land off Cambridge Road, Waterbeach  | 8 dwellings   | 1258 |
| Site 206       | Land at Bannold Road and Bannold Drove,<br>Waterbeach                              | 36 dwellings  | 1265 |
| Site 270       | Land off Gibson Close, Waterbeach  | 14 dwellings  | 1272 |

# South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Site Assessment Proforma

| Proforma<br>Created  | July 2012  |
|--|--|
| Proforma Last<br>Updated   | July 2012  |
| Location   | Waterbeach   |
| Site name / address  | Land off Lode Avenue, Waterbeach   |
| Category of site:  | A village extension i.e. a development adjoining the existing village development framework boundary   |
| Description of promoter's proposal                                   | 10 dwellings   |
| Site area (hectares)   | 0.59 ha  |
| Site Number  | Site 001   |
| Site description<br>& context  | This small site is situated between the built edge of the village and the railway line, to the south of Burgess Road on the eastern edge of Waterbeach. The site is screened to Burgess Road and the residential boundaries with hedgerow. The eastern boundary to the railway line, which is on a slight embankment, has patchy hedgerow. The site is paddock land and there is a small area with garages, sheds and caravans in a fenced off area in the north west corner of the site.  Note: site 019 lies across Burgess Road to the north. |
| Current or last use of the site                                      | Paddock  |
| Is the site<br>Previously<br>Developed<br>Land?                      | No   |
| Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan? | No   |
| Planning<br>history  | None   |
| Source of site   | Site suggested through call for sites  |

### **Tier 1: Strategic Considerations** The site is within the Green Belt. Green Belt Purposes Maintains and enhances the quality of Cambridge's setting Prevents coalescence between settlements and with Cambridge Function with regard to the special character of Cambridge and it's settina: • The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages A landscape which retains a strong rural character **Green Belt** Site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on GB purposes and functions. The Landscape Design Associates Green Belt Study (2002) describes it as an area from which distinct views of the city are scarce or absent. The function of this landscape is providing a backdrop to views of the city, and providing a setting for approaches to connective, supportive and distinctive areas of townscape and landscape. (page 62) Outer Rural Areas play a lesser role in contributing to the distinctiveness of Cambridge and its setting, and are less finite. They may also have the potential to accommodate change and development that does not cause adverse effects on the setting and special character. (page 66) Is the site subject to any other Flood Zone – approximately half the site, on the eastern side, is considerations within Flood Zone 2. that have the Minerals and Waste LDF designations (Core Strategy designations only) – a small part of the south eastern corner is potential to within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel. make the site unsuitable for development? This is a small paddock situated between the built edge of the village and the railway line, to the south of Burgess Road on the eastern edge of Waterbeach, within the Green Belt. The site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions: Maintains and enhances the quality of Cambridge's setting Prevents coalescence between settlements and with Cambridge Tier 1 The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character conclusion: of Green Belt villages A landscape which retains a strong rural character The eastern half part of the site is also within Flood Zone 2, which will

SHLAA (August 2013) Appendix 7i – Assessment of 2011 'Call for Sites' SHLAA sites Minor Rural Centre

reduce the developable area, although there is sufficient land

is within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel.

remaining for development. A small part of the south eastern corner

| Does the site   |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| warrant further | Yes |
| assessment?     |     |

### **Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations**

| Designations and Constraints                                |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Heritage considerations?                                    | <ul> <li>Listed Buildings – a Grade II Listed building is situated approximately 100m along Burgess Road to the west. Adverse effect due to loss of significant green edge for village and listed building approach from riverside.</li> <li>Non-statutory archaeological site - The site is located to the east of the historic village core and to the north east of the site of nationally important Waterbeach Abbey (SAM52). County Archaeologists would require further information in advance of any planning application for this site before it is able to advise on the suitability of the site for development.</li> </ul>  |  |
|   | The site forms part of the setting of a Grade II Listed Building, however, with careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the historic environment with landscape screening, especially along the western edge.   |  |
| Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations? | <ul> <li>Public Rights of Way – a footpath runs adjacent to the eastern boundary on the opposite site of the railway line.</li> <li>Biodiversity features - Fenland landscapes support species and habitats characterised by intensive agriculture due to the high quality soil. This has restricted biodiversity in some parts. However, drains, hedges and field margins provide refuge for species such as barn owl, corn bunting and skylark. Washlands provide temporary areas of flooded grassland that are important for plants such as the marsh foxtail, tufted hair-grass and narrow-leaved water dropwort. Important numbers of wintering wildfowl maybe found on flooded fields. The network of drainage ditches in places still retain water voles with otters occasionally found into the fens where suitable fish stocks are found. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design.</li> </ul> |  |
|   | With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the natural environment.   |  |
| Physical considerations?                                    | <ul> <li>Land contamination - Agricultural buildings in the north. A contaminated Land Assessment will be required as a condition of any planning application.</li> <li>Noise issues - The east of the site is bounded by an operational railway line. The impact of existing noise / vibration on any</li> </ul>  |  |

future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well being and providing a high quality living environment. However it is likely that such railway noise and vibration transport sources can be abated to an acceptable level with careful noise mitigation. Possible noise barrier / earth berm and special foundation design may be required. Noise likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises. On balance no objection in principle.

• Utility services – telecom wires run along the Burgess Road frontage of the site.

The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes the landscape surrounding Waterbeach as typical fenland, comprising very flat large arable fields, distant views, together with quite distinctive groupings of trees. Many of the surrounding roads are raised on embankments and run alongside drainage ditches, which are also visible between the fields.

The tower of St John's Church provides a distinctive landmark within Waterbeach, being visible from many viewpoints to the east and south of the village.

### Townscape and landscape impact?

Moving closer to the edge of the village, there are more local landscape characteristics. To the east the village edge comprises enclosed fields and paddocks, with well used footpaths to the banks of the River Cam. The site is paddock to the rear of a number of residential properties, enclosed by hedgerow and trees, which creates a soft edge to the village. The site is bordered by railway line to the east on a slight embankment.

Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Waterbeach. The presence of the railway line to the east does not mean that the village should automatically expand outwards towards it. Development in this location would create an area of backland development which would not relate well to the existing built form.

### Can any issues be mitigated?

In part. Historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts, but with careful design it should be possible to mitigate these impacts. Further investigation and possible mitigation will be required to address the physical considerations, including potential for land contamination, noise and vibration.

# Regarding sites in the Milton / Waterbeach (estimated capacity of 13,602 dwellings on 14 sites) the Highways Agency comment that the vast majority of this grouping consists of the barracks site as a new settlement with the remainder essentially in-fill sites. On the whole, the in-fill sites are less likely to present an unacceptable pressure on the A14 given the majority of travel demand will be focused on

SHLAA (August 2013) Appendix 7i – Assessment of 2011 'Call for Sites' SHLAA sites Minor Rural Centre
Site 001 Land off Lode Avenue, Waterbeach

|                       | Cambridge and credible alternatives to car travel could be available.   |
|-----------------------|---|
|                       | The proposed site does not appear to have a direct link to the adopted public highway.  |
|                       | The promoter makes reference to a ransom strip to be negotiated by the developer. If this would provide the necessary connection of the site to the public highway then access at the closest point to the western boundary would be acceptable, subject to design.   |
| Utility services?     | <ul> <li>Electricity - No significant impact on existing network.</li> <li>Mains Water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains</li> <li>Gas – Waterbeach has a gas supply and to serve this site with gas is likely to be able to be accommodated with minimal disruption or system reinforcement.</li> <li>Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the waste water treatment works to accommodate this development site. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre- development assessment will be required to ascertain the specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the</li> </ul> |
|                       | developer.  No FRA provided.  |
| Drainage<br>measures? | A majority of the development sites falls within the Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage District. The District does not have any capacity to accept any direct discharge into its system above the green field run off rate. All surface water from the site would have to be balanced before it is released into the Boards system. We also have main drains adjacent to the site, therefore any works involving these drains would require the consent of the Board.  |
| School capacity?      | Waterbeach has a primary school with a PAN of 60 and school capacity of 420 and, and lies within the catchment of Cottenham Village College with a PAN of 180 and school capacity of 900 children. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there were deficit of 25 primary places in Waterbeach taking account of planned development in Waterbeach, and a deficit of 30 secondary places taking account of planned development across the village college   |

SHLAA (August 2013) Appendix 7i – Assessment of 2011 'Call for Sites' SHLAA sites

Minor Rural Centre

|                   | catchment area.  |
|-------------------|--|
|                   |  |
|                   | The development of this site for 10 dwellings could generate a need    |
|                   | for early years places and a maximum of 4 primary school places and    |
|                   | 3 secondary places.  |
|                   |  |
|                   | After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site     |
|                   | would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission     |
|                   | numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or    |
| Health facilities | the provision of new schools.  |
|                   | There is one doctors practice in Waterbeach which has potential for    |
| capacity?         | expansion.   |
| Any other         |  |
| issues?           |  |
|                   | Yes, with upgrades to local infrastructure, including utilities (mains |
|                   | water and sewerage), school capacity and health.                       |
| Can issues be     |  |
| mitigated?        | However, it is unclear whether appropriate access can be secured to    |
|                   | the site as it is not linked to the adopted public highway. The        |
|                   | promoter makes reference to a ransom strip to be negotiated.           |
| Does the site     |  |
| warrant further   | Yes  |
| assessment?       |  |

### **Tier 3: Site Specific Factors**

| Capacity      |              |
|---------------|--------------|
| Developable   | 0.47 ha.     |
| area          | 0.47 Hd.     |
| Site capacity | 14 dwellings |
| Density       | 30 dph       |

| Potential Suitability |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Conclusion            | The site is potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints. |

| Availability   |   |
|----------------|---|
| Is the land in |   |
| single         | No  |
| ownership?     |   |
| Site ownership | Site promoted by two joint landowners.                    |
| status?        |   |
| Legal          | Reference to ransom strip – to be negotiated by developer |
| constraints?   |   |

SHLAA (August 2013) Appendix 7i – Assessment of 2011 'Call for Sites' SHLAA sites Minor Rural Centre

| Is there market interest in the site?             | The site has not been marketed but there is interest in the site from a developer. |
|---|--|
| When would the site be available for development? | The site is available immediately.   |

| Achievability  |  |
|--|--|
| Phasing and delivery of the development                                      | The promoter indicates that the first dwellings could be completed on site 2011-16   |
| Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability? | None known.  |
| Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?   | The promoter makes reference to a ransom strip to be negotiated by developer.  |
| Could issues identified be overcome?   |  |
| Economic   | Viability Category 2 Viable sites  This viability assessment is provided independent of any policy or other assessment as to whether the site should be allocated for development. The references to planning policy only relate to those existing policies governing how a site would be developed, not whether it should be allocated in the new Local Plan.  Having undertaken an assessment of this site the local planning  |
| viability?   | authority have few concerns that that the landowner would be unable to deliver a development that complies with current planning policy in respect of density, mix and the provision of onsite facilities whilst still delivering the necessary level of affordable housing, planning obligations and potential community infrastructure levy payments.  In summary this scheme is not considered to have any barriers, in terms of development viability alone, to restrict it coming forward within the next 5 years (new settlements and other very large developments may take longer than 5 years to come forward). |

#### **Site Assessment Conclusion**

Site with limited development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.

### Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013

Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework; Green Belt.

# South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Site Assessment Proforma

| Proforma   | July 2012  |
|--|--|
| Created Proforma Last  |  |
| Updated  | July 2012  |
| Location   | Waterbeach   |
| Site name / address  | Land adj to 35 Burgess Road, Waterbeach  |
| Category of site:  | A village extension i.e. a development adjoining the existing village development framework boundary   |
| Description of promoter's proposal                                   | Residential development  |
| Site area (hectares)   | 4.00 ha.   |
| Site Number  | Site 019   |
| Site description<br>& context  | This site is situated alongside the railway line, to the north of Burgess Road on the eastern edge of Waterbeach. The site is situated close to the village framework at the Burgess Road frontage, but beyond the boundary of adjoining property, the land becomes isolated from the built part of the village, by over 200m at the widest point.  The site is hedged to Burgess Road and alongside the track on the western boundary. The eastern boundary to the railway line, which is on a slight embankment, has patchy hedgerow. The paddock is subdivided into fields being used for grazing horses and the land closest to Burgess Road has a couple of stables.  Note: the site is 10m to the east of the village framework. Site 001 lies across Burgess Road to the south. |
| Current or last use of the site                                      | Paddock  |
| Is the site<br>Previously<br>Developed<br>Land?                      | No   |
| Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan? | No   |

| Planning<br>history | Land south of Bannold Road / north of Burgess Road was considered in LP 2004 and the Inspector concluded: "I have not found any exceptional circumstances to warrant modification of the boundaries of the Green Belt. In addition, it appeared to me that there may be access constraints. I therefore do not support the objections." |
|---------------------|---|
| Source of site      | Site suggested through call for sites   |

| Tier 1: Strategic Considerations   |   |
|--|---|
|  |   |
| Green Belt   | The site is within the Green Belt.  Green Belt Purposes  Maintains and enhances the quality of Cambridge's setting  Prevents coalescence between settlements and with Cambridge  Function with regard to the special character of Cambridge and it's setting:  The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages  A landscape which retains a strong rural character  Site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on GB purposes and functions. The Landscape Design Associates Green Belt Study (2002) describes it as an area from which distinct views of the city are scarce or absent. The function of this landscape is providing a backdrop to views of the city, and providing a setting for approaches to connective, supportive and distinctive areas of townscape and landscape. (page 62) Outer Rural Areas play a lesser role in contributing to the distinctiveness of Cambridge and its setting, and are less finite. They may also have the potential to accommodate change and development that does not cause adverse effects on the setting and special character. (page 66) |
| Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development? | <ul> <li>Flood Zone – the majority of the site is within Flood Zones 2 &amp; 3.</li> <li>Minerals and Waste LDF designations (Core Strategy designations only) – a large proportion of the site is within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</li> </ul>  |
| Tier 1<br>conclusion:  | This is an area of situated alongside the railway line, to the north of Burgess Road on the eastern edge of Waterbeach, within the Green Belt. The site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions:  • Maintains and enhances the quality of Cambridge's setting  • Prevents coalescence between settlements and with Cambridge  • The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character  |

SHLAA (August 2013) Appendix 7i – Assessment of 2011 'Call for Sites' SHLAA sites Minor Rural Centre

of Green Belt villages

• A landscape which retains a strong rural character

The majority of the site is within flood zones 2 and 3, which will reduce the developable area, although approximately a quarter would be available for development. A large part of the site is also within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel.

Does the site warrant further assessment?

Yes

### **Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations**

|   | Designations and Constraints   |  |
|---|--|--|
| Heritage considerations?                                    | <ul> <li>Listed Buildings – Grade II Listed Building approximately 90m to west along Burgess Road. Adverse effect due to loss of significant green edge for village and listed building approach from riverside.</li> <li>Non-statutory archaeological site - The site is located to the east of the historic village core and to the north east of the site of nationally important Waterbeach Abbey (SAM52). County Archaeologists would require further information in advance of any planning application for this site before it is able to advise on the suitability of the site for development.</li> <li>The site forms part of the setting of a Grade II Listed Building, however, with pareful design it should be passible to mitigate any.</li> </ul>  |  |
|   | however, with careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the historic environment with additional landscaping to retain a green edge for the village.  |  |
| Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations? | <ul> <li>Public Rights of Way – a footpath lies approximately 40m to the south of the site.</li> <li>Biodiversity features – Fenland landscapes support species and habitats characterised by intensive agriculture due to the high quality soil. This has restricted biodiversity in some parts. However, drains, hedges and field margins provide refuge for species such as barn owl, corn bunting and skylark. Washlands provide temporary areas of flooded grassland that are important for plants such as the marsh foxtail, tufted hair-grass and narrow-leaved water dropwort. Important numbers of wintering wildfowl maybe found on flooded fields. The network of drainage ditches in places still retain water voles with otters occasionally found into the fens where suitable fish stocks are found. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design.</li> <li>Agricultural land of high grade (i.e. Agricultural Land</li> </ul> |  |

Classification Grade 1, 2, 3a) – the north eastern part of the site is Grade 1. With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the natural environment. Land contamination - Agricultural buildings in south. A contaminated Land Assessment will be required as a condition of any planning application. Noise issues - the east of the site is also bounded by an operational railway line. The impact of existing noise / vibration on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well being and providing a high quality living environment. However it is likely that such railway noise and vibration transport sources can be abated to an acceptable level with careful noise mitigation. Possible noise barrier / earth berm and special foundation design may be required. Noise likely to **Physical** influence the design / layout and number / density of residential considerations? premises. On balance no objection in principle. Noise issues – Some minor to moderate additional off-site road traffic noise generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance. Possible to mitigate but may require s106 agreements. Noise and malodour - Hall Crest Farm & workshop in close proximity to the east - possible noise and malodour as proposals would be closer than existing residential. No history of complaints. Minor to moderate adverse noise / odour risk but no objection in principle, but need consideration. The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes the landscape surrounding Waterbeach as typical fenland, comprising very flat large arable fields, distant views, together with quite distinctive groupings of trees. Many of the surrounding roads are raised on embankments and run alongside drainage ditches, which are also visible between the fields. The tower of St John's Church provides a distinctive landmark within Waterbeach, being visible from many viewpoints to the east and Townscape and south of the village. landscape impact? Moving closer to the edge of the village, there are more local landscape characteristics. To the east the village edge comprises enclosed fields and paddocks, with well used footpaths to the banks of the River Cam. The site is located in an area with an irregular boundary with occasional hedgerows and woodland / paddocks abutting low density housing provides a soft edge and rural setting for the village. Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on

| the landscape and townscape setting of Waterbeach. This site is                              |
|--|
| situated alongside the railway line, and does not relate well to the                         |
| built part of the village except at the Burgess Road frontage. There is                      |
| a clear edge to the village at the last property on the western side,                        |
| alongside which is a track screened from the wider countryside by a                          |
| tall dense hedge. This part of Waterbeach is characterised by                                |
| woodland and paddocks. The presence of the railway line to the east                          |
| does not mean that the village should automatically expand outwards                          |
| towards it.  |
| In part. Historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts, but                          |
| with careful design it should be possible to mitigate these impacts.                         |
| Fronth and to the Control of the |

### Can any issues be mitigated?

In part. Historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts, but with careful design it should be possible to mitigate these impacts. Further investigation and possible mitigation will be required to address the physical considerations, including potential for land contamination, noise, vibration and malodour.

| Infrastructure    |  |
|-------------------|--|
|                   |  |
| Highways access?  | Regarding sites in the Milton / Waterbeach (estimated capacity of 13,602 dwellings on 14 sites) the Highways Agency comment that the vast majority of this grouping consists of the barracks site as a new settlement with the remainder essentially in-fill sites. On the whole, the in-fill sites are less likely to present an unacceptable pressure on the A14 given the majority of travel demand will be focused on Cambridge and credible alternatives to car travel could be available.  |
|                   | The Highway Authority has severe concerns due to the access being located in such close proximity to the existing level crossing for this number of dwellings (120) and would recommend that the Local Planning Authority contact Rail Track before progressing this site.   |
| Utility services? | <ul> <li>Electricity - No significant impact on existing network.</li> <li>Mains Water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge         Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare         capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the         distribution zone, less any commitments already made to         developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within         Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed         properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the         zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on         a first come first served basis. Development requiring an         increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to         existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster         plus associated mains</li> <li>Gas – Waterbeach has a gas supply and to serve this site with         gas is likely to be able to be accommodated with minimal         disruption or system reinforcement.</li> <li>Mains sewerage - There is capacity at the works however the         numbers attributed to this development site are unknown. The         sewerage network is approaching capacity and a developer         impact assessment will be required to ascertain the required</li> </ul> |

SHLAA (August 2013) Appendix 7i – Assessment of 2011 'Call for Sites' SHLAA sites

Minor Rural Centre

|   | upgrades, if any. This assessment and any mitigation required  |
|---|--|
|   | will be funded by the developer.   |
| Drainage<br>measures?                     | No FRA provided.  A majority of the development sites falls within the Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage District. The District does not have any capacity to accept any direct discharge into its system above the green field run off rate. All surface water from the site would have to be balanced before it is released into the Boards system. We also have main drains adjacent to the site, therefore any works involving these drains   |
| School capacity?                          | Waterbeach has a primary school with a PAN of 60 and school capacity of 420 and, and lies within the catchment of Cottenham Village College with a PAN of 180 and school capacity of 900 children. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there were deficit of 25 primary places in Waterbeach taking account of planned development in Waterbeach, and a deficit of 30 secondary places taking account of planned development across the village college catchment area.  After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or the provision of new schools. |
| Health facilities                         | There is one doctors practice in Waterbeach which has potential for  |
| capacity?                                 | expansion.   |
| Any other issues?                         |  |
| Can issues be mitigated?                  | Yes, with upgrades to local infrastructure, including utilities (mains water and sewerage), school capacity and health.  However, it is unclear whether safe highway access can be secured close to the operational railway.   |
| Does the site warrant further assessment? | No   |

### **Tier 3: Site Specific Factors**

| Capacity         |                                 |
|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Developable area | None (1.00 ha if unconstrained) |
| Site capacity    | 30 dwellings                    |
| Density          | 30 dph                          |

| Potential Suitability |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Conclusion            | The site is not potentially capable of providing residential |
|                       | development taking account of site factors and constraints.  |

|   | Availability   |  |
|---|--|--|
| Is the land in single ownership?                  | No   |  |
| Site ownership status?                            | Site in multiple landownership.                                |  |
| Legal constraints?                                | No known constraints.  |  |
| Is there market interest in the site?             | There is interest in the site from a developer.                |  |
| When would the site be available for development? | The promoter indicates that the site is available immediately. |  |

| Achievability  |  |
|--|--|
| Phasing and delivery of the development                                      | The promoter indicates that the first dwellings could be completed on site 2011-16.  |
| Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability? | None known   |
| Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?   | None known   |
| Could issues identified be overcome?   |  |
| Economic viability?  | Viability Category 4 Least viable sites  This viability assessment is provided independent of any policy or other assessment as to whether the site should be allocated for development. The references to planning policy only relate to those existing policies governing how a site would be developed, not whether it should be allocated in the new Local Plan. |

Having undertaken an assessment of this site the local planning authority have concerns about the landowners ability to deliver a development that fully complies with current planning policy in respect of density, mix and the provision of onsite facilities whilst still delivering the necessary level of affordable housing, planning obligations and potential community infrastructure levy payments.

This site may not be sufficiently attractive for developers to be interested in acquiring it in the current market. The necessary changes to planning policy requirements to help ensure site viability would be more significant but could allow development during the plan period.

#### **Site Assessment Conclusion**

Site with no development potential.

### Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013

Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework; Green Belt.

# South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Site Assessment Proforma

| Proforma<br>Created  | July 2012  |
|--|--|
| Proforma Last Updated  | July 2012  |
| Location   | Waterbeach   |
| Site name / address  | Land north of Glebe Road, Waterbeach (land north west of 1 Glebe Road, Waterbeach)   |
| Category of site:  | A village extension i.e. a development adjoining the existing village development framework boundary   |
| Description of promoter's proposal                                   | 216 dwellings with allotments  |
| Site area (hectares)   | 5.35 ha.   |
| Site Number  | Site 043   |
| Site description<br>& context  | The site is located to the north of Glebe Road on the western edge of Waterbeach. The site adjoins residential development to the south and along part of the eastern boundary, with open countryside to the north. To the west is low density development set in large grounds. An area of pasture lies to the west of the site. The land is largely pasture and allotments close to the edge of the village, although the northern part of the site is open arable land.  Note: the site adjoins site 142 to the east. |
| Current or last use of the site                                      | Agricultural, pasture and allotments   |
| Is the site Previously Developed Land?                               | No   |
| Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan? | No   |
| Planning<br>history  | LP 2004 Inspector considered land east of Ely Road/north of Cambridge Road but saw no reason to exclude the site from the Green Belt, or include it within the village framework or allocate it for development.   |
| Source of site   | Site suggested through call for sites  |

| Tier 1: Strategic Considerations  |  |
|---|--|
|   | The site is within the Green Belt.   |
|   | <ul> <li>Green Belt Purposes</li> <li>Maintains and enhances the quality of Cambridge's setting</li> <li>Prevents coalescence between settlements and with Cambridge</li> <li>Function with regard to the special character of Cambridge and it's setting:</li> </ul>  |
| One on Bolk   | <ul> <li>The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages</li> <li>A landscape which retains a strong rural character</li> </ul>   |
| Green Belt  | Site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on GB purposes and functions. The Landscape Design Associates Green Belt Study (2002) describes it as an area from which distinct views of the city are scarce or absent. The function of this landscape is providing a backdrop to views of the city, and providing a setting for approaches to connective, supportive and distinctive areas of townscape and landscape. (page 62) Outer Rural Areas play a lesser role in contributing to the distinctiveness of Cambridge and its setting, and are less finite. They may also have the potential to accommodate change and development that does not cause adverse effects on the setting and special character. (page 66) |
| Is the site subject to any other  |  |
| considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development? | Minerals and Waste LDF designations (Core Strategy designations only) – virtually the whole site is within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel.   |
| Tier 1<br>conclusion:   | <ul> <li>This site, largely agricultural and allotments, is located to the north of Glebe Road on the western edge of Waterbeach within the Green Belt. The site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions:</li> <li>Maintains and enhances the quality of Cambridge's setting</li> <li>Prevents coalescence between settlements and with Cambridge</li> <li>The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages</li> <li>A landscape which retains a strong rural character</li> <li>Virtually the whole site is within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</li> </ul>  |
| Does the site warrant further assessment?   | Yes  |

### **Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations**

|   | Designations and Constraints   |  |
|---|--|--|
| Heritage considerations?                                    | <ul> <li>Conservation Area – the Waterbeach Conservation Area lies approximately 130m to the east.</li> <li>Listed Buildings – there are three Grade II Listed Buildings close to the site. The closest, numbers 5 and 19 Greenside, are approximately 180m to the east. The third, on Cambridge Road lies approximately 190m to the south east.</li> <li>Non-statutory archaeological site - The site is located adjacent to the line of the Car Dyke Roman canal. There is also evidence for Saxon settlement in the vicinity. County Archaeologists would require further information in advance of any planning application for this site before it is able to advise on the suitability of the site for development.</li> <li>It is unlikely to be possible to mitigate any impact on the historic environment, particularly on the setting of the Conservation Area and a Grade II Listed Building, due to loss of green rural backdrop and countryside setting.</li> </ul>  |  |
| Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations? | <ul> <li>Tree Preservation Orders – there is a protected Ash tree situated in rear garden of 43 Vicarage Close, approximately 40m to the east.</li> <li>Public Rights of Way – a footpath runs through the northern part of the site and around part of the eastern boundary of the site.</li> <li>Biodiversity features - Fenland landscapes support species and habitats characterised by intensive agriculture due to the high quality soil. This has restricted biodiversity in some parts. However, drains, hedges and field margins provide refuge for species such as barn owl, corn bunting and skylark. Washlands provide temporary areas of flooded grassland that are important for plants such as the marsh foxtail, tufted hair-grass and narrow-leaved water dropwort. Important numbers of wintering wildfowl maybe found on flooded fields. The network of drainage ditches in places still retain water voles with otters occasionally found into the fens where suitable fish stocks are found. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design.</li> <li>Agricultural land of high grade (i.e. Agricultural Land Classification Grade 1, 2, 3a) – Grade 2.</li> <li>With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the natural environment.</li> </ul> |  |
| Physical  | Land contamination – allotment gardens in south. A   |  |
| considerations?   | contaminated Land Assessment will be required as a condition of  |  |

SHLAA (August 2013) Appendix 7i – Assessment of 2011 'Call for Sites' SHLAA sites Minor Rural Centre

- any planning application.
- Noise issues The A10 lies close to the east and traffic noise will need assessment in accordance with PPG 24 and associated guidance. The impact of existing noise on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well being and providing a high quality living environment. However residential use is likely to be acceptable with careful noise mitigation. Noise likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises. On balance no objection in principle.
- Noise issues Some minor to moderate additional off-site road traffic noise generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance. Possible to mitigate but may require s106 agreements.

The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes the landscape surrounding Waterbeach as typical fenland, comprising very flat large arable fields, distant views, together with quite distinctive groupings of trees. Many of the surrounding roads are raised on embankments and run alongside drainage ditches, which are also visible between the fields.

Moving closer to the edge of the village, there are more local landscape characteristics. To the west and north, enclosed fields again provide an important landscape setting for the village.

There are wide views of the village across arable fields from the approach to the village. Open arable land to the south and flat arable fields to south west provide long views. New housing estates create a clear, harsh edge to the village.

### Townscape and landscape impact?

The Draft Waterbeach Conservation Area Appraisal (2007) states: The Green is identified as a "substantial open area [that] lies at the centre of the village settlement. Along with the parish church it is the key landmark in the Conservation Area, particularly notable for the mature lime trees that line it." (page 10) "No.5 is a 17<sup>th</sup> century grade II listed two storey house. No.19, a 16<sup>th</sup> century grade II listed house." (page 11)

A public footpath leading out from The Green into the countryside to the west runs along the northern boundary of the site. There is another footpath running along the eastern boundary from residential development to the south. As an undeveloped green wedge coming in almost to the heart of the village, the site therefore provides an important amenity area.

Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Waterbeach. The site forms a semi-rural transition area between the village and the countryside

|   | beyond, and retains the rural character of the local footpaths. Appeal inspectors considering development on adjoining land to the west felt the introduction of development would be harmful to the rural attributes.  |
|---|---|
|   | attributes.   |
| 5 | No. Significant historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts on this important amenity part of the village. Development would have a detrimental impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area, which it would not be possible to mitigate. Further investigation and possible mitigation will be |

### Can any issues be mitigated?

required to address the physical considerations, including potential for land contamination and noise.

|                   | Infrastructure   |  |
|-------------------|--|--|
| Highways access?  | Regarding sites in the Milton / Waterbeach (estimated capacity of 13,602 dwellings on 14 sites) the Highways Agency comment that the vast majority of this grouping consists of the barracks site as a new settlement with the remainder essentially in-fill sites. On the whole, the in-fill sites are less likely to present an unacceptable pressure on the A14 given the majority of travel demand will be focused on Cambridge and credible alternatives to car travel could be available.  |  |
|                   | The Highway Authority has concerns in relationship to the provision of suitable inter vehicle visibility splay for this site. The access link to the public highway is unsuitable to serve the number of units that are being proposed.  |  |
| Utility services? | <ul> <li>Electricity - No significant impact on existing network.</li> <li>Mains Water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains</li> <li>Gas – Waterbeach has a gas supply and to serve this site with gas is likely to be able to be accommodated with minimal disruption or system reinforcement.</li> <li>Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the waste water treatment works to accommodate this development site. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre- development assessment will be required to ascertain the specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the developer.</li> </ul> |  |

|   | No FRA provided.   |
|---|--|
| Drainage<br>measures?                   | A majority of the development sites falls within the Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage District. The District does not have any capacity to accept any direct discharge into its system above the green field run off rate. All surface water from the site would have to be balanced before it is released into the Boards system. We also have main drains adjacent to the site, therefore any works involving these drains would require the consent of the Board.   |
| School capacity?                        | Waterbeach has a primary school with a PAN of 60 and school capacity of 420 and, and lies within the catchment of Cottenham Village College with a PAN of 180 and school capacity of 900 children. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there were deficit of 25 primary places in Waterbeach taking account of planned development in Waterbeach, and a deficit of 30 secondary places taking account of planned development across the village college catchment area.  The development of this site for 216 dwellings could generate a need for early years places and a maximum of 76 primary school places and 54 secondary places.  After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or the provision of new schools. |
| Health facilities                       | There is one doctors practice in Waterbeach which has potential for  |
| capacity?                               | expansion.   |
| Any other                               |  |
| issues?                                 |  |
| Can issues be mitigated?  Does the site | No. It is not possible to provide safe highway access to the site.  Upgrades required to local infrastructure, including utilities (mains water and sewerage), school capacity and health.   |
| warrant further                         | No   |
| assessment?                             | 140  |
| assessificit!                           |  |

### **Tier 3: Site Specific Factors**

| Capacity         |                                 |
|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Developable area | None (4.01 ha if unconstrained) |
| Site capacity    | 120 dwellings                   |
| Density          | 30 dph                          |

SHLAA (August 2013) Appendix 7i – Assessment of 2011 'Call for Sites' SHLAA sites Minor Rural Centre

| Potential Suitability |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Conclusion            | The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints |

| Availability                                      |   |
|---|---|
| Is the land in single ownership?                  | Yes   |
| Site ownership status?                            | Site promoted by single landowner.  |
| Legal constraints?                                | No known constraints.   |
| Is there market interest in the site?             | The site has not been marketed and there is no interest in the site from a developer. |
| When would the site be available for development? | The promoter indicates that the site is available immediately.                        |

|  | Achievability   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Phasing and delivery of the development                                      | The promoter indicates that the first dwellings could be completed on site 2011-16.   |  |
| Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability? | None known.   |  |
| Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?   | None known.   |  |
| Could issues identified be overcome?   |   |  |
| Economic viability?  | Viability Category 3 Less viable sites  This viability assessment is provided independent of any policy or other assessment as to whether the site should be allocated for development. The references to planning policy only relate to those existing policies governing how a site would be developed, not |  |

whether it should be allocated in the new Local Plan.

Having undertaken an assessment of this site the local planning authority have some concerns about the landowners ability to deliver a development that fully complies with current planning policy in respect of density, mix and the provision of onsite facilities whilst still delivering the necessary level of affordable housing, planning obligations and potential community infrastructure levy payments.

This site is considered to be sufficiently attractive for developers to be interested in acquiring it, assuming that the existing landowner does not have excessive aspirations, housing prices increase to those previously experienced and / or that the Council might be minded to be flexible in its application of planning policy to help ensure site viability. The Council should be mindful that the aspirations of the existing landowner, and ability to be flexible with some planning policy requirements would allow development during the plan period.

#### **Site Assessment Conclusion**

Site with no development potential.

#### Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013

Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework; Green Belt.

# South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Site Assessment Proforma

| Proforma<br>Created  | July 2012   |
|--|---|
| Proforma Last<br>Updated   | August 2013   |
| Location   | Waterbeach  |
| Site name / address  | Cody Road, Waterbeach   |
| Category of site:  | A village extension i.e. a development adjoining the existing village development framework boundary  |
| Description of promoter's proposal                                   | 45 dwellings with public open space   |
| Site area (hectares)   | 1.86 ha.  |
| Site Number  | Site 089  |
| Site<br>description &<br>context                                     | The site is located to the west of Cody Road on the north eastern edge of Waterbeach. The site is an open agricultural field surrounded by residential development to the south and west, and the Barracks to the north. The Cody Road frontage, to the east, is open to views across further open agricultural land to the east.             |
|  | Note: the site is also considered as site 189 and is adjacent to Site 231 to the north.   |
| Current or last use of the site                                      | Agricultural  |
| Is the site<br>Previously<br>Developed<br>Land?                      | No  |
| Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan? | No  |
| Planning<br>history  | LP 2004 Inspector concluded: "This is a green field arable site immediately to the west of that discussed above. The land is open to Cody Road and much more visible from the east. In my view there is far less case for developing this site and I do not support the objector's request that it be allocated for residential development." |
| Source of site   | Site suggested through call for sites   |

| Tier 1: Strategic Considerations   |  |
|--|--|
| Green Belt<br>(Updated August<br>2013)   | The site is included in the Green Belt in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.  |
| Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development? | Minerals and Waste LDF designations (Core Strategy designations only) – the majority of the site is within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel.   |
| Tier 1 conclusion:   | The is an agricultural site located to the west of Cody Road on the north eastern edge of Waterbeach with no strategic constraints identified that would prevent the site from being developed. The majority of the site is within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel. |
| Does the site warrant further assessment?  | Yes.   |

### **Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations**

| Designations and Constraints                                |  |
|---|--|
| Heritage considerations?                                    | <ul> <li>Conservation Area – the Waterbeach Conservation Area is approximately 170m to the south west. Minimal impact on setting of conservation area.</li> <li>Non-statutory archaeological site - Archaeological investigations to the immediate west identified evidence for Roman activity. County Archaeologists would require archaeological works to be secured by condition of planning permission.</li> <li>The site forms part of the setting of the Conservation Area, but with careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the historic environment.</li> </ul> |
| Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations? | <ul> <li>Tree Preservation Orders – a group of protected trees are located 60m to the south.</li> <li>Biodiversity features - Fenland landscapes support species and habitats characterised by intensive agriculture due to the high quality soil. This has restricted biodiversity in some parts. However, drains, hedges and field margins provide refuge for species such as barn owl, corn bunting and skylark. Washlands provide temporary areas of flooded grassland that are important for plants such as the marsh foxtail, tufted hair-grass and</li> </ul>                           |

narrow-leaved water dropwort. Important numbers of wintering wildfowl maybe found on flooded fields. The network of drainage ditches in places still retain water voles with otters occasionally found into the fens where suitable fish stocks are found. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design.

Agricultural land of high grade (i.e. Agricultural Land Classification Grade 1, 2, 3a) - Grade 2.

With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the natural environment.

### **Physical** considerations?

Noise issues - Some minor to moderate additional off-site road traffic noise generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance. Possible to mitigate but may require s106 agreements.

The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes the landscape surrounding Waterbeach as typical fenland, comprising very flat large arable fields, distant views, together with quite distinctive groupings of trees. Many of the surrounding roads are raised on embankments and run alongside drainage ditches, which are also visible between the fields.

The tower of St John's Church provides a distinctive landmark within Waterbeach, being visible from many viewpoints to the east and south of the village.

### Townscape and landscape impact? (Updated August 2013)

Moving closer to the edge of the village, there are more local landscape characteristics. To the east the village edge comprises enclosed fields and paddocks, with well used footpaths to the banks of the River Cam.

The site is characterised as enclosed farmland. There is a well defined edge along Bannold Road, with views north across flat rough grassland to housing along Kirby Road.

Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Waterbeach. There is a very clear boundary to the village to the west and south of the site. The site is located in a relatively open area separating the village from the Barracks to the north. It is in agricultural use and this, together with the open land to the east, creates a rural character and the appearance of the countryside entering the village. If this site were developed it would intrude into the rural separation area between Waterbeach and the Barracks.

Land to the north of the village has been identified in the Proposed Submission Local Plan for the development of a new settlement. The area is important for maintaining the village character of Waterbeach,

|   | and warrants the level of protection afforded by the Green Belt in order that it remains open. |
|---|--|
| Can any issues<br>be mitigated?<br>(Updated August<br>2013) | No.  |

| Infrastructure      |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Highways<br>access? | Regarding sites in the Milton / Waterbeach (estimated capacity of 13,602 dwellings on 14 sites) the Highways Agency comment that the vast majority of this grouping consists of the barracks site as a new settlement with the remainder essentially in-fill sites. On the whole, the in-fill sites are less likely to present an unacceptable pressure on the A14 given the majority of travel demand will be focused on Cambridge and credible alternatives to car travel could be available.  A junction located on to Cody Road would be acceptable to the Highway Authority. The proposed site is acceptable in principle subject to detailed design.  In the Highway Authority's opinion a significant level of infrastructure will be required to encourage more sustainable transport links; such infrastructure will extend be used the confined of the site.  |
| Utility services?   | <ul> <li>infrastructure will extend beyond the confines of the site.</li> <li>Electricity - No significant impact on existing network.</li> <li>Mains Water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains</li> <li>Gas – Waterbeach has a gas supply and to serve this site with gas is likely to be able to be accommodated with minimal disruption or system reinforcement.</li> <li>Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the waste water treatment works to accommodate this development site. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre- development assessment will be required to ascertain the specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the developer.</li> </ul> |

|                       | No FRA provided.   |
|-----------------------|--|
| Drainage<br>measures? | A majority of the development sites falls within the Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage District. The District does not have any capacity to accept any direct discharge into its system above the green field run off rate. All surface water from the site would have to be balanced before it is released into the Boards system. We also have main drains adjacent to the site, therefore any works involving these drains would require the consent of the Board.   |
| School capacity?      | Waterbeach has a primary school with a PAN of 60 and school capacity of 420 and, and lies within the catchment of Cottenham Village College with a PAN of 180 and school capacity of 900 children. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there were deficit of 25 primary places in Waterbeach taking account of planned development in Waterbeach, and a deficit of 30 secondary places taking account of planned development across the village college catchment area.  The development of this site for 45 dwellings could generate a need for early years places and a maximum of 16 primary school places and 11 secondary places.  After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or  |
| Health facilities     | the provision of new schools.  There is one doctors practice in Waterbeach which has potential for   |
| capacity?             | expansion.   |
| Any other issues?     | <ol> <li>The proposer provides the following supporting information:</li> <li>A safe vehicular access to serve the development will be created because the entire west boundary fronts Cody Road and there is good visibility in both directions.</li> <li>A permeable site layout will be created because pedestrian and cycle access points could be located on the west boundary where it adjoins the public open space on the Cambs Lock residential development site (see applications S/1551/04/O, S/1737/07/RM and S/1260/09/RM).</li> <li>The natural surveillance of the adjoining public open space on the Cambs Lock development will be enhanced because houses could be positioned to front its east boundary.</li> <li>The extent of the Green Belt to the east, south and west of Waterbeach will be safeguarded and its special qualities and characteristics will be preserved.</li> <li>Development would not represent a flood risk or exacerbate flooding elsewhere because the site is not susceptible to flooding.</li> <li>More affordable and diverse range of housing to help alleviate housing pressures and contribute to a balanced housing market in</li> </ol> |

|                 | <ul> <li>Waterbeach.</li> <li>7. Locating new development in a well connected location that benefits from strategic transport corridors of the A10, A14 and the King's Lynn to London Kin's Cross railway line, providing excellent links to the M11, Cambridge, Peterborough and Bury St Edmunds; linking people to jobs, schools, health and other services.</li> <li>8. Locating new development in the centre of the Cambridge subregion and close to significant areas of employment, such as the science and business parks on the north edge of Cambridge and along the A10 corridor, will help to sustain, and enhance, its role in leading in the education, research and knowledge-based industry.</li> </ul> |
|-----------------|---|
| Can issues be   | Yes, with upgrades to local infrastructure, including utilities (mains  |
| mitigated?      | water and sewerage), school capacity and health.  |
| Does the site   |   |
| warrant further | No  |
| assessment?     |   |

### **Tier 3: Site Specific Factors**

| Capacity         |                                  |
|------------------|----------------------------------|
| Developable area | None (1.67 ha. If unconstrained) |
| Site capacity    | 50 dwellings                     |
| Density          | 30 dph                           |

| Potential Suitability                  |  |
|--|--|
| Conclusion<br>(Updated August<br>2013) | The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints. |

| Availability                                      |   |
|---|---|
| Is the land in single ownership?                  | Yes   |
| Site ownership status?                            | Site promoted by a single landowner.  |
| Legal constraints?                                | No known constraints.   |
| Is there market interest in the site?             | The promoter has indicated that the site has not been marketed and there is no interest in the site from a developer. |
| When would the site be available for development? | The promoter has indicated that the site is available immediately.  |

| Achievability  |  |
|--|--|
| Phasing and delivery of the development                                      | The promoter has indicated that the first dwellings could be completed on site 2011-16.  |
| Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability? | None known.  |
| Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?   | None known.  |
| Could issues identified be overcome?   |  |
| Economic viability?  | Viability Category 2 Viable sites  This viability assessment is provided independent of any policy or other assessment as to whether the site should be allocated for development. The references to planning policy only relate to those existing policies governing how a site would be developed, not whether it should be allocated in the new Local Plan.  Having undertaken an assessment of this site the local planning authority have few concerns that that the landowner would be unable to deliver a development that complies with current planning policy in respect of density, mix and the provision of onsite facilities whilst still delivering the necessary level of affordable housing, planning obligations and potential community infrastructure levy payments.  In summary this scheme is not considered to have any barriers, in |
|  | terms of development viability alone, to restrict it coming forward within the next 5 years (new settlements and other very large developments may take longer than 5 years to come forward).  |

### **Site Assessment Conclusion**

Update August 2013: Site with no development potential.

### Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013

Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework; Green Belt.

# South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Site Assessment Proforma

| Droforms   |  |
|--|--|
| Proforma<br>Created  | July 2012  |
| Proforma Last<br>Updated   | July 2012  |
| Location   | Waterbeach   |
| Site name / address  | Burgess Road, Waterbeach   |
| Category of site:  | A village extension i.e. a development adjoining the existing village development framework boundary   |
| Description of promoter's proposal                                   | 27 dwellings with public open space  |
| Site area (hectares)   | 1.14 ha.   |
| Site Number  | Site 090   |
| Site description & context   | The site is located to the north of Burgess Road, on the eastern edge of Waterbeach. The northern part of the site only partly adjoins the edge of the village and is rough grassland, enclosed by trees. The southern part of the site is more enclosed rough ground and storage buildings, close to the rear of residential properties on Burgess Road. Open countryside lies to the east, up to the railway line.  Note: the northern part of the site is also considered as part of site |
| Current or last  | 190. The site adjoins site 91 to the north.  Pasture and storage buildings.  |
| Is the site Previously Developed Land?                               | No   |
| Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan? | No   |
| Planning<br>history  | Part of the site was promoted through the LDF as Objection Site 126 (and parts of larger sites 129 and 131). It had also been considered by the Inspectors for LP 2004 and 1993:  LP2004 - "I have not found any exceptional circumstances to warrant modification of the boundaries of the Green Belt. While there are  |

SHLAA (August 2013) Appendix 7i – Assessment of 2011 'Call for Sites' SHLAA sites Minor Rural Centre Site 090 Burgess Road, Waterbeach about 3 parcels that are not affected either by the Green Belt designation or the flood plain I am not aware that any are 'previously developed land'. In addition, it appeared to me that there may be access constraints. I therefore do not support the objections."

LP1993 - "Land east of the Framework between Bannold Road and Burgess Road is essentially open countryside and part of the rural setting of Waterbeach. The railway line crosses it, but I do not consider that this forms any sort of enclosure or suitable edge of the village towards which further development should advance. The Green Belt status of much of the land further militates against its development."

A planning application for residential development on a larger site (C/1368/73/O) was refused as contrary to the village plan which only allowed infilling due to limited availability of services and facilities.

#### Source of site

Site suggested through call for sites

### **Tier 1: Strategic Considerations**

The majority of the site is within the Green Belt, although a small part in the south west corner is white land.

**Green Belt Purposes** 

- Maintains and enhances the quality of Cambridge's setting
- Prevents coalescence between settlements and with Cambridge

Function with regard to the special character of Cambridge and it's setting:

- The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages
- A landscape which retains a strong rural character

#### **Green Belt**

Site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on GB purposes and functions. The Landscape Design Associates Green Belt Study (2002) describes it as an area from which distinct views of the city are scarce or absent. The function of this landscape is providing a backdrop to views of the city, and providing a setting for approaches to connective, supportive and distinctive areas of townscape and landscape. (page 62) Outer Rural Areas play a lesser role in contributing to the distinctiveness of Cambridge and its setting, and are less finite. They may also have the potential to accommodate change and development that does not cause adverse effects on the setting and special character. (page 66)

| Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development? | No   |
|--|--|
| Tier 1<br>conclusion:  | This site is located to the north of Burgess Road, on the eastern edge of Waterbeach within the Green Belt. The site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions:  • Maintains and enhances the quality of Cambridge's setting  • Prevents coalescence between settlements and with Cambridge  • The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages  • A landscape which retains a strong rural character |
| Does the site  |  |
| warrant further  | Yes  |
| assessment?  |  |

**Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations** 

| Designations and Constraints                                |  |
|---|--|
| Heritage considerations?                                    | <ul> <li>Listed Buildings – a Grade II Listed building is situated adjacent to the south eastern boundary. Major adverse effect to setting due to loss of wooded and open green backdrop and streetscape.</li> <li>Non-statutory archaeological site - The site is located to the east of the historic village core and to the north of the site of nationally important Waterbeach Abbey (SAM52). County Archaeologists would require further information in advance of any planning application for this site before it is able to advise on the suitability of the site for development.</li> <li>It would be very difficult to mitigate any impact on the historic environment as development would have a direct impact on the setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed Building and development would result in the loss of wooded and open green backdrop and</li> </ul> |
| Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations? | <ul> <li>Tree Preservation Orders – protected trees are situated approximately 55m to the west of the site.</li> <li>Public Rights of Way – a footpath lies approximately 225m to the south east, along the railway line.</li> <li>Biodiversity features - Fenland landscapes support species and habitats characterised by intensive agriculture due to the high</li> </ul>   |

quality soil. This has restricted biodiversity in some parts. However, drains, hedges and field margins provide refuge for species such as barn owl, corn bunting and skylark. Washlands provide temporary areas of flooded grassland that are important for plants such as the marsh foxtail, tufted hair-grass and narrow-leaved water dropwort. Important numbers of wintering wildfowl maybe found on flooded fields. The network of drainage ditches in places still retain water voles with otters occasionally found into the fens where suitable fish stocks are found. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design.

With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the natural environment.

### Physical considerations?

- Land contamination Agricultural buildings in south. A contaminated Land Assessment will be required as a condition of any planning application.
- Noise issues Some minor to moderate additional road traffic noise generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance.

The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes the landscape surrounding Waterbeach as typical fenland, comprising very flat large arable fields, distant views, together with quite distinctive groupings of trees. Many of the surrounding roads are raised on embankments and run alongside drainage ditches, which are also visible between the fields.

The tower of St John's Church provides a distinctive landmark within Waterbeach, being visible from many viewpoints to the east and south of the village.

### Townscape and landscape impact?

Moving closer to the edge of the village, there are more local landscape characteristics. To the east the village edge comprises enclosed fields and paddocks, with well used footpaths to the banks of the River Cam.

The site is in a substantial area of woodland and grassland, which provides a transition between village and arable fields. The woodland forms a rural setting and soft edge for village, beyond which is more open agricultural fields closer to the railway line to the east.

Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Waterbeach. The built up edge of Waterbeach is clearly defined to the west of the site. The site, particularly the northern part of the site, does not relate well to the village but to the treed land that opens out to the east onto the adjoining flat agricultural fields. The site has a rural character and

|                | creates a soft edge to the village. The presence of the railway line to  |
|----------------|--|
|                | the east does not mean that the village should automatically expand      |
|                | outwards towards it. Development would be detrimental to the rural       |
|                | character and setting of this part of the village.                       |
|                | No. Significant historic environment, townscape and landscape            |
|                | impacts. Development would have a detrimental impact on the              |
| Can any issues | setting of Grade II Listed Building, which it would not be possible to   |
| be mitigated?  | mitigate. Further investigation and possible mitigation will be required |
|                | to address the physical considerations, including potential for land     |
|                | contamination.   |

|                     | Infrastructure   |  |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Highways<br>access? | Regarding sites in the Milton / Waterbeach (estimated capacity of 13,602 dwellings on 14 sites) the Highways Agency comment that the vast majority of this grouping consists of the barracks site as a new settlement with the remainder essentially in-fill sites. On the whole, the in-fill sites are less likely to present an unacceptable pressure on the A14 given the majority of travel demand will be focused on Cambridge and credible alternatives to car travel could be available.  The access link to the public highway is unsuitable to serve the number of units that are being proposed, due to the close proximity of Payton Way.   |  |
| Utility services?   | <ul> <li>Electricity - No significant impact on existing network.</li> <li>Mains Water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains</li> <li>Gas – Waterbeach has a gas supply and to serve this site with gas is likely to be able to be accommodated with minimal disruption or system reinforcement.</li> <li>Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the waste water treatment works to accommodate this development site. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre- development assessment will be required to ascertain the specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the developer.</li> </ul> |  |

|                       | No EDA maridad  |
|-----------------------|---|
|                       | No FRA provided.  |
| Drainage<br>measures? | A majority of the development sites falls within the Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage District. The District does not have any capacity to accept any direct discharge into its system above the green field run off rate. All surface water from the site would have to be balanced before it is released into the Boards system. We also have main drains adjacent to the site, therefore any works involving these drains would require the consent of the Board.  |
| School capacity?      | Waterbeach has a primary school with a PAN of 60 and school capacity of 420 and, and lies within the catchment of Cottenham Village College with a PAN of 180 and school capacity of 900 children. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there were deficit of 25 primary places in Waterbeach taking account of planned development in Waterbeach, and a deficit of 30 secondary places taking account of planned development across the village college catchment area.   |
|                       | The development of this site for 27 dwellings could generate a need for early years places and a maximum of 9 primary school places and 7 secondary places.  After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or the provision of new schools.  |
| Health facilities     | There is one doctors practice in Waterbeach which has potential for   |
| capacity?             | expansion.  |
| Any other issues?     | <ol> <li>The proposer provides the following supporting information:</li> <li>Retaining and converting the three farm buildings on the site represents an opportunity to enhance the appearance of the southern part of the site.</li> <li>It represents the most sustainable way to provide new housing as it would involve the redevelopment of existing buildings and allow new development to be integrated within the existing settlement pattern.</li> <li>Development will not lead to unrestricted sprawl or coalescence with other settlements because the site is well related to the built-up area and the residential areas to the north, south and west.</li> <li>Locating new development away from a prominent location and on a relatively flat site will preserve the setting and special character of Waterbeach.</li> <li>A larger development providing more homes, enhanced public open space and additional connections to existing residential areas could be achieved if the site is brought forward for development at the same time as the adjoining site to the north, which is in the same ownership (see separate submission for 'Saberton Close, Waterbeach').</li> <li>More affordable and diverse range of housing to help alleviate</li> </ol> |

|                 | housing pressures and contribute to a balanced housing market in Waterbeach.  |
|-----------------|---|
|                 | 7. Locating new development in a well connected location that   |
|                 | benefits from strategic transport corridors of the A10, A14 and the   |
|                 | King's Lynn to London Kin's Cross railway line, providing excellent   |
|                 | links to the M11, Cambridge, Peterborough and Bury St Edmunds;  |
|                 | linking people to jobs, schools, health and other services.   |
|                 | 8. Locating new development in the centre of the Cambridge sub-<br>region and close to significant areas of employment, such as the |
|                 | science and business parks on the north edge of Cambridge and   |
|                 | along the A10 corridor, will help to sustain, and enhance, its role in  |
|                 | leading in the education, research and knowledge-based industry.  |
|                 | No. It is not possible to provide safe highway access to the site.  |
| Can issues be   |   |
| mitigated?      | Upgrades required to local infrastructure, including utilities (mains   |
|                 | water and sewerage), school capacity and health.  |
| Does the site   |   |
| warrant further | No  |
| assessment?     |   |

#### **Tier 3: Site Specific Factors**

| Capacity         |                                 |
|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Developable area | None (0.64 ha if unconstrained) |
| Site capacity    | 19 dwellings                    |
| Density          | 30 dph                          |

| Potential Suitability |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Conclusion            | The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints. |

| Availability                          |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Is the land in single ownership?      | No   |
| Site ownership status?                | Site promoted by two joint landowners.   |
| Legal constraints?                    | No known constraints.  |
| Is there market interest in the site? | The site has not been marketed and is there is no interest in the site from a developer. |

| When would the                     |  |
|------------------------------------|--|
| site be available for development? | The promoter indicates that the site is available immediately. |

| Achievability  |  |
|--|--|
| Phasing and delivery of the development                                      | The promoter indicates that the first dwellings could be completed on site 2011-16   |
| Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability? | None known.  |
| Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?   | None known.  |
| Could issues identified be overcome?   |  |
| Economic viability?  | Viability Category 3 Less viable sites  This viability assessment is provided independent of any policy or other assessment as to whether the site should be allocated for development. The references to planning policy only relate to those existing policies governing how a site would be developed, not whether it should be allocated in the new Local Plan.  Having undertaken an assessment of this site the local planning authority have some concerns about the landowners ability to deliver a development that fully complies with current planning policy in respect of density, mix and the provision of onsite facilities whilst still delivering the necessary level of affordable housing, planning obligations and potential community infrastructure levy payments.  This site is considered to be sufficiently attractive for developers to be interested in acquiring it, assuming that the existing landowner does not have excessive aspirations, housing prices increase to those previously experienced and / or that the Council might be minded to be flexible in its application of planning policy to help ensure site viability. The Council should be mindful that the aspirations of the existing landowner, and ability to be flexible with some planning policy requirements would allow development during the plan period. |

#### **Site Assessment Conclusion**

Site with no development potential.

#### Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013

Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework; Green Belt.

## South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Site Assessment Proforma

| Proforma<br>Created  | July 2012  |
|--|--|
| Proforma Last<br>Updated   | July 2012  |
| Location   | Waterbeach   |
| Site name / address  | Saberton Close, Waterbeach   |
| Category of site:  | A village extension i.e. a development adjoining the existing village development framework boundary   |
| Description of promoter's proposal                                   | 26 dwellings with public open space  |
| Site area<br>(hectares)  | 1.08 ha.   |
| Site Number  | Site 091   |
| Site description & context   | The site is located to the east of Saberton Close, south of Bannold Road and north of Burgess Road, on the eastern edge of Waterbeach. The site is bounded on three sides; to the north, west and part of the south by housing and is heavily treed. Open countryside lies to the east, up to the railway line.  |
|  | Note: the site is considered as part of larger site 190. It also adjoins site 90 to the south.   |
| Current or last use of the site                                      | Woodland   |
| Is the site<br>Previously<br>Developed<br>Land?                      | No   |
| Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan? | No   |
| Planning<br>history  | The site was promoted through the LDF as Objection Site 126 (and parts of larger sites 129 and 131). It had also been considered by the Inspectors for LP 2004 and 1993:  LP2004 - "I have not found any exceptional circumstances to warrant modification of the boundaries of the Green Belt. While there are about 3 parcels that are not affected either by the Green Belt |

designation or the flood plain I am not aware that any are 'previously developed land'. In addition, it appeared to me that there may be access constraints. I therefore do not support the objections."

LP1993 - "Land east of the Framework between Bannold Road and Burgess Road is essentially open countryside and part of the rural setting of Waterbeach. The railway line crosses it, but I do not consider that this forms any sort of enclosure or suitable edge of the village towards which further development should advance. The Green Belt status of much of the land further militates against its development."

A planning application for residential development on a larger site (C/1368/73/O) was refused as contrary to the village plan which only allowed infilling due to limited availability of services and facilities.

#### Source of site

Site suggested through call for sites

#### **Tier 1: Strategic Considerations**

The site is within the Green Belt.

Green Belt Purposes

- Maintains and enhances the quality of Cambridge's setting
- Prevents coalescence between settlements and with Cambridge

Function with regard to the special character of Cambridge and it's setting:

- The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages
- A landscape which retains a strong rural character

#### **Green Belt**

Site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on GB purposes and functions. The Landscape Design Associates Green Belt Study (2002) describes it as an area from which distinct views of the city are scarce or absent. The function of this landscape is providing a backdrop to views of the city, and providing a setting for approaches to connective, supportive and distinctive areas of townscape and landscape. (page 62) Outer Rural Areas play a lesser role in contributing to the distinctiveness of Cambridge and its setting, and are less finite. They may also have the potential to accommodate change and development that does not cause adverse effects on the setting and special character. (page 66)

| Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development? | No   |
|--|--|
| Tier 1<br>conclusion:  | This site is located to the east of Saberton Close, on the eastern edge of Waterbeach, within the Green Belt. The site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions:  • Maintains and enhances the quality of Cambridge's setting  • Prevents coalescence between settlements and with Cambridge  • The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages  • A landscape which retains a strong rural character |
| Does the site  |  |
| warrant further  | Yes  |
| assessment?  |  |

#### **Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations**

| Designations and Constraints                                |  |
|---|--|
| Heritage considerations?                                    | <ul> <li>Listed Buildings – a Grade II Listed Building lies approximately 160m to the south. Adverse effect to setting due to loss of wooded and open green backdrop.</li> <li>Non-statutory archaeological site - The site is located to the east of the historic village core and to the north of the site of nationally important Waterbeach Abbey (SAM52). County Archaeologists would require further information in advance of any planning application for this site before it is able to advise on the suitability of the site for development.</li> <li>It would be very difficult to mitigate any impact on the historic environment as development would have a direct impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Buildings.</li> </ul> |
| Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations? | <ul> <li>Tree Preservation Orders – protected trees are situated approximately 80m to the south west of the site.</li> <li>Public Rights of Way – a footpath lies approximately 210m to the south east, along the railway line.</li> <li>Biodiversity features – Fenland landscapes support species and habitats characterised by intensive agriculture due to the high quality soil. This has restricted biodiversity in some parts. However, drains, hedges and field margins provide refuge for</li> </ul>  |

species such as barn owl, corn bunting and skylark. Washlands provide temporary areas of flooded grassland that are important for plants such as the marsh foxtail, tufted hair-grass and narrow-leaved water dropwort. Important numbers of wintering wildfowl maybe found on flooded fields. The network of drainage ditches in places still retain water voles with otters occasionally found into the fens where suitable fish stocks are found. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design.

With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the natural environment.

### Physical considerations?

 Noise issues – Some minor to moderate additional road traffic noise generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance.

The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes the landscape surrounding Waterbeach as typical fenland, comprising very flat large arable fields, distant views, together with quite distinctive groupings of trees. Many of the surrounding roads are raised on embankments and run alongside drainage ditches, which are also visible between the fields.

The tower of St John's Church provides a distinctive landmark within Waterbeach, being visible from many viewpoints to the east and south of the village.

### Townscape and landscape impact?

Moving closer to the edge of the village, there are more local landscape characteristics. To the east the village edge comprises enclosed fields and paddocks, with well used footpaths to the banks of the River Cam.

The site is in a substantial area of woodland and grassland, which provides a transition between village and arable fields. The woodland forms a rural setting and soft edge for village, beyond which is more open agricultural fields closer to the railway line to the east.

Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Waterbeach. The built up edge of Waterbeach is clearly defined to the west of the site. The site, particularly the southern part of the site, does not relate well to the village but to the treed land that opens out to the east onto the adjoining flat agricultural fields. The site has a rural character and creates a soft edge to the village. The presence of the railway line to the east does not mean that the village should automatically expand outwards towards it. Development would be detrimental to the rural character and setting of this part of the village.

| Can any issues |
|----------------|
| be mitigated?  |

No. Significant historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts. Development would have a detrimental impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building, which it would not be possible to mitigate.

|                       | Infrastructure   |  |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Highways access?      | Regarding sites in the Milton / Waterbeach (estimated capacity of 13,602 dwellings on 14 sites) the Highways Agency comment that the vast majority of this grouping consists of the barracks site as a new settlement with the remainder essentially in-fill sites. On the whole, the in-fill sites are less likely to present an unacceptable pressure on the A14 given the majority of travel demand will be focused on Cambridge and credible alternatives to car travel could be available.  The access link to the public highway is unsuitable to serve the number of units that are being proposed.   |  |
| Utility services?     | <ul> <li>Electricity - No significant impact on existing network.</li> <li>Mains Water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains</li> <li>Gas – Waterbeach has a gas supply and to serve this site with gas is likely to be able to be accommodated with minimal disruption or system reinforcement.</li> <li>Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the waste water treatment works to accommodate this development site. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre- development assessment will be required to ascertain the specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the developer.</li> </ul> |  |
| Drainage<br>measures? | No FRA provided.  A majority of the development sites falls within the Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage District. The District does not have any capacity to accept any direct discharge into its system above the green field run off rate. All surface water from the site would have to be balanced before it is released into the Boards system. We also have main drains adjacent to the site, therefore any works involving these drains would require the consent of the Board.   |  |

#### Waterbeach has a primary school with a PAN of 60 and school capacity of 420 and, and lies within the catchment of Cottenham Village College with a PAN of 180 and school capacity of 900 children. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there were deficit of 25 primary places in Waterbeach taking account of planned development in Waterbeach, and a deficit of 30 secondary places taking account of planned development across the village college School catchment area. capacity? The development of this site for 26 dwellings could generate a need for early years places and a maximum of 9 primary school places and 7 secondary places. After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or the provision of new schools. **Health facilities** There is one doctors practice in Waterbeach which has potential for capacity? expansion. The proposer provides the following supporting information: 1. Removing trees that are in a poor condition or are dangerous and replacing them with fruit trees represents an opportunity to create an orchard on part of the site, which was its former use. 2. A safe vehicular access to serve the development will be created because part of the west boundary adjoins Saberton Close and there is good visibility in both directions. 3. Providing landscaped areas will create landscape and habitat links across the development embedding the scheme into the local landscape and provide opportunities for creative and structured play. 4. The extent of the Green Belt to the east, south and west of Waterbeach will be safeguarded and its special qualities and Any other characteristics will be preserved. 5. Development would not represent a flood risk or exacerbate issues? flooding elsewhere because the site is not susceptible to flooding. 6. More affordable and diverse range of housing to help alleviate housing pressures and contribute to a balanced housing market in Waterbeach. 7. Locating new development in a well connected location that benefits from strategic transport corridors of the A10, A14 and the King's Lynn to London Kin's Cross railway line, providing excellent links to the M11, Cambridge, Peterborough and Bury St Edmunds; linking people to jobs, schools, health and other services. 8. Locating new development in the centre of the Cambridge subregion and close to significant areas of employment, such as the science and business parks on the north edge of Cambridge and along the A10 corridor, will help to sustain, and enhance, its role in leading in the education, research and knowledge-based industry.

|                 | No. It is not possible to provide safe highway access to the site.    |
|-----------------|---|
| Can issues be   |   |
| mitigated?      | Upgrades required to local infrastructure, including utilities (mains |
|                 | water and sewerage), school capacity and health.                      |
| Does the site   |   |
| warrant further | No  |
| assessment?     |   |

#### **Tier 3: Site Specific Factors**

| Capacity         |                                 |
|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Developable area | None (0.41 ha if unconstrained) |
| Site capacity    | 12 dwellings                    |
| Density          | 30 dph                          |

| Potential Suitability |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Conclusion            | The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints. |

| Availability                                      |   |
|---|---|
| Is the land in single ownership?                  | Yes   |
| Site ownership status?                            | Site promoter by single owner.  |
| Legal constraints?                                | No known constraints.   |
| Is there market interest in the site?             | The site has not been marketed and there is no interest in the site from a developer. |
| When would the site be available for development? | The promoter indicates that the site is available immediately.                        |

| Achievability                           |  |
|---|--|
| Phasing and delivery of the development | The promoter indicates that the first dwellings could be completed on site 2011-16 |

| Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability? | None known.  |
|--|--|
| Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?   | None known.  |
| Could issues identified be overcome?   |  |
| Economic viability?  | Viability Category 3 Less viable sites  This viability assessment is provided independent of any policy or other assessment as to whether the site should be allocated for development. The references to planning policy only relate to those existing policies governing how a site would be developed, not whether it should be allocated in the new Local Plan.  Having undertaken an assessment of this site the local planning authority have some concerns about the landowners ability to deliver a development that fully complies with current planning policy in respect of density, mix and the provision of onsite facilities whilst still delivering the necessary level of affordable housing, planning obligations and potential community infrastructure levy payments.  This site is considered to be sufficiently attractive for developers to be interested in acquiring it, assuming that the existing landowner does not have excessive aspirations, housing prices increase to those previously experienced and / or that the Council might be minded to be flexible in its application of planning policy to help ensure site viability. The Council should be mindful that the aspirations of the existing landowner, and ability to be flexible with some planning policy requirements would allow development during the plan period. |

#### **Site Assessment Conclusion**

Site with no development potential.

#### Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013

Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework; Green Belt.

### South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Site Assessment Proforma

| Proforma<br>Created  | July 2012   |
|--|---|
| Proforma Last<br>Updated   | July 2012   |
| Location   | Waterbeach  |
| Site name / address  | Land north of Poorsfield Road, Waterbeach   |
| Category of site:  | A village extension i.e. a development adjoining the existing village development framework boundary  |
| Description of promoter's proposal                                   | Residential development (note: the site does not meet the size threshold, however it adjoins other sites and therefore the assessment of this site is conditional on an adjoining site being found to have potential)   |
| Site area<br>(hectares)  | 0.2 ha.   |
| Site Number  | Site 142  |
| Site description & context   | The site is located to the north of Poorsfield Road on the western edge of Waterbeach. It is a rectangular site, adjoining residential to the south and countryside on the other three sides. The land is wooded, adjacent to pasture to the east and open arable land to the west.  Note: The site is adjacent to site 270 to the east and site 43 to the west.  |
| Current or last use of the site                                      | Pasture (former orchard)  |
| Is the site<br>Previously<br>Developed<br>Land?                      | No  |
| Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan? | No  |
| Planning<br>history  | LP 2004 Inspector considered a larger area of land between Vicarage Close & Harding Close and concluded: "These objections relate to 3 separate but adjoining sites alongside an east-west footpath not far to the west of the main village green. From my visit I concluded that the sites serve very little townscape or landscape function. Any limited 'green' views on the boundary of the Conservation Area to the east |

SHLAA (August 2013) Appendix 7i – Assessment of 2011 'Call for Sites' SHLAA sites Minor Rural Centre could be preserved through appropriate landscaping details at development control stage. In my view the land represents a wasted resource and its more effective use should be encouraged in order to contribute towards the District's housing needs. There appear to be potential options for providing access to the objection sites across other underused sites to the south and east and I recommend that all 3 be brought into the village framework." Note – the Council did not agree with the Inspector's recommendation and no change was made to the village framework.

An application for 6 dwellings (S/1564/91/O) was refused and appeal dismissed. The Inspector concluded: "It seems to me that the appeal site lies not in open countryside, but at the interface between built-up area and countryside. The site, which is not in the Green Belt, is overgrown and I particularly noted the formation and degree of screening it created to this part of the village. As it is not physically contained by existing residential development, I regard the proposal as representing an undesirable extension of the village; such extension would harm the nature and character of the area.

I am concerned also about the impact of the proposal on the public footpath which abuts the site. In view of the distance of most existing properties from this footpath and the vegetation in the vicinity, its character appears secluded and semi-rural, providing an attractive link between the sparsely developed area to the west and the developed area of the village to the east. I consider that the appeal scheme would have a significant and adverse impact on the attractive character of the footpath, even if it were carefully screened and landscaped."

#### Source of site

Site suggested through call for sites

| Tier 1: Strategic Considerations   |  |
|--|--|
| Green Belt   | The site is not within the Green Belt.   |
| Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development? | Minerals and Waste LDF designations (Core Strategy designations only) – the whole site is within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel.   |
| Tier 1<br>conclusion:  | This is a pastureland site located to the north of Poorsfield Road on the western edge of Waterbeach with no strategic constraints identified that would prevent the site from being developed. The whole site is within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel. |

Does the site
warrant further
assessment?

Yes

#### **Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations**

#### **Designations and Constraints** Conservation Area – the Waterbeach Conservation Area lies approximately 120m to the east. Listed Buildings – there are three Grade II Listed Buildings close to the site. The closest, 10 Cambridge Road, is 125m to the south east. The other two are approximately 180m to the east. Setting of 5 Greenside would have adverse effect due to loss of significant green setting. Non-statutory archaeological site - The site is located adjacent to Heritage the line of the Car Dyke Roman canal. There is also evidence considerations? for Saxon settlement in the vicinity. County Archaeologists would require further information in advance of any planning application for this site before it is able to advise on the suitability of the site for development. It would be very difficult to mitigate any impact on the historic environment as development would impact on the setting of three Grade II Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area due to the loss of significant green setting. Tree Preservation Orders – there is a protected Ash tree situated in rear garden of 43 Vicarage Close, approximately 44m to the north east. Public Rights of Way – footpaths run along the northern and eastern boundaries of the site. Biodiversity features - Fenland landscapes support species and habitats characterised by intensive agriculture due to the high quality soil. This has restricted biodiversity in some parts. Environmental However, drains, hedges and field margins provide refuge for and wildlife species such as barn owl, corn bunting and skylark. Washlands designations provide temporary areas of flooded grassland that are important and for plants such as the marsh foxtail, tufted hair-grass and considerations? narrow-leaved water dropwort. Important numbers of wintering wildfowl maybe found on flooded fields. The network of drainage ditches in places still retain water voles with otters occasionally found into the fens where suitable fish stocks are found. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design.

Agricultural land of high grade (i.e. Agricultural Land

Classification Grade 1, 2, 3a) – Grade 2.

|                                 | With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the natural environment.  |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Physical considerations?        | None  |
| Townscape and landscape impact? | The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes the landscape surrounding Waterbeach as typical fenland, comprising very flat large arable fields, distant views, together with quite distinctive groupings of trees. Many of the surrounding roads are raised on embankments and run alongside drainage ditches, which are also visible between the fields.   |
|                                 | Moving closer to the edge of the village, there are more local landscape characteristics. To the west and north, enclosed fields again provide an important landscape setting for the village.  |
|                                 | The site forms part of the setting of the Waterbeach Conservation Area. The Draft Waterbeach Conservation Area Appraisal (2007) states: "The Green is identified as a "substantial open area [that] lies at the centre of the village settlement. Along with the parish church it is the key landmark in the Conservation Area, particularly notable for the mature lime trees that line it." (page 10) "No.5 is a 17 <sup>th</sup> century grade II listed two storey house. No.19, a 16 <sup>th</sup> century grade II listed house." (page 11) |
|                                 | A public footpath leading out from The Green into the countryside to the west runs along the northern boundary of the site. There is another footpath running along the eastern boundary from residential development to the south. As an undeveloped green wedge coming in almost to the heart of the village, the site therefore provides an important amenity area.  |
|                                 | Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Waterbeach. The site forms a semi-rural transition area between the village and the countryside beyond, and retains the rural character of the local footpaths. The appeal inspector (see planning history) felt the introduction of development would be harmful to the rural attributes.   |
| Can any issues be mitigated?    | No. Significant historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts. Development would have a detrimental impact on the setting of three Grade II Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area, which it would not be possible to mitigate.   |

| Infrastructure   |   |
|------------------|---|
| Highways access? | Regarding sites in the Milton / Waterbeach (estimated capacity of 13,602 dwellings on 14 sites) the Highways Agency comment that the vast majority of this grouping consists of the barracks site as a new settlement with the remainder essentially in-fill sites. On the whole, |

|                       | the in fill sites are less likely to present an unaccentable preserves are   |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | the in-fill sites are less likely to present an unacceptable pressure on<br>the A14 given the majority of travel demand will be focused on<br>Cambridge and credible alternatives to car travel could be available.  |
|                       | The proposed site does not appear to have a direct link to the adopted public highway.   |
| Utility services?     | <ul> <li>Electricity - No significant impact on existing network.</li> <li>Mains Water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains</li> <li>Gas – Waterbeach has a gas supply and to serve this site with gas is likely to be able to be accommodated with minimal disruption or system reinforcement.</li> <li>Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the waste water treatment works to accommodate this development site. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre- development assessment will be required to ascertain the specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the developer.</li> </ul> |
| Drainage<br>measures? | No FRA provided.  A majority of the development sites falls within the Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage District. The District does not have any capacity to accept any direct discharge into its system above the green field run off rate. All surface water from the site would have to be balanced before it is released into the Boards system. We also have main drains adjacent to the site, therefore any works involving these drains would require the consent of the Board.   |
| School capacity?      | Waterbeach has a primary school with a PAN of 60 and school capacity of 420 and, and lies within the catchment of Cottenham Village College with a PAN of 180 and school capacity of 900 children. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there were deficit of 25 primary places in Waterbeach taking account of planned development in Waterbeach, and a deficit of 30 secondary places taking account of planned development across the village college catchment area.  After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site  |

|                          | would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or the provision of new schools. |
|--------------------------|--|
| Health facilities        | There is one doctors practice in Waterbeach which has potential for  |
| capacity?                | expansion.   |
| Any other                |  |
| issues?                  |  |
| Can issues be mitigated? | Yes, with upgrades to local infrastructure, including utilities (mains water and sewerage), school capacity and health.  |
|                          | However, it is unclear whether appropriate access can be secured to the site as it is not linked to the adopted public highway.                                      |
| Does the site            |  |
| warrant further          | No   |
| assessment?              |  |

#### **Tier 3: Site Specific Factors**

| Capacity         |                                 |
|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Developable area | None (0.15 ha if unconstrained) |
| Site capacity    | 5 dwellings                     |
| Density          | 30 dph                          |

| Potential Suitability |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Conclusion            | The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints. |

| Availability                                      |  |
|---|--|
| Is the land in single ownership?                  | Yes  |
| Site ownership status?                            | The site is promoted by a single landowner.                    |
| Legal constraints?                                | No known constraints.  |
| Is there market interest in the site?             | Not known.   |
| When would the site be available for development? | The promoter indicates that the site is available immediately. |

| Achievability  |  |
|--|--|
| Phasing and delivery of the development                                      | The promoter indicates that the first dwellings could be completed on site 2011-16.  |
| Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability? | None known.  |
| Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?   | None known.  |
| Could issues identified be overcome?   |  |
| Economic viability?  | Viability Category 2 Viable sites  This viability assessment is provided independent of any policy or other assessment as to whether the site should be allocated for development. The references to planning policy only relate to those existing policies governing how a site would be developed, not whether it should be allocated in the new Local Plan.  Having undertaken an assessment of this site the local planning authority have few concerns that that the landowner would be unable to deliver a development that complies with current planning policy in respect of density, mix and the provision of onsite facilities whilst still delivering the necessary level of affordable housing, planning obligations and potential community infrastructure levy payments.  In summary this scheme is not considered to have any barriers, in |
|  | terms of development viability alone, to restrict it coming forward within the next 5 years (new settlements and other very large developments may take longer than 5 years to come forward).  |

| n |
|---|
| n |

Site with no development potential.

#### Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013

Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework.

## South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Site Assessment Proforma

| Γ  |  |
|--|--|
| Proforma<br>Created  | June 2012  |
| Proforma Last<br>Updated   | August 2013  |
| Location   | Waterbeach   |
| Site name / address  | North side of Bannold Road, Waterbeach   |
| Category of site:  | A village extension i.e. a development adjoining the existing village development framework boundary   |
| Description of promoter's proposal                                   | 23 dwellings   |
| Site area (hectares)   | 1.43 ha.   |
| Site Number  | Site 155   |
| Site description<br>& context  | The site is located to the north of Bannold Road on the north eastern edge of Waterbeach. The site is a mixture of residential and agricultural land fronting Bannold Road, situated in an area of relatively open land between the edge of the village to the south and the Barracks to the north.  Note: the site adjoins site 206 to the east.  |
| Current or last use of the site                                      | Residential and agricultural   |
| Is the site Previously Developed Land?                               | In part (residential).   |
| Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan? | No   |
| Planning<br>history  | A small part of the site was proposed through the LDF process for residential development (Objection Site 128). The LP 1993 Inspector considered Land north of Bannold Road and concluded: the land "is for the most part open and although it is not in the Green Belt or in my opinion of great scenic value, it does contribute towards the rural character of the village. I do not consider that there is any urgent physical, social or other need for the two parts of the village to be linked by development, and I can see no justification for allocating |

SHLAA (August 2013) Appendix 7i – Assessment of 2011 'Call for Sites' SHLAA sites Minor Rural Centre

land in this locality contrary to the general planning policies which apply."

An application for 5 dwellings (S/1432/85/O) was refused and appeal dismissed. The Inspector noted: "[The site] is separated from Waterbeach Barracks by a strip of arable land only some 200m wide and the Barracks itself is as extensive as a large village. It seems to me highly desirable that a wedge of open land should be retained between the 2 settlements to prevent their coalescence. Bannold Road, with its grass verges, mature trees and generally rural appearance forms a natural northern boundary to the village providing open views of farmland with the Barracks beyond. If the appeal site were also to be built on this would further reduce the visual impact of the green wedge and it might be difficult to resist pressure for more house building on the land to the east of the site. Cody Road forms a distinct boundary to development on the northern side of Bannold Road and I consider it appropriate that the village envelope should exclude all the land to the east of this road."

An application for two dwellings (C/0145/66/O) was refused as development of the type proposed would detract from the open and rural appearance and character of the area.

An application for residential development on a larger site (C/0452/60/) was refused as the scale of development would be too large an extension to the village and would thereby change the character of the village.

Source of site

Site suggested through call for sites

| Tier 1: Strategic Considerations   |   |
|--|---|
| Green Belt<br>(Updated August<br>2013)   | The site is included in the Green Belt in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.   |
| Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development? | Minerals and Waste LDF designations (Core Strategy designations only) – a very small part of the site, on the eastern edge, is within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel.   |
| Tier 1<br>conclusion:  | The is a site located to the north of Bannold Road on the north eastern edge of Waterbeach with no strategic constraints identified that would prevent the site from being developed. A very small part of the site is within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel. |

#### **Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations**

|   | Designations and Constraints  |  |
|---|---|--|
| Heritage considerations?                                    | <ul> <li>Non-statutory archaeological site - Archaeological investigations to the immediate west identified evidence for Roman activity. County Archaeologists would require archaeological works to be secured by condition of planning permission.</li> <li>With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the historic environment.</li> </ul>  |  |
| Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations? | <ul> <li>Tree Preservation Orders – a group of protected trees are located 20m to the south west.</li> <li>Biodiversity features - Fenland landscapes support species and habitats characterised by intensive agriculture due to the high quality soil. This has restricted biodiversity in some parts. However, drains, hedges and field margins provide refuge for species such as barn owl, corn bunting and skylark. Washlands provide temporary areas of flooded grassland that are important for plants such as the marsh foxtail, tufted hair-grass and narrow-leaved water dropwort. Important numbers of wintering wildfowl maybe found on flooded fields. The network of drainage ditches in places still retain water voles with otters occasionally found into the fens where suitable fish stocks are found. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design.</li> <li>Agricultural land of high grade (i.e. Agricultural Land Classification Grade 1, 2, 3a) – a very small part of the site is Grade 2.</li> <li>With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the natural environment.</li> </ul> |  |
| Physical considerations?                                    | <ul> <li>Land contamination - Agricultural buildings in centre. A contaminated Land Assessment will be required as a condition of any planning application.</li> <li>Noise issues - Some minor to moderate additional off-site road traffic noise generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance. Possible to mitigate but may require s106 agreements.</li> </ul>  |  |

The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes the landscape surrounding Waterbeach as typical fenland, comprising very flat large arable fields, distant views, together with quite distinctive groupings of trees. Many of the surrounding roads are raised on embankments and run alongside drainage ditches, which are also visible between the fields.

The tower of St John's Church provides a distinctive landmark within Waterbeach, being visible from many viewpoints to the east and south of the village.

Moving closer to the edge of the village, there are more local landscape characteristics. To the east the village edge comprises enclosed fields and paddocks, with well used footpaths to the banks of the River Cam.

# Townscape and landscape impact? (Updated August 2013)

The site is characterised as enclosed farmland. There is a well defined edge along Bannold Road, with views north across flat rough grassland to housing along Kirby Road.

Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Waterbeach. There is a very clear boundary to the village to the west and south of the site with the road junction marking the limit of the built up area. The site is located in a relatively open area separating the village from the Barracks to the north. It is in residential and agricultural use with mature trees along Bannold Road. Bannold Road has sporadic development along the northern side and this, together with the open land, creates a rural character and the appearance of the countryside entering the village, as demonstrated by the planning appeal (see planning history). If this site were developed it would intrude into the rural separation area between Waterbeach and the Barracks.

Land to the north of the village has been identified in the Proposed Submission Local Plan for the development of a new settlement. The area is important for maintaining the village character of Waterbeach, and warrants the level of protection afforded by the Green Belt in order that it remains open.

#### Can any issues be mitigated? (Updated August 2013)

No.

#### Infrastructure Regarding sites in the Milton / Waterbeach (estimated capacity of 13,602 dwellings on 14 sites) the Highways Agency comment that the vast majority of this grouping consists of the barracks site as a new settlement with the remainder essentially in-fill sites. On the whole, the in-fill sites are less likely to present an unacceptable pressure on the A14 given the majority of travel demand will be focused on Cambridge and credible alternatives to car travel could be available. **Highways** access? A junction located on to Bannold Road would be acceptable to the Highway Authority. The proposed site is acceptable in principle subject to detailed design. In the Highway Authority's opinion a significant level of infrastructure will be required to encourage more sustainable transport links; such infrastructure will extend beyond the confines of the site. Electricity - No significant impact on existing network. Mains Water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to **Utility services?** existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains Gas – Waterbeach has a gas supply and to serve this site with gas is likely to be able to be accommodated with minimal disruption or system reinforcement. Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the waste water treatment works to accommodate this development site. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a predevelopment assessment will be required to ascertain the specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the developer. No FRA provided. A majority of the development sites falls within the Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage District. The District does not have any capacity to **Drainage** accept any direct discharge into its system above the green field run measures? off rate. All surface water from the site would have to be balanced before it is released into the Boards system. We also have main drains adjacent to the site, therefore any works involving these drains would require the consent of the Board.

SHLAA (August 2013) Appendix 7i – Assessment of 2011 'Call for Sites' SHLAA sites Minor Rural Centre
Site 155 North side of Bannold Road, Waterbeach

| School capacity?                          | Waterbeach has a primary school with a PAN of 60 and school capacity of 420 and, and lies within the catchment of Cottenham Village College with a PAN of 180 and school capacity of 900 children. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there were deficit of 25 primary places in Waterbeach taking account of planned development in Waterbeach, and a deficit of 30 secondary places taking account of planned development across the village college catchment area.  The development of this site for 23 dwellings could generate a need for early years places and a maximum of 8 primary school places and 6 secondary places.  After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or |
|---|---|
|   | the provision of new schools.   |
| Health facilities capacity?               | There is one doctors practice in Waterbeach which has potential for expansion.  |
| Any other issues?                         | The proposer provides the following supporting information: Reopening of the culverted watercourse along the south edge of the site to increase habitat for wetland species.  |
| Can issues be mitigated?                  | Yes, with upgrades to local infrastructure, including sustainable transport, utilities (mains water and sewerage), school capacity and health.  |
| Does the site warrant further assessment? | No  |

#### **Tier 3: Site Specific Factors**

| Capacity                         |                                  |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Developable                      |                                  |
| area<br>(Updated August<br>2013) | None (0.97 ha. if unconstrained) |
| Site capacity                    | 29 dwellings                     |
| Density                          | 30 dph                           |

| Potential Suitability                  |  |
|--|--|
| Conclusion<br>(Updated August<br>2013) | The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints. |

|   | Availability   |
|---|--|
| Is the land in single ownership?                  | No   |
| Site ownership status?                            | The site is promoted by multiple landowners.   |
| Legal constraints?                                | No known constraints.  |
| Is there market interest in the site?             | The promoter has indicated that the site has not been marketed but there is interest in the site from a developer. |
| When would the site be available for development? | The promoter has indicated that the site is not available immediately. The site could become available 2011-16.    |

|  | Achievability   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Phasing and delivery of the development                                      | The promoter has indicated that the first dwellings could be completed on site 2011-16. |  |
| Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability? | None known.   |  |
| Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?   | None known.   |  |
| Could issues identified be overcome?   |   |  |

#### Viability Category 3 Less viable sites

This viability assessment is provided independent of any policy or other assessment as to whether the site should be allocated for development. The references to planning policy only relate to those existing policies governing how a site would be developed, not whether it should be allocated in the new Local Plan.

### Economic viability?

Having undertaken an assessment of this site the local planning authority have some concerns about the landowners ability to deliver a development that fully complies with current planning policy in respect of density, mix and the provision of onsite facilities whilst still delivering the necessary level of affordable housing, planning obligations and potential community infrastructure levy payments.

This site is considered to be sufficiently attractive for developers to be interested in acquiring it, assuming that the existing landowner does not have excessive aspirations, housing prices increase to those previously experienced and / or that the Council might be minded to be flexible in its application of planning policy to help ensure site viability. The Council should be mindful that the aspirations of the existing landowner, and ability to be flexible with some planning policy requirements would allow development during the plan period.

#### **Site Assessment Conclusion**

Updated August 2013: Site with no development potential.

#### Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013

Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework; Green Belt.

## South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Site Assessment Proforma

| Proforma   | July 2012   |
|--|---|
| Created  | oaly 2012   |
| Proforma Last<br>Updated   | August 2013   |
| Location   | Waterbeach  |
| Site name / address  | Land to the west of Cody Road, Waterbeach   |
| Category of site:  | A village extension i.e. a development adjoining the existing village development framework boundary  |
| Description of promoter's proposal                                   | 30 dwellings  |
| Site area (hectares)   | 1.86 ha.  |
| Site Number  | Site 189  |
| Site description<br>& context  | The site is located to the west of Cody Road on the north eastern edge of Waterbeach. The site is an open agricultural field surrounded by residential development to the south and west, and the Barracks to the north. The Cody Road frontage, to the east, is open to views across further open agricultural land to the east.             |
|  | Note: the site is also considered as site 89 and is adjacent to Site 231 to the north.  |
| Current or last use of the site                                      | Agricultural  |
| Is the site<br>Previously<br>Developed<br>Land?                      | No  |
| Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan? | No  |
| Planning<br>history  | LP 2004 Inspector concluded: "This is a green field arable site immediately to the west of that discussed above. The land is open to Cody Road and much more visible from the east. In my view there is far less case for developing this site and I do not support the objector's request that it be allocated for residential development." |
| Source of site   | Site suggested through call for sites   |

SHLAA (August 2013) Appendix 7i – Assessment of 2011 'Call for Sites' SHLAA sites Minor Rural Centre Site 189 Land to the west of Cody Road, Waterbeach

| Tier 1: Strategic Considerations   |  |
|--|--|
| Green Belt<br>(Updated August<br>2013)   | The site is included in the Green Belt in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.  |
| Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development? | Minerals and Waste LDF designations (Core Strategy designations only) – the majority of the site is within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel.   |
| Tier 1 conclusion:   | The is an agricultural site located to the west of Cody Road on the north eastern edge of Waterbeach with no strategic constraints identified that would prevent the site from being developed. The majority of the site is within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel. |
| Does the site warrant further assessment?  | Yes.   |

#### **Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations**

| Designations and Constraints                                |   |
|---|---|
| Heritage considerations?                                    | <ul> <li>Conservation Area – the Waterbeach Conservation Area is approximately 170m to the south west. Minimal effect on Conservation Area but significant green entrance to village.</li> <li>Non-statutory archaeological site - Archaeological investigations to the immediate west identified evidence for Roman activity. County Archaeologists would require archaeological works to be secured by condition of planning permission.</li> <li>The site forms part of the setting of the Conservation Area, but with careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the historic environment.</li> </ul> |
| Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations? | <ul> <li>Tree Preservation Orders – a group of protected trees are located 60m to the south.</li> <li>Biodiversity features - Fenland landscapes support species and habitats characterised by intensive agriculture due to the high quality soil. This has restricted biodiversity in some parts. However, drains, hedges and field margins provide refuge for species such as barn owl, corn bunting and skylark. Washlands provide temporary areas of flooded grassland that are important for plants such as the marsh foxtail, tufted hair-grass and</li> </ul>  |

narrow-leaved water dropwort. Important numbers of wintering wildfowl maybe found on flooded fields. The network of drainage ditches in places still retain water voles with otters occasionally found into the fens where suitable fish stocks are found. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design.

 Agricultural land of high grade (i.e. Agricultural Land Classification Grade 1, 2, 3a) – Grade 2.

With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the natural environment.

### Physical considerations?

 Noise issues - some minor to moderate additional off-site road traffic noise generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance. Possible to mitigate but may require s106 agreements.

The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes the landscape surrounding Waterbeach as typical fenland, comprising very flat large arable fields, distant views, together with quite distinctive groupings of trees. Many of the surrounding roads are raised on embankments and run alongside drainage ditches, which are also visible between the fields.

The tower of St John's Church provides a distinctive landmark within Waterbeach, being visible from many viewpoints to the east and south of the village.

## Townscape and landscape impact? (Updated August

2013)

Moving closer to the edge of the village, there are more local landscape characteristics. To the east the village edge comprises enclosed fields and paddocks, with well used footpaths to the banks of the River Cam.

The site is characterised as enclosed farmland. There is a well defined edge along Bannold Road, with views north across flat rough grassland to housing along Kirby Road.

Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Waterbeach. There is a very clear boundary to the village to the west and south of the site. The site is located in a relatively open area separating the village from the Barracks to the north. It is in agricultural use and this, together with the open land to the east, creates a rural character and the appearance of the countryside entering the village. If this site were developed it would intrude into the rural separation area between Waterbeach and the Barracks.

Land to the north of the village has been identified in the Proposed Submission Local Plan for the development of a new settlement. The

SHLAA (August 2013) Appendix 7i – Assessment of 2011 'Call for Sites' SHLAA sites Minor Rural Centre

|  | area is important for maintaining the village character of Waterbeach, and warrants the level of protection afforded by the Green Belt in order that it remains open. |
|--|---|
| Can any issues be mitigated? (Updated August 2013) | No.   |

|                     | Infrastructure   |
|---------------------|--|
| Highways<br>access? | Regarding sites in the Milton / Waterbeach (estimated capacity of 13,602 dwellings on 14 sites) the Highways Agency comment that the vast majority of this grouping consists of the barracks site as a new settlement with the remainder essentially in-fill sites. On the whole, the in-fill sites are less likely to present an unacceptable pressure on the A14 given the majority of travel demand will be focused on Cambridge and credible alternatives to car travel could be available.  A junction located on to Cody Road would be acceptable to the   |
|                     | Highway Authority. The proposed site is acceptable in principle subject to detailed design.  |
|                     | In the Highway Authority's opinion a significant level of infrastructure will be required to encourage more sustainable transport links; such infrastructure will extend beyond the confines of the site.  |
| Utility services?   | <ul> <li>Electricity - No significant impact on existing network.</li> <li>Mains Water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge         Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare         capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the         distribution zone, less any commitments already made to         developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within         Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed         properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the         zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on         a first come first served basis. Development requiring an         increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to         existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster         plus associated mains</li> <li>Gas – Waterbeach has a gas supply and to serve this site with         gas is likely to be able to be accommodated with minimal         disruption or system reinforcement.</li> <li>Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the waste water         treatment works to accommodate this development site. The         sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre-         development assessment will be required to ascertain the         specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any         mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the         developer.</li> </ul> |

|                               | T ==  |
|-------------------------------|---|
|                               | No FRA provided.  |
| Drainage<br>measures?         | A majority of the development sites falls within the Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage District. The District does not have any capacity to accept any direct discharge into its system above the green field run off rate. All surface water from the site would have to be balanced before it is released into the Boards system. We also have main drains adjacent to the site, therefore any works involving these drains would require the consent of the Board.  |
|                               | Waterbeach has a primary school with a PAN of 60 and school   |
| School capacity?              | capacity of 420 and, and lies within the catchment of Cottenham Village College with a PAN of 180 and school capacity of 900 children. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there were deficit of 25 primary places in Waterbeach taking account of planned development in Waterbeach, and a deficit of 30 secondary places taking account of planned development across the village college catchment area.   |
|                               | The development of this site for 30 dwellings could generate a need for early years places and a maximum of 11 primary school places and 8 secondary places.  |
|                               | After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or the provision of new schools.   |
| Health facilities             | There is one doctors practice in Waterbeach which has potential for   |
| capacity?                     | expansion.  |
| Any other issues?             | The promoter provides the following supporting information:  The land subject to this submission is surrounded by development to the south. The development would relate well to the existing ribbon of development along Bannold Road, and the arable land beyond. The site has a closer affinity with the built-up area within Waterbeach compared to the open countryside beyond, and can be released for development without harming the open countryside. Waterbeach has very good local facilities, with numerous food shops, and non-food shops, bank, a post office and 3 public houses. There was also a branch library and a range of sporting facilities available such as football, cricket and bowls. Waterbeach also has a railway station situated on the Cambridge-Ely-Kings Lynn railway line. The site provides an opportunity to provide much needed housing (including affordable) and support existing local services. |
| Can issues be                 | Yes, with upgrades to local infrastructure, including utilities (mains  |
| mitigated?                    | water and sewerage), school capacity and health.  |
| Does the site warrant further | No  |
| assessment?                   |   |

SHLAA (August 2013) Appendix 7i – Assessment of 2011 'Call for Sites' SHLAA sites Minor Rural Centre

#### **Tier 3: Site Specific Factors**

| Capacity                               |                                  |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Developable area (Updated August 2013) | None (1.67 ha. If unconstrained) |
| Site capacity                          | 50 dwellings                     |
| Density                                | 30 dph                           |

| Potential Suitability                  |  |
|--|--|
| Conclusion<br>(Updated August<br>2013) | The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints. |

| Availability                                      |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Is the land in single ownership?                  | Yes   |  |
| Site ownership status?                            | Site promoted by a single landowner.  |  |
| Legal constraints?                                | No known constraints.   |  |
| Is there market interest in the site?             | The site has not been marketed and there is no interest in the site from a developer. |  |
| When would the site be available for development? | The promoter has indicated that the site is available immediately.                    |  |

| Achievability  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Phasing and delivery of the development                                      | The promoter indicates that the first dwellings could be completed on site 2011-16. |  |
| Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability? | None known.   |  |

| Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability? | None known.  |
|--|--|
| Could issues identified be   |  |
| overcome?  |  |
| Economic viability?  | Viability Category 2 Viable sites  This viability assessment is provided independent of any policy or other assessment as to whether the site should be allocated for development. The references to planning policy only relate to those existing policies governing how a site would be developed, not whether it should be allocated in the new Local Plan.  Having undertaken an assessment of this site the local planning authority have few concerns that that the landowner would be unable to deliver a development that complies with current planning policy in respect of density, mix and the provision of onsite facilities whilst still delivering the necessary level of affordable housing, planning obligations and potential community infrastructure levy payments.  In summary this scheme is not considered to have any barriers, in terms of development viability alone, to restrict it coming forward within the next 5 years (new settlements and other very large |
|  | developments may take longer than 5 years to come forward).  |

#### **Site Assessment Conclusion**

Update August 2013: Site with no development potential.

#### Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013

Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework; Green Belt.

#### South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)

#### **Site Assessment Proforma**

| Droforms   |  |
|--|--|
| Proforma<br>Created  | July 2012  |
| Proforma Last<br>Updated   | July 2012  |
| Location   | Waterbeach   |
| Site name / address  | Land adjacent to Pieces Lane, Waterbeach   |
| Category of site:  | A village extension i.e. a development adjoining the existing village development framework boundary   |
| Description of promoter's proposal                                   | 35 dwellings with public open space  |
| Site area (hectares)   | 1.78 ha  |
| Site Number  | Site 190   |
| Site description<br>& context  | The site is located to the south of Bannold Road and north of Burgess Road, on the eastern edge of Waterbeach. The northern part of the site is bounded on three sides; to the north, west and part of the south by housing and is heavily treed. The southern part of the site is more exposed, only partly adjoining the edge of the village and is rough grassland, enclosed by trees. Open countryside lies to the east, up to the railway line. |
|  | Note: the northern part of the site is also considered as site 91. The southern part of the site also forms part of site 90, together with adjoining land to the south.  |
| Current or last use of the site                                      | Woodland and pasture.  |
| Is the site Previously Developed Land?                               | No   |
| Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan? | No   |
| Planning<br>history  | The site was promoted through the LDF as Objection Site 126 (and parts of larger sites 129 and 131). It had also been considered by the Inspectors for LP 2004 and 1993:  LP2004 - "I have not found any exceptional circumstances to warrant modification of the boundaries of the Green Belt. While there are  |

SHLAA (August 2013) Appendix 7i – Assessment of 2011 'Call for Sites' SHLAA sites

Minor Rural Centre

about 3 parcels that are not affected either by the Green Belt designation or the flood plain I am not aware that any are 'previously developed land'. In addition, it appeared to me that there may be access constraints. I therefore do not support the objections."

LP1993 - "Land east of the Framework between Bannold Road and Burgess Road is essentially open countryside and part of the rural setting of Waterbeach. The railway line crosses it, but I do not consider that this forms any sort of enclosure or suitable edge of the village towards which further development should advance. The Green Belt status of much of the land further militates against its development."

A planning application for residential development on a larger site (C/1368/73/O) was refused as contrary to the village plan which only allowed infilling due to limited availability of services and facilities.

#### Source of site

Site suggested through call for sites

#### **Tier 1: Strategic Considerations**

The site is partly within the Green Belt. Approximately half the site is within the Green Belt and half is white land.

Green Belt Purposes

- Maintains and enhances the quality of Cambridge's setting
- Prevents coalescence between settlements and with Cambridge

Function with regard to the special character of Cambridge and it's setting:

- The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages
- A landscape which retains a strong rural character

#### **Green Belt**

Site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on GB purposes and functions. The Landscape Design Associates Green Belt Study (2002) describes it as an area from which distinct views of the city are scarce or absent. The function of this landscape is providing a backdrop to views of the city, and providing a setting for approaches to connective, supportive and distinctive areas of townscape and landscape. (page 62) Outer Rural Areas play a lesser role in contributing to the distinctiveness of Cambridge and its setting, and are less finite. They may also have the potential to accommodate change and development that does not cause adverse effects on the setting and special character. (page 66)

| Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development? | No  |
|--|---|
| Tier 1<br>conclusion:  | This site is located to the south of Bannold Road and north of Burgess Road, on the eastern edge of Waterbeach, within the Green Belt. The site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions:  • Maintains and enhances the quality of Cambridge's setting  • Prevents coalescence between settlements and with Cambridge  • The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages  • A landscape which retains a strong rural character |
| Does the site  |   |
| warrant further  | Yes   |
| assessment?  |   |

**Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations** 

| Designations and Constraints                                |  |
|---|--|
| Heritage<br>considerations?                                 | <ul> <li>Listed Buildings – a Grade II Listed Building lies approximately 45m to the south. Development will have adverse effect to setting due to loss of wooded and open green backdrop.</li> <li>Non-statutory archaeological site - The site is located to the east of the historic village core and to the north of the site of nationally important Waterbeach Abbey (SAM52). County Archaeologists would require further information in advance of any planning application for this site before it is able to advise on the suitability of the site for development.</li> <li>It is unlikely to be possible to mitigate any impact on the historic environment as development will have an adverse impact on the setting of a Grade II Listed Building due to the loss of wooded and open green backdrop.</li> </ul> |
| Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations? | <ul> <li>Tree Preservation Orders – protected trees are situated approximately 55m to the west of the site.</li> <li>Public Rights of Way – a footpath lies approximately 210m to the south east, along the railway line.</li> <li>Biodiversity features - Fenland landscapes support species and habitats characterised by intensive agriculture due to the high quality soil. This has restricted biodiversity in some parts. However, drains, hedges and field margins provide refuge for</li> </ul>  |

species such as barn owl, corn bunting and skylark. Washlands provide temporary areas of flooded grassland that are important for plants such as the marsh foxtail, tufted hair-grass and narrow-leaved water dropwort. Important numbers of wintering wildfowl maybe found on flooded fields. The network of drainage ditches in places still retain water voles with otters occasionally found into the fens where suitable fish stocks are found. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design.

With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the natural environment.

## Physical considerations?

 Noise issues – Some minor to moderate additional off-site road traffic noise generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance. Possible to mitigate but may require s106 agreements.

The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes the landscape surrounding Waterbeach as typical fenland, comprising very flat large arable fields, distant views, together with quite distinctive groupings of trees. Many of the surrounding roads are raised on embankments and run alongside drainage ditches, which are also visible between the fields.

The tower of St John's Church provides a distinctive landmark within Waterbeach, being visible from many viewpoints to the east and south of the village.

# Townscape and landscape impact?

Moving closer to the edge of the village, there are more local landscape characteristics. To the east the village edge comprises enclosed fields and paddocks, with well used footpaths to the banks of the River Cam.

The site is in a substantial area of woodland and grassland, which provides a transition between village and arable fields. The woodland forms a rural setting and soft edge for village, beyond which is more open agricultural fields closer to the railway line to the east.

Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Waterbeach. The built up edge of Waterbeach is clearly defined to the west of the site. The site, particularly the northern part of the site, does not relate well to the village but to the treed land that opens out to the east onto the adjoining flat agricultural fields. The site has a rural character and creates a soft edge to the village. The presence of the railway line to the east does not mean that the village should automatically expand outwards towards it. Development would be detrimental to the rural character and setting of this part of the village.

| Can any issues |
|----------------|
| July 100400    |
| be mitigated?  |

No. Significant historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts. Development would have a detrimental impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Building, which it would not be possible to mitigate.

|                       | Infrastructure  |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Highways access?      | Regarding sites in the Milton / Waterbeach (estimated capacity of 13,602 dwellings on 14 sites) the Highways Agency comment that the vast majority of this grouping consists of the barracks site as a new settlement with the remainder essentially in-fill sites. On the whole, the in-fill sites are less likely to present an unacceptable pressure on the A14 given the majority of travel demand will be focused on Cambridge and credible alternatives to car travel could be available.  The access link to the public highway is unsuitable to serve the number of units that are being proposed.  |  |
| Utility services?     | <ul> <li>Electricity - No significant impact on existing network.</li> <li>Mains Water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains</li> <li>Gas – Waterbeach has a gas supply and to serve this site with gas is likely to be able to be accommodated with minimal disruption or system reinforcement.</li> <li>Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the waste water treatment works to accommodate this development site. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre- development assessment will be required to ascertain the specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the</li> </ul> |  |
| Drainage<br>measures? | developer.  No FRA provided.  A majority of the development sites falls within the Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage District. The District does not have any capacity to accept any direct discharge into its system above the green field run off rate. All surface water from the site would have to be balanced before it is released into the Boards system. We also have main drains adjacent to the site, therefore any works involving these drains would require the consent of the Board.  |  |

# Waterbeach has a primary school with a PAN of 60 and school capacity of 420 and, and lies within the catchment of Cottenham Village College with a PAN of 180 and school capacity of 900 children. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there were deficit of 25 primary places in Waterbeach taking account of planned development in Waterbeach, and a deficit of 30 secondary places taking account of planned development across the village college catchment area. School capacity? The development of this site for 35 dwellings could generate a need for early years places and a maximum of 12 primary school places and 9 secondary places.

After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or the provision of new schools.

### Health facilities capacity?

There is one doctors practice in Waterbeach which has potential for expansion.

The proposer provides the following supporting information:

The site comprises a substantial area extending to the east of Pieces Lane, Waterbeach, immediately to the east of the existing residential development. The land extends to the south to the south to abut the residential development to the north of Burgess Road. The site is partially located in the Green Belt.

# Any other issues?

The development of the site (as its inclusion within the village framework) would provide an opportunity to provide a transition between the hard edge of the urban form and the countryside beyond. The alteration will provide a more logical edge to the village, providing a natural continuation of the village boundary to the north. To the east of the site is a thick belt of trees, with a Paddock beyond. This visual screen together with Hartley Court provides a natural stop to development, and will not harm the amenity of the Countryside. The site will not harm the amenity of the countryside, and can be readily accessed from Pieces Lane.

Waterbeach has very good local facilities, with numerous food shops, and non-food shops, bank, a post office and 3 public houses. There was also a branch library and a range of sporting facilities available such as football, cricket and bowls. Waterbeach also has a railway station situated on the Cambridge-Ely-Kings Lynn railway line. The site provides an opportunity to provide much needed housing (including affordable), support existing local services and provide some recreational space if required.

|                 | No. It is not possible to provide safe highway access to the site.    |
|-----------------|---|
| Can issues be   |   |
| mitigated?      | Upgrades required to local infrastructure, including utilities (mains |
|                 | water and sewerage), school capacity and health.                      |
| Does the site   |   |
| warrant further | No  |
| assessment?     |   |

#### **Tier 3: Site Specific Factors**

| Capacity         |                                 |
|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Developable area | None (1.00 ha if unconstrained) |
| Site capacity    | 30 dwellings                    |
| Density          | 30 dph                          |

| Potential Suitability |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Conclusion            | The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints. |

|   | Availability  |  |
|---|---|--|
| Is the land in single ownership?                  | Yes   |  |
| Site ownership status?                            | Site promoted by single owner.  |  |
| Legal constraints?                                | No known constraints.   |  |
| Is there market interest in the site?             | The site has not been marketed and there is no interest in the site from a developer. |  |
| When would the site be available for development? | The promoter indicates that the site is available immediately.                        |  |

| Achievability                           |   |
|---|---|
| Phasing and delivery of the development | The promoter indicates that the first dwellings could be completed on site 2011-16. |

|                     | T  |
|---------------------|--|
| Are there any       |  |
| market factors      |  |
| that would          | None Impure  |
| significantly       | None known.  |
| affect              |  |
| deliverability?     |  |
| •                   |  |
| Are there any       |  |
| cost factors        |  |
| that would          | None known.  |
| significantly       |  |
| affect              |  |
| deliverability?     |  |
| Could issues        |  |
| identified be       |  |
| overcome?           |  |
| Economic viability? | Viability Category 3 Less viable sites  This viability assessment is provided independent of any policy or other assessment as to whether the site should be allocated for development. The references to planning policy only relate to those existing policies governing how a site would be developed, not whether it should be allocated in the new Local Plan.  Having undertaken an assessment of this site the local planning authority have some concerns about the landowners ability to deliver a development that fully complies with current planning policy in respect of density, mix and the provision of onsite facilities whilst still delivering the necessary level of affordable housing, planning obligations and potential community infrastructure levy payments.  This site is considered to be sufficiently attractive for developers to be interested in acquiring it, assuming that the existing landowner does not have excessive aspirations, housing prices increase to those previously experienced and / or that the Council might be minded to be flexible in its application of planning policy to help ensure site viability. The Council should be mindful that the aspirations of the |
|                     | existing landowner, and ability to be flexible with some planning policy requirements would allow development during the plan period.  |

#### **Site Assessment Conclusion**

Site with no development potential.

#### Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013

Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework; Green Belt.

# South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Site Assessment Proforma

| Proforma   | July 2012  |
|--|--|
| Created  | July 2012  |
| Proforma Last<br>Updated   | July 2012  |
| Location   | Waterbeach   |
| Site name / address  | Land off Cambridge Road, Waterbeach  |
| Category of site:  | A village extension i.e. a development adjoining the existing village development framework boundary   |
| Description of promoter's proposal                                   | Residential development with public open space   |
| Site area<br>(hectares)  | 4.81 ha.   |
| Site Number  | Site 202   |
| Site description & context   | The site is located between Car Dyke Road and Cambridge Road, on the south western edge of Waterbeach. There is residential development to the north and east of the site and flat, open farmland to the south and west. The site itself is an arable field with substantial hedges and lines of small trees to the east, north and south boundaries, although patchy in places. |
| Current or last use of the site                                      | Agricultural   |
| Is the site Previously Developed Land?                               | No   |
| Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan? | No   |
| Planning<br>history  | The site was considered through the production of the LDF (Objection Site 130).  |
| Source of site   | Site suggested through call for sites  |

| Tier 1: Strategic Considerations   |   |
|--|---|
|  | The site is within the Green Belt.  |
| Green Belt   | <ul> <li>Green Belt Purposes</li> <li>Maintains and enhances the quality of Cambridge's setting</li> <li>Prevents coalescence between settlements and with Cambridge</li> <li>Function with regard to the special character of Cambridge and it's setting:</li> <li>The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages</li> <li>A landscape which retains a strong rural character</li> <li>Site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on GB purposes and functions. The Landscape Design Associates Green Belt Study (2002) describes it as an area</li> </ul>   |
|  | from which distinct views of the city are scarce or absent. The function of this landscape is providing a backdrop to views of the city, and providing a setting for approaches to connective, supportive and distinctive areas of townscape and landscape. (page 62) Outer Rural Areas play a lesser role in contributing to the distinctiveness of Cambridge and its setting, and are less finite. They may also have the potential to accommodate change and development that does not cause adverse effects on the setting and special character. (page 66)   |
| Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development? | Minerals and Waste LDF designations (Core Strategy designations only) – the majority of the site is within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel.  |
| Tier 1 conclusion:   | <ul> <li>The site is an agricultural site located between Car Dyke Road and Cambridge Road, on the south western edge of Waterbeach, within the Green Belt. The site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions: <ul> <li>Maintains and enhances the quality of Cambridge's setting</li> <li>Prevents coalescence between settlements and with Cambridge</li> <li>The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages</li> <li>A landscape which retains a strong rural character</li> <li>The majority of the site is within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| Does the site warrant further assessment?  | Yes   |

#### **Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations**

| Designations and Constraints                                |   |
|---|---|
|   | Designations and Constraints  |
| Heritage considerations?                                    | <ul> <li>Non-statutory archaeological site - The site is located adjacent to the line of the Car Dyke Roman canal. There is also evidence for Roman settlement and industry to the south, linked to the Car Dyke by a Droveway. County Archaeologists would require further information in advance of any planning application for this site before it is able to advise on the suitability of the site for development.</li> <li>With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on</li> </ul>  |
|   | the historic environment.   |
| Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations? | <ul> <li>County Wildlife Site - The 'Cambridge Road Willow Pollards' County Wildlife Site lies approximately 55m to the west of the site.</li> <li>Public Rights of Way – footpaths approximately 50m to the east and 290m to the north.</li> <li>Biodiversity features - Fenland landscapes support species and habitats characterised by intensive agriculture due to the high quality soil. This has restricted biodiversity in some parts. However, drains, hedges and field margins provide refuge for species such as barn owl, corn bunting and skylark. Washlands provide temporary areas of flooded grassland that are important for plants such as the marsh foxtail, tufted hair-grass and narrow-leaved water dropwort. Important numbers of wintering wildfowl maybe found on flooded fields. The network of drainage ditches in places still retain water voles with otters occasionally found into the fens where suitable fish stocks are found. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design.</li> <li>Agricultural land of high grade (i.e. Agricultural Land Classification Grade 1, 2, 3a) – Grade 2.</li> </ul> |
|   | With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the natural environment.  |
| Physical considerations?                                    | <ul> <li>Noise issues - The A10 lies close to the East and traffic noise will need assessment in accordance with PPG 24 and associated guidance. The impact of existing noise on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well being and providing a high quality living environment. However residential use is likely to be acceptable with careful noise mitigation. Noise likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises. On balance no objection in principle.</li> <li>Some minor to moderate additional off-site road traffic noise</li> </ul>   |

|                                 | generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance. Possible to mitigate but may require s106 agreements.  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Townscape and landscape impact? | The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes the landscape surrounding Waterbeach as typical fenland, comprising very flat large arable fields, distant views, together with quite distinctive groupings of trees. Many of the surrounding roads are raised on embankments and run alongside drainage ditches, which are also visible between the fields.  Moving closer to the edge of the village, there are more local  |
|                                 | landscape characteristics. To the west and north, enclosed fields again provide an important landscape setting for the village.  |
|                                 | The site is an arable field between Car Dyke Road and village edge. Cambridge Road provides the boundary interspersed with semi-detached properties with long back gardens. There are wide views of the village across arable fields from the approach to the village. Open arable land to the south and flat arable fields to south west provide long views   |
|                                 | Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Waterbeach. The landscape is flat with regular medium and large sized fields, divided by a mix of hedges and wet ditches. The site is somewhat separated from the built up area of Waterbeach by strong boundaries – Cambridge Road to the north and Car Dyke Road to the south. As a result it does not relate well to the village. The site is open and exposed to the wider countryside, visible over long distances to the south and west, and the land clearly performs a Green Belt function. |
| Can any issues be mitigated?    | In part. The site is somewhat separated from the built up area of Waterbeach by strong boundaries and does not relate well to the built-up part of the village and clearly performs Green Belt functions. It may be possible to mitigate the impacts of a smaller scale of development along the Cambridge Road frontage. Further investigation and possible mitigation will be required to address the  |

| Infrastructure   |  |
|------------------|--|
| Highways access? | Regarding sites in the Milton / Waterbeach (estimated capacity of 13,602 dwellings on 14 sites) the Highways Agency comment that the vast majority of this grouping consists of the barracks site as a new settlement with the remainder essentially in-fill sites. On the whole, the in-fill sites are less likely to present an unacceptable pressure on the A14 given the majority of travel demand will be focused on Cambridge and credible alternatives to car travel could be available.  A junction located on Cambridge Road would be acceptable to the |

physical considerations, including potential noise.

|                       | Highway Authority. The proposed site is acceptable in principle   |
|-----------------------|---|
|                       | subject to detailed design.   |
| Utility services?     | <ul> <li>Electricity - No significant impact on existing network.</li> <li>Mains Water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge         Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare         capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the         distribution zone, less any commitments already made to         developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within         Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed         properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the         zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on         a first come first served basis. Development requiring an         increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to         existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster         plus associated mains</li> <li>Gas – Waterbeach has a gas supply and to serve this site with         gas is likely to be able to be accommodated with minimal         disruption or system reinforcement.</li> <li>Mains sewerage - There is capacity at the waste water treatment         works however the numbers attributed to this development site         are unknown. The sewerage network is approaching capacity         and a developer impact assessment will be required to ascertain         the required upgrades, if any. This assessment and any         mitigation required will be funded by the developer.</li> </ul> |
| Drainage<br>measures? | No FRA provided.  A majority of the development sites falls within the Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage District. The District does not have any capacity to accept any direct discharge into its system above the green field run off rate. All surface water from the site would have to be balanced before it is released into the Boards system. We also have main drains adjacent to the site, therefore any works involving these drains  |
| School capacity?      | Waterbeach has a primary school with a PAN of 60 and school capacity of 420 and, and lies within the catchment of Cottenham Village College with a PAN of 180 and school capacity of 900 children. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there were deficit of 25 primary places in Waterbeach taking account of planned development in Waterbeach, and a deficit of 30 secondary places taking account of planned development across the village college catchment area.  After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or  |
| Health facilities     | the provision of new schools.  There is one dectors provise in Waterback which has potential for  |
| capacity?             | There is one doctors practice in Waterbeach which has potential for expansion.  |
| capacity:             | ολρατισιότι.  |

| Any other issues? | The proposer provides the following supporting information:  Provides a potential housing site on land well connected to the sustainable village of Waterbeach, together with land for open space and recreation use. |
|-------------------|---|
| Can issues be     | Yes, with upgrades to local infrastructure, including utilities (mains  |
| mitigated?        | water and sewerage), school capacity and health.  |
| Does the site     |   |
| warrant further   | Yes   |
| assessment?       |   |

#### **Tier 3: Site Specific Factors**

| Capacity         |             |
|------------------|-------------|
| Developable area | 0.72 ha.    |
| Site capacity    | 8 dwellings |
| Density          | 30 dph      |

| Potential Suitability |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Conclusion            | The site is potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints. |

|   | Availability   |  |
|---|--|--|
| Is the land in single ownership?                  | Yes  |  |
| Site ownership status?                            | The site is promoted by a single landowner.  |  |
| Legal constraints?                                | No known constraints.  |  |
| Is there market interest in the site?             | The site has not been marketed but there is interest in the site from a developer. |  |
| When would the site be available for development? | The promoter indicates that the site is available immediately.                     |  |

| Achievability                           |   |
|---|---|
| Phasing and delivery of the development | The promoter indicates that the first dwellings could be completed on site 2011-16. Phasing 50-100% 2011-16, 0-50% 2016-21. |

| Are there any market factors that would significantly affect                               | None known.  |
|--|--|
| deliverability? Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability? | None known.  |
| Could issues identified be overcome?   |  |
| Economic viability?  | Viability Category 3 Less viable sites  This viability assessment is provided independent of any policy or other assessment as to whether the site should be allocated for development. The references to planning policy only relate to those existing policies governing how a site would be developed, not whether it should be allocated in the new Local Plan.  Having undertaken an assessment of this site the local planning authority have some concerns about the landowners ability to deliver a development that fully complies with current planning policy in respect of density, mix and the provision of onsite facilities whilst still delivering the necessary level of affordable housing, planning obligations and potential community infrastructure levy payments.  This site is considered to be sufficiently attractive for developers to be interested in acquiring it, assuming that the existing landowner does not have excessive aspirations, housing prices increase to those previously experienced and / or that the Council might be minded to be flexible in its application of planning policy to help ensure site viability. The Council should be mindful that the aspirations of the existing landowner, and ability to be flexible with some planning policy requirements would allow development during the plan period. |

#### **Site Assessment Conclusion**

Site with limited development potential. This does not include a judgement on whether the site is suitable for residential development in planning policy terms, which will be for the separate plan making process.

#### Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013

Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework; Green Belt.

#### South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)

#### **Site Assessment Proforma**

| Proforma<br>Created  | July 2012   |
|--|---|
| Proforma Last<br>Updated   | August 2013   |
| Location   | Waterbeach  |
| Site name / address  | Land at Bannold Road and Bannold Drove, Waterbeach  |
| Category of site:  | A village extension i.e. a development adjoining the existing village development framework boundary  |
| Description of promoter's proposal                                   | 50-70 dwellings   |
| Site area (hectares)   | 1.77 ha.  |
| Site Number  | Site 206  |
| Site description<br>& context  | The site is located to the north of Bannold Road and west of Bannold Drove on the north eastern edge of Waterbeach. The site is agricultural land situated in an area of relatively open land between the edge of the village to the south and the Barracks to the north. It is enclosed by hedgerow on all sides, particularly dense along the two road frontages. The site only touches the village framework at the south west corner.  Note: The site adjoins site 155 to the west. |
| Current or last use of the site                                      | Agricultural  |
| Is the site Previously Developed Land?                               | No  |
| Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan? | No  |
| Planning<br>history  | The site has previously been considered through the production of LP 2004 and 1993 and the Inspector's concluded:  LP2004 – "Although Waterbeach Barracks is to the immediate north the site touches the defined village framework only at its south-west corner and lies in an area which, in my view, has a definite rural character. I find no reason to support this objection."  |

|                | LP1993 – "Land north of Bannold Road up to the Barracks is for the most part open and although it is not in the Green Belt or in my opinion of great scenic value, it does contribute towards the rural character of the village. I do not consider that there is any urgent physical, social or other need for the two parts of the village to be linked by development, and I can see no justification for allocating land in this locality contrary to the general planning policies which apply." |
|----------------|---|
| Source of site | Site suggested through call for sites   |

| Tier 1: Strategic Considerations   |   |
|--|---|
| Green Belt<br>(Updated August<br>2013)   | The site is included in the Green Belt in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.   |
| Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development? | <ul> <li>Flood Zone – a very small part of the south east corner of the site is within Flood Zone 2.</li> <li>Minerals and Waste LDF designations (Core Strategy designations only) – most of the site is within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel.</li> </ul>   |
| Tier 1<br>conclusion:  | The is an agricultural site located to the north of Bannold Road and west of Bannold Drove on the north eastern edge of Waterbeach with no strategic constraints identified that would prevent the site from being developed. A very small part of the site is within Flood Zone 2 and most of the site is within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel. |
| Does the site warrant further assessment?  | Yes.  |

#### **Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations**

| Designations and Constraints |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| Heritage considerations?     | <ul> <li>Non-statutory archaeological site - Archaeological investigations<br/>to the west identified evidence for Roman activity. County<br/>Archaeologists would require archaeological works to be secured<br/>by condition of planning permission.</li> </ul> |
|                              | With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the historic environment.   |

#### Tree Preservation Orders – a group of protected trees are located 290m to the west. Biodiversity features - Fenland landscapes support species and habitats characterised by intensive agriculture due to the high quality soil. This has restricted biodiversity in some parts. However, drains, hedges and field margins provide refuge for species such as barn owl, corn bunting and skylark. Washlands provide temporary areas of flooded grassland that are important Environmental and wildlife for plants such as the marsh foxtail, tufted hair-grass and designations narrow-leaved water dropwort. Important numbers of wintering wildfowl maybe found on flooded fields. The network of drainage and considerations? ditches in places still retain water voles with otters occasionally found into the fens where suitable fish stocks are found. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design. With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the natural environment. Noise issues - possible noise and malodour from Barton Ley & Midload Farm immediately to the east as proposals would be closer than existing residential. No history of complaints but noise sources etc. have not been quantified. Minor to moderate noise / odour risk. Might be possible to coexist but possible offsite noise and odour impacts or statutory nuisances so requires careful consideration prior to allocation? Noise mitigation may **Physical** be required off-site at source but no guarantee that off site considerations? mitigation can be secured and viability and any detrimental economic impact on existing businesses should be considered prior to allocation? Noise issues - Some minor to moderate additional off-site road traffic noise generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance. Possible to mitigate but may require s106 agreements. The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes the landscape surrounding Waterbeach as typical fenland, comprising very flat large arable fields, distant views, together with quite distinctive groupings of trees. Many of the surrounding roads are raised on embankments and run alongside drainage ditches, which Townscape and are also visible between the fields. landscape impact? The tower of St John's Church provides a distinctive landmark within (Updated August Waterbeach, being visible from many viewpoints to the east and 2013) south of the village.

SHLAA (August 2013) Appendix 7i – Assessment of 2011 'Call for Sites' SHLAA sites Minor Rural Centre

Moving closer to the edge of the village, there are more local landscape characteristics. To the east the village edge comprises enclosed fields and paddocks, with well used footpaths to the banks

of the River Cam.

The site is characterised as enclosed farmland. There is a well defined edge along Bannold Road, with views north across flat rough grassland to housing along Kirby Road.

Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Waterbeach. The site is located in a relatively open area separating the village from the Barracks to the north. It is in agricultural use with dense hedgerow, particularly along the road frontages. Bannold Road has sporadic development along the northern side and this, together with the open land, creates

Land to the north of the village has been identified in the Proposed Submission Local Plan for the development of a new settlement. The area is important for maintaining the village character of Waterbeach, and warrants the level of protection afforded by the Green Belt in order that it remains open.

a rural character and the appearance of the countryside entering the

#### Can any issues be mitigated? (Updated August 2013)

No.

village.

#### Infrastructure Regarding sites in the Milton / Waterbeach (estimated capacity of 13,602 dwellings on 14 sites) the Highways Agency comment that the vast majority of this grouping consists of the barracks site as a new settlement with the remainder essentially in-fill sites. On the whole, the in-fill sites are less likely to present an unacceptable pressure on **Highways** the A14 given the majority of travel demand will be focused on access? Cambridge and credible alternatives to car travel could be available. A junction located on to Bannold Road would be acceptable to the Highway Authority. The proposed site is acceptable in principle subject to detailed design. Electricity - No significant impact on existing network. Mains Water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to **Utility services?** developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on

a first come first served basis. Development requiring an

increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to

|                       | <ul> <li>existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains</li> <li>Gas – Waterbeach has a gas supply and to serve this site with gas is likely to be able to be accommodated with minimal disruption or system reinforcement.</li> <li>Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the waste water treatment works to accommodate this development site. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a predevelopment assessment will be required to ascertain the specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the developer.</li> </ul> |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | No FRA provided.   |
| Drainage<br>measures? | A majority of the development sites falls within the Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage District. The District does not have any capacity to accept any direct discharge into its system above the green field run off rate. All surface water from the site would have to be balanced before it is released into the Boards system. We also have main drains adjacent to the site, therefore any works involving these drains would require the consent of the Board.   |
| School capacity?      | Waterbeach has a primary school with a PAN of 60 and school capacity of 420 and, and lies within the catchment of Cottenham Village College with a PAN of 180 and school capacity of 900 children. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there were deficit of 25 primary places in Waterbeach taking account of planned development in Waterbeach, and a deficit of 30 secondary places taking account of planned development across the village college catchment area.  |
|                       | The development of this site for 70 dwellings could generate a need for early years places and a maximum of 25 primary school places and 18 secondary places.  |
|                       | After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or the provision of new schools.  |
| Health facilities     | There is one doctors practice in Waterbeach which has potential for  |
| capacity?             | expansion.   |
| Any other issues?     | The promoter provides the following supporting information:  The site provides land suitable for housing development in a location well related to the existing built up area of Waterbeach. It would not only provide housing with limited impact on the rural character of the surrounding open countryside but would also be well connected to services and facilities located within the village.  |

| Can issues be   | Yes, with upgrades to local infrastructure, including utilities (mains |
|-----------------|--|
| mitigated?      | water and sewerage), school capacity and health.                       |
| Does the site   |  |
| warrant further | No   |
| assessment?     |  |

#### **Tier 3: Site Specific Factors**

| Capacity                               |                                  |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Developable area (Updated August 2013) | None (1.19 ha. if unconstrained) |
| Site capacity                          | 36 dwellings                     |
| Density                                | 30 dph                           |

| Potential Suitability                  |  |
|--|--|
| Conclusion<br>(Updated August<br>2013) | The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints. |

| Availability                                      |   |
|---|---|
| Is the land in single ownership?                  | Yes   |
| Site ownership status?                            | Site promoted by single landowner.  |
| Legal constraints?                                | No known constraints.   |
| Is there market interest in the site?             | The site has not been marketed and there is no interest in the site from a developer. |
| When would the site be available for development? | The promoter has indicated that the site is available immediately.                    |

| Achievability   |   |
|-----------------|---|
| Phasing and     | The promoter has indicated that the first dwellings could be    |
| delivery of the | completed on site 2011-16. Phasing 50-100% 2011-16, 0-50% 2016- |
| development     | 21.   |

|                     | T  |
|---------------------|--|
| Are there any       |  |
| market factors      |  |
| that would          | None Impure  |
| significantly       | None known.  |
| affect              |  |
| deliverability?     |  |
| •                   |  |
| Are there any       |  |
| cost factors        |  |
| that would          | None known.  |
| significantly       |  |
| affect              |  |
| deliverability?     |  |
| Could issues        |  |
| identified be       |  |
| overcome?           |  |
| Economic viability? | Viability Category 3 Less viable sites  This viability assessment is provided independent of any policy or other assessment as to whether the site should be allocated for development. The references to planning policy only relate to those existing policies governing how a site would be developed, not whether it should be allocated in the new Local Plan.  Having undertaken an assessment of this site the local planning authority have some concerns about the landowners ability to deliver a development that fully complies with current planning policy in respect of density, mix and the provision of onsite facilities whilst still delivering the necessary level of affordable housing, planning obligations and potential community infrastructure levy payments.  This site is considered to be sufficiently attractive for developers to be interested in acquiring it, assuming that the existing landowner does not have excessive aspirations, housing prices increase to those previously experienced and / or that the Council might be minded to be flexible in its application of planning policy to help ensure site viability. The Council should be mindful that the aspirations of the |
|                     | existing landowner, and ability to be flexible with some planning policy requirements would allow development during the plan period.  |

#### **Site Assessment Conclusion**

Updated August 2013: Site with no development potential (as a result of the allocation of Waterbeach new town in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, and proposed extension of the Green Belt between the new town site and Waterbeach village in the vicinity of Bannold Road.)

#### Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013

Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework; Proposed Green Belt.

#### South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)

#### **Site Assessment Proforma**

| Proforma   |  |
|--|--|
| Created  | July 2012  |
| Proforma Last<br>Updated   | July 2012  |
| Location   | Waterbeach   |
| Site name / address  | Land off Gibson Close, Waterbeach  |
| Category of site:  | A village extension i.e. a development adjoining the existing village development framework boundary   |
| Description of promoter's proposal                                   | 15-20 dwellings  |
| Site area (hectares)   | 0.69 ha.   |
| Site Number  | Site 270   |
| Site description & context   | The site is located to the west of Gibson Close on the western edge of Waterbeach. It is a rectangular site, enclosed on three sides by residential development and countryside to the west. The land is pasture, overgrown with scrub vegetation and mature trees.  |
|  | Note: The site is adjacent to site 142 to the west.  |
| Current or last use of the site                                      | Pasture  |
| Is the site Previously Developed Land?                               | No   |
| Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan? | No   |
| Planning<br>history  | LP 2004 Inspector considered a larger area of land between Vicarage Close & Harding Close and concluded: "These objections relate to 3 separate but adjoining sites alongside an east-west footpath not far to the west of the main village green. From my visit I concluded that the sites serve very little townscape or landscape function. Any limited 'green' views on the boundary of the Conservation Area to the east could be preserved through appropriate landscaping details at development control stage. In my view the land represents a wasted resource and its more effective use should be encouraged in order to contribute towards the District's housing needs. There appear to be potential options for providing access to the objection sites across |

other underused sites to the south and east and I recommend that all 3 be brought into the village framework." Note – the Council did not agree with the Inspector's recommendation and no change was made to the village framework.

An appeal was dismissed for a planning application for residential development (S/2234/02/O) on the site. The Inspector reported: "The Local Plan Inspector considered that the appeal site performed no useful townscape or landscape function. I do not disagree that its visual qualities are limited...I consider that the site does provide an undeveloped green wedge coming in almost to the heart of the village as found in some other parts of the settlement. It also allows a semi-rural transition area between the village and the countryside beyond, and retains the rural character of the local footpaths. In my judgement the introduction of built form would be harmful to the rural

Source of site

Site suggested through call for sites

attributes that I have described."

| Tier 1: Strategic Considerations   |   |
|--|---|
| Green Belt   | The site is not within the Green Belt.  |
| Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development? | Minerals and Waste LDF designations (Core Strategy designations only) – the whole site is within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel (with the exception of the land needed to provide vehicular access).  |
| Tier 1 conclusion:  Does the site warrant further  | This is a pastureland site located to the west of Gibson Close on the western edge of Waterbeach with no strategic constraints identified that would prevent the site from being developed. The whole site is within the Minerals Safeguarding area for sand and gravel.  Yes |
| assessment?  |   |

#### **Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations**

| Designations and Constraints |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| Heritage considerations?     | Conservation Area – the site is adjacent to the Waterbeach     Conservation Area, although to the access would be achieved     via land within the Conservation Area. Adverse effect to setting     due to loss of green rural backdrop and countryside setting. |

Listed Buildings – there are three Grade II Listed Buildings close to the site. The closest, 5 Greenside, is adjacent to the proposed access road. The other two are approximately 25m to the south and 60m to the north east. Major adverse effect to setting of 5 Greenside due to loss of garden, intensification of entrance, loss of wooded and open green backdrop and potential alterations to Listed Building. Non-statutory archaeological site - The site is located on the eastern side of the historic village core and evidence for Saxon settlement is known in the vicinity. County Archaeologists would require further information in advance of any planning application for this site before it is able to advise on the suitability of the site for development. It is unlikely to be possible to mitigate any impact on the historic environment, particularly on the setting of the Conservation Area and a Grade II Listed Building, due to loss of green rural backdrop and countryside setting. Tree Preservation Orders – there is a protected Ash tree situated in rear garden of 43 Vicarage Close, approximately 22m to the north. Public Rights of Way – footpaths run along the northern and western boundaries of the site. Biodiversity features - Fenland landscapes support species and habitats characterised by intensive agriculture due to the high quality soil. This has restricted biodiversity in some parts. However, drains, hedges and field margins provide refuge for species such as barn owl, corn bunting and skylark. Washlands **Environmental** provide temporary areas of flooded grassland that are important and wildlife for plants such as the marsh foxtail, tufted hair-grass and designations narrow-leaved water dropwort. Important numbers of wintering and wildfowl maybe found on flooded fields. The network of drainage considerations? ditches in places still retain water voles with otters occasionally found into the fens where suitable fish stocks are found. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design. Agricultural land of high grade (i.e. Agricultural Land Classification Grade 1, 2, 3a) - Grade 2. With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the natural environment. **Physical** None considerations? The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes Townscape and the landscape surrounding Waterbeach as typical fenland, comprising

distinctive groupings of trees. Many of the surrounding roads are raised on embankments and run alongside drainage ditches, which

very flat large arable fields, distant views, together with quite

landscape

impact?

are also visible between the fields.

Moving closer to the edge of the village, there are more local landscape characteristics. To the west and north, enclosed fields again provide an important landscape setting for the village.

The site is adjacent to the Waterbeach Conservation Area. The Draft Waterbeach Conservation Area Appraisal (2007) states: "The village has a rich stock of historic buildings with around 60 listed buildings. These range from the grade II\* Church of St John...to many fine 19<sup>th</sup> century villas built of gault brick and standing in spacious plots along the High Street and around The Green. The church and the green provide dual focuses for the village." (page 4)

The Green is identified as a "substantial open area [that] lies at the centre of the village settlement. Along with the parish church it is the key landmark in the Conservation Area, particularly notable for the mature lime trees that line it." (page 10) "No.5 is a 17<sup>th</sup> century grade II listed two storey house. No.19, a 16<sup>th</sup> century grade II listed house." (page 11)

A public footpath leading out from The Green into the countryside to the west runs along the northern boundary of the site. There is another footpath running along the western boundary from residential development to the south. As an area of open ground, an undeveloped green wedge coming in almost to the heart of the village, the site therefore provides an important amenity area.

Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Waterbeach. The site forms a semi-rural transition area between the village and the countryside beyond, and retains the rural character of the local footpaths. The appeal inspector (see planning history) felt the introduction of built form would be harmful to the rural attributes.

# Can any issues be mitigated?

No. Significant historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts on this important amenity part of the village. Development would have a detrimental impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area, which it would not be possible to mitigate.

# Highways access? Regarding sites in the Milton / Waterbeach (estimated capacity of 13,602 dwellings on 14 sites) the Highways Agency comment that the vast majority of this grouping consists of the barracks site as a new settlement with the remainder essentially in-fill sites. On the whole, the in-fill sites are less likely to present an unacceptable pressure on the A14 given the majority of travel demand will be focused on Cambridge and credible alternatives to car travel could be available.

|                   | The access link to the public highway is unsuitable to serve the  |
|-------------------|---|
|                   | number of units that are being proposed.  |
|                   | Electricity - No significant impact on existing network.  |
|                   | Mains Water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge   |
|                   | Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare  |
|                   | capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the  |
|                   | distribution zone, less any commitments already made to   |
|                   | developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within   |
|                   | Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed  |
|                   | properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the  |
|                   | zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on  |
|                   | a first come first served basis. Development requiring an   |
|                   | increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to  |
| Utility services? | existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster  |
|                   | plus associated mains   |
|                   | Gas – Waterbeach has a gas supply and to serve this site with   |
|                   | gas is likely to be able to be accommodated with minimal  |
|                   | disruption or system reinforcement.   |
|                   | Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the waste water  |
|                   | treatment works to accommodate this development site. The   |
|                   | sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre-   |
|                   | development assessment will be required to ascertain the  |
|                   | specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any   |
|                   | mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the   |
|                   | developer.  |
|                   | No FRA provided.  |
|                   | A series to a fitte a development attached to fall a settle to the Martanhara shi based   |
|                   | A majority of the development sites falls within the Waterbeach Level   |
| Drainage          | Internal Drainage District. The District does not have any capacity to  |
| measures?         | accept any direct discharge into its system above the green field run off rate. All surface water from the site would have to be balanced |
|                   | before it is released into the Boards system. We also have main   |
|                   | drains adjacent to the site, therefore any works involving these drains   |
|                   | would require the consent of the Board.   |
|                   | Waterbeach has a primary school with a PAN of 60 and school   |
|                   | capacity of 420 and, and lies within the catchment of Cottenham   |
|                   | Village College with a PAN of 180 and school capacity of 900  |
|                   | children. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and  |
|                   | City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there were deficit   |
|                   | of 25 primary places in Waterbeach taking account of planned  |
| School            | development in Waterbeach, and a deficit of 30 secondary places   |
| capacity?         | taking account of planned development across the village college  |
|                   | catchment area.   |
|                   |   |
|                   | The development of this site for 20 dwellings could generate a need   |
|                   | for early years places and a maximum of 7 primary school places and   |
|                   | 5 secondary places.   |
|                   |   |

| Г                 |   |
|-------------------|---|
|                   | After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site  |
|                   | would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission  |
|                   | numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or   |
| Health facilities | the provision of new schools.   |
|                   | There is one doctors practice in Waterbeach which has potential for   |
| capacity?         | expansion.  |
|                   | The promoter provides the following supporting information:   |
|                   | The cite can provide land for much peeded further begins  |
|                   | The site can provide land for much needed further housing   |
|                   | development in a sustainable village location, adjoining the existing settlement limits but outside them (and on 'white land' excluded from |
|                   | the Green Belt).  |
|                   | the Green beity.  |
|                   | The site could be brought forward in conjunction with two sites to the  |
|                   | west which have access off Mill Road and Poorsfield Road. My  |
|                   | clients' land has access from the west, giving direct access to the   |
|                   | village centre, via Gibson Close.   |
| Any other         | 3   |
| issues?           | There could be scope to also incorporate land at 12 Cambridge Road  |
|                   | (The Shieling) to create a larger site with scope for more dwellings.   |
|                   |   |
|                   | The land is well contained by existing built development and looks to   |
|                   | be a logical candidate for development in terms of rounding off the   |
|                   | edge of Waterbeach.   |
|                   | A mix of housing types/sizes and tenures could be delivered on the  |
|                   | land thus helping to meet further housing needs in Waterbeach.  |
|                   | There are no known constraints to development of this land and its  |
|                   | owners are willing to bring it forward at an early date.  |
|                   | No. It is not possible to provide safe highway access to the site.  |
| Can issues be     | The man possible to provide sale might de describe the title site.  |
| mitigated?        | Upgrades required to local infrastructure, including utilities (mains   |
|                   | water and sewerage), school capacity and health.  |
| Does the site     | · ·   |
| warrant further   | No  |
| assessment?       |   |

#### **Tier 3: Site Specific Factors**

| Capacity         |                                 |  |
|------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Developable area | None (0.47 ha if unconstrained) |  |
| Site capacity    | 14 dwellings                    |  |
| Density          | 30 dph                          |  |

| Potential Suitability |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Conclusion            | The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints. |

| Availability                                      |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Is the land in single ownership?                  | Yes   |  |
| Site ownership status?                            | The site is promoted by a single landowner.   |  |
| Legal constraints?                                | No known constraints.   |  |
| Is there market interest in the site?             | The site has not been marketed and there is no interest in the site from a developer. |  |
| When would the site be available for development? | The promoter indicates that the site is available immediately.                        |  |

| Achievability  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Phasing and delivery of the development                                      | The promoter indicates that the first dwellings could be completed on site 2011-16.  |  |
| Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability? | None known.  |  |
| Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?   | None known.  |  |
| Could issues identified be overcome?   |  |  |
| Economic viability?  | Viability Category 2 Viable sites  This viability assessment is provided independent of any policy or other assessment as to whether the site should be allocated for development. The references to planning policy only relate to those existing policies governing how a site would be developed, not whether it should be allocated in the new Local Plan. |  |

Having undertaken an assessment of this site the local planning authority have few concerns that that the landowner would be unable to deliver a development that complies with current planning policy in respect of density, mix and the provision of onsite facilities whilst still delivering the necessary level of affordable housing, planning obligations and potential community infrastructure levy payments.

In summary this scheme is not considered to have any barriers, in terms of development viability alone, to restrict it coming forward within the next 5 years (new settlements and other very large developments may take longer than 5 years to come forward).

#### **Site Assessment Conclusion**

Site with no development potential.

#### Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013

Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework.