

Intended for

Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

Date




November, 2015 (Updated March 2016)

Project Number

UK15-22172

CAMBRIDGE AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL PLANS SA ADDENDUM REPORT NON TECHNICAL SUMMARY

Project No. **UK15-22172**
Issue No. **1**
Date **18/11/2015**
Made by **Emma Jones**
Checked by **Bram Miller**
Approved by **Matt Royall**

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

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

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

Version Control Log

| Revision | Date | Made by | Checked by | Approved by | Description |
|----------|------------|---------|------------|-------------|--------------|
| 1 | 18/11/2015 | EJ | BM | MR | Client Draft |

CONTENTS

| | | |
|------------|--|-----------|
| 1. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 | Purpose of this Report | 1 |
| 1.2 | Issues raised by the Inspectors | 1 |
| 2. | BACKGROUND | 3 |
| 2.1 | The Need to Review the Local Plans | 3 |
| 2.2 | Contents and objectives of the plans | 3 |
| 2.3 | Relationship to other plans and programmes | 7 |
| 2.4 | The role of the SA and work completed to date | 7 |
| 2.5 | The consideration of alternatives | 7 |
| 3. | BASELINE DATA | 11 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 11 |
| 4. | APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY | 14 |
| 4.1 | Joint framework for testing of strategic alternatives | 14 |
| 4.2 | Other aspects of methodology | 20 |
| 5. | REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS | 21 |
| 5.1 | Background | 21 |
| 5.2 | Review of new evidence | 21 |
| 5.3 | The impact of the new targets | 21 |
| 6. | STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT SEQUENCE | 23 |
| 6.1 | Background | 23 |
| 6.2 | Existing development sequence | 23 |
| 6.3 | Purpose of the SA | 23 |
| 6.4 | Results of the assessment | 24 |
| 7. | SITE OPTIONS | 26 |
| 7.1 | Background | 26 |
| 7.2 | Identifying Sites | 26 |
| 7.3 | Site Assessment | 26 |
| 7.4 | Site Appraisal Results | 26 |
| 8. | STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES | 36 |
| 8.1 | Introduction | 36 |
| 8.2 | Considering alternative approaches to development | 36 |
| 8.3 | Sustainability appraisal of strategic alternatives | 37 |
| 8.4 | Results of the assessment | 37 |
| 9. | GREEN BELT IN THE SA | 39 |
| 9.1 | Introduction | 39 |
| 9.2 | The treatment of Green Belt in SA | 39 |
| 9.3 | How the issue of Green Belt was considered in the SAs | 39 |
| 9.4 | How Green Belt has been addressed in plan making | 40 |
| 10. | PREFERRED APPROACH | 41 |
| 10.1 | Outline of the reasons for selecting the alternative approaches dealt with at this stage of the SA | 41 |
| 10.2 | The preferred approach | 41 |
| 10.3 | Reason for selection of the preferred approach | 41 |
| 11. | PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE PLANS | 43 |

| | | |
|------------|---|-----------|
| 11.1 | Screening the effects of the Proposed Changes | 43 |
| 11.2 | Likely significant cumulative effects | 43 |
| 11.3 | Consideration of A428 and A10 transport schemes | 44 |
| 11.4 | Mitigation measures | 44 |
| 12. | CONSULTATION AND NEXT STEPS | 45 |
| 12.1 | Consultation on the SA Addendum Report | 45 |
| 12.2 | Next steps for the Local Plans | 45 |
| 12.3 | Next steps for the SAs | 45 |
| 13. | POST CONSULTATION UPDATE (MARCH 2016) | 46 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1.1: Addressing the concerns of the Inspectors | 1 |
| Table 3.1: SEA regulation requirements | 12 |
| Table 4.1: Joint Strategic SA framework | 15 |
| Table 4.2: Assessment Key | 20 |
| Table 7.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria..... | 28 |

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of this Report

This report is the Non-Technical Summary for the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Addendum Report for the Cambridge Local Plan and the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan¹. The purpose of the SA Addendum Report is to address the concerns expressed by the Local Plan Inspectors during the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Joint Local Plan Examination Process². The SA Addendum Report signposts the important SA information that the Inspectors have addressed concerns about and reports on additional assessment that has been undertaken in response to the Inspectors' concerns. This SA Addendum Report forms part of the Submission Draft SAs, adding additional detail to some elements and superceding others.

1.2 Issues raised by the Inspectors

Table 1.1 sets out how this report seeks to address the concerns of the Inspectors.

Table 1.1: Addressing the concerns of the Inspectors

| Table 1.1: Addressing the concerns of the Inspectors | |
|--|--|
| Inspectors' concern | How this is addressed in the SA Addendum Report |
| Larger releases of Green Belt land were rejected at an early stage in the Local Plan process. A number of sites were rejected on the grounds that they were not reasonable alternatives. The Councils need to revisit the SAs to appraise all reasonable alternatives to the same level as the preferred option. | <p>Section 6 addresses this issue by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explaining the methodology that was used to select, sieve and assess sites for both Local Plans; • Setting out a clear methodology by which the sites on the edge of Cambridge have been assessed to the same level as the other sites; • Presenting an assessment of sites on the edge of Cambridge; • Presenting a re-assessment of all sites in the light of the new evidence available. <p>Section 7 addresses this issue by considering the alternative of allocating development on edge of Cambridge on an equal basis with other locations.</p> |
| It is difficult to understand how various dimensions of sustainability were assessed with regard to paragraph 85 of the NPPF | Section 8 addresses this issue by explaining how NPPF paragraph 85 has been addressed by the Councils and how the SA forms part of this consideration. This is supplemented by the Councils' Overall Development Strategy paper. |
| There is an inconsistency between the | Section 4 outlines growth level options in |

¹ Proposed Submission South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (South Cambridgeshire District Council, July 2013). Reference Document Library Number RD/Sub/SC/010. Cambridge Local Plan 2014 Proposed Submission (Cambridge City Council, 2013). Reference Document Library Number RD/Sub/C/010.

² Letter dated 20th May 2015 from Laura Graham and Alan Wood to South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council. Please see

<https://www.scambs.gov.uk/sites/www.scambs.gov.uk/files/documents/Letter%20from%20Inspectors%20to%20Councils%20-%20Preliminary%20Conclusions%20200515.pdf>

| Table 1.1: Addressing the concerns of the Inspectors | |
|---|--|
| <p>SDSR and the Plans’ reliance on meeting development needs in new settlements. It may be that the Councils take the view that Green Belt outweighs other considerations but this should be stated clearly.</p> <p>Further modifications need to be made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Either align the plan more closely with the SDSR; or • More fully explain the reasons for departing from the strategy together with a further evidenced explanation of how challenges in making new settlements sustainable is addressed | <p>light of new work on Objectively Assessed Needs. Section 5 includes a re-appraisal of the strategic development sequence in light of new evidence. Section 7 outlines the alternatives available for the strategy of the plans in light of the findings of the site assessments and new evidence base and presents an updated SA of each of these alternatives. Section 9 then sets out the reasons for selection of the Preferred Option in light of the above work.</p> <p>Issues related to the SDSR have been considered throughout the addendum but especially in Section 7.</p> <p>This is supplemented by the Councils’ Overall Development Strategy paper which brings together all the different elements of work that have been undertaken.</p> |

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 The Need to Review the Local Plans

The Councils need to carry out the review of their Local Plans in order to be able to demonstrate at least a 15-year supply of deliverable housing land in line with the NPPF. In addition, there have been a number of changes in recent years that have resulted in the need for review. These include changes in the economic climate, changes in local circumstances and changes in planning policy guidance.

2.2 Contents and objectives of the plans

2.2.1 The Cambridge Local Plan

The Cambridge Local Plan 2014³ sets out policies to guide the future development of Cambridge to 2031. It also identifies land for specific uses such as housing, employment, open space, Green Belt, etc. It will be the key document used to determine planning applications for new development in Cambridge. The Local Plan includes strategic policies, site allocations and more specific development management policies to guide development. On adoption, it will replace the current Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and policies CE/3 and CE/35 of the Cambridge East Area Action Plan.

Following on from the Vision and objectives, the plan is divided into a number of sections, all of which contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

- Section 2 of the plan sets out the spatial strategy for Cambridge.
- Section 3 gives consideration to Cambridge's City Centre, areas of major change and opportunity areas, and site specific policies.
- Section 4 sets out the need for new development to integrate the principles of sustainable design and construction in order to respond to our changing climate.
- Section 5 addresses the need to support and facilitate Cambridge's economy and the role of the Cambridge Cluster of knowledge-based industries and institutions.
- Section 6 seeks to maintain a balanced supply of housing types and sizes to meet the needs of all sections of the community, including the maximum reasonable proportion of affordable housing.
- Section 7 sets out the approach to protecting and enhancing the character of Cambridge, maintaining and improving an enviable quality of life and place.
- Section 8 on services and local facilities addresses the need to protect and increase the city's community facilities.
- Section 9 sets out the need to provide infrastructure to support development, including sustainable transport solutions.

Included within the plan is a Vision for Cambridge to 2031, which sets out a vision of Cambridge as:

"...a compact, dynamic city, located within the high quality landscape setting of the Cambridge Green Belt. The city will draw inspiration from its iconic historic core, heritage assets, river and structural green corridors, achieving a sense of place in all its parts, with generous, accessible and biodiverse open spaces and well-designed architecture. Building on the city's reputation for design excellence, Cambridge's new development will be innovative and will promote the use of sustainable modes of transport, helping to support the transition to a more environmentally sustainable

³ Cambridge Local Plan 2014 Proposed Submission (Cambridge City Council, 2013). Reference Document Library Number RD/Sub/C/010.

and successful low carbon economy. The city will continue to develop as a centre of excellence and world leader in the fields of higher education and research, and will foster the dynamism, prosperity and further expansion of the knowledge-based economy, while retaining the high quality of life and place that underpins that economic success. It will also grow in importance as a sub-regional centre for a wide range of services. Housing provision in the city will be of a high quality and will support the development and enhancement of balanced and mixed communities through provision of housing of a mix of sizes and types, including a high proportion of affordable housing. The Cambridge Local Plan 2014 seeks to guide and facilitate growth and the infrastructure required to support development, so that the city grows in a sensitive and sustainable manner. This will ensure that the high environmental quality of the city is protected and enhanced and that future developments offer a full range of opportunities to all.”

The Local Plan then establishes a set of strategic objectives for the plan to deliver this vision. The objectives of the Local Plan are presented in Box 2.1 below.

Box 2.1: Objectives of the Cambridge Local Plan.

All new development should...

1. Contribute to the vision of Cambridge as an environmentally sustainable city, where it is easy for people to make a transition to a low carbon lifestyle. This means making best use of energy (including community energy projects), water and other natural resources, securing radical reductions in carbon emissions, minimising environmental impact and being capable of adapting to the impacts of climate change
2. Be highly water efficient, contribute to overall flood risk reduction through water sensitive urban design, and help to improve the quality of the River Cam and other water features in the city
3. Be of the highest quality, in terms of design excellence and innovation, addressing the development's impact upon its surroundings and embracing the principles of sustainable design and construction;
4. Contribute to the positive management of change in the historic environment, protecting, enhancing and maintaining the unique qualities and character of Cambridge, including the River Cam corridor, the city's wider landscape and setting, and its designated and undesignated heritage assets for the future;
5. Protect and, where appropriate, enhance the character and quality of the Cambridge skyline;
6. Protect and enhance the landscape setting of the city, which comprises the Cambridge Green Belt, the green corridors penetrating the urban area, the established network of multi-functional green spaces, and tree canopy cover in the city;
7. Protect and enhance the city's biodiversity, network of habitats and geodiversity;
8. Meet the housing needs of the city within its sub-region, delivering an appropriate mix of housing types, sizes and tenures to meet existing and future needs, including affordable housing;
9. Assist the creation and maintenance of inclusive, environmentally sustainable communities;
10. Promote and support economic growth in environmentally sustainable and accessible locations, facilitating innovation and supporting Cambridge's role as a world leader in higher education, research and knowledge-based industries, while maintaining the quality of life and place that contribute to economic success;
11. Support Cambridge's vibrant and thriving centres, with a varied range of shopping facilities in accessible locations that meet the needs of people living, working and studying in, or visiting, the city and its wider sub-region;
12. Promote social cohesion and sustainability and a high quality of life by maintaining and enhancing provision for open space, sports and recreation, community and leisure facilities, including arts and cultural venues that serve Cambridge and the sub-region;
13. Be located to help minimise the distance people need to travel, and be designed to make it easy for everyone to move around the city and access jobs and services by sustainable modes of transport;
14. Ensure appropriate and timely provision of environmentally sustainable forms of infrastructure to support the demands of the city, including digital and cultural infrastructure
15. Promote a safe and healthy environment, minimising the impacts of development and ensuring quality of life and place.

2.2.2 The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan

The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2014⁴ sets the levels of employment and housing development that should be provided over the plan period, to best meet the needs of the area and establish a clear strategy for meeting development needs in the most sustainable way. The Local Plan includes the following chapters:

- Chapter 1 is the introduction which describes the overall purpose of the document.
- Chapter 2 sets out the vision and objectives and development needs for South Cambridgeshire to 2031 together with the spatial strategy.
- Chapter 3 contains the strategic sites which will contribute most to the delivery of sustainable development in South Cambridgeshire.
- Chapter 4 is concerned with sustainable development, climate change, water resources and flooding.
- Chapter 5 is concerned with design, landscape, and public realm.
- Chapter 6 contains proposals to protect and enhance the historic built and the natural environment.
- Chapter 7 is concerned with delivering high quality housing and includes village housing sites.
- Chapter 8 deals with building a strong and competitive economy, including sections on employment, retail and tourism and development sites.
- Chapter 9 is concerned with creating successful communities, including the provision of open space, leisure facilities and community facilities.
- Chapter 10 deals with promoting and delivering sustainable transport and other kinds of infrastructure.

The Local Plan establishes a Vision for the district. This states:

“South Cambridgeshire will continue to be the best place to live, work and study in the country. Our district will demonstrate impressive and sustainable economic growth. Our residents will have a superb quality of life in an exceptionally beautiful, rural and green environment.”

The Local Plan then establishes a set of objectives for the plan to deliver this vision. The objectives of the Local Plan are presented in Box 2.2.

⁴ Proposed Submission South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (South Cambridgeshire District Council, July 2013).
Reference Document Library Number RD/Sub/SC/010.

Box 2.2: Objectives of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan

1. To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy;
2. To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity;
3. To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost;
4. To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change;
5. To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure; and
6. To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.

2.3 Relationship to other plans and programmes

The relationship of the Local Plans to other plans and programmes is outlined in the following places

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). Part 2 of the SA report outlines the findings of the scoping process. The review of relevant plans and programmes is described in Section 6.1 of Part 2.
- Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014). Part 3 of the SA report outlines the findings of the scoping process. This sets out the policy context (relevant plans, policies and programmes) for each SA theme.

2.4 The role of the SA and work completed to date

The purpose of SA is to ensure that potential sustainability effects of plans are addressed through assessing sustainability impacts of objectives, actions, policies and their alternatives at an early stage in plan preparation. It is not the role of the SA to state which alternative should be chosen, this is a decision for Councils based on a number of factors.

From the outset of both Local Plans' preparation, and throughout the subsequent processes, a series of iterative appraisals has been published and consulted upon. At each stage, comments were considered and, where appropriate, resulted in changes to the Plans⁵.

2.5 The consideration of alternatives

A key issue is how alternatives (both strategy alternatives and site alternatives) are addressed in plan making (and the SA process). The SEA Regulations require that the SA report identifies the reasons for selecting the alternatives tested in light of the others available (SEA Regulations Schedule 2 (8)). Figure 2.1 shows a flow diagram

⁵ Responses to Issues Raised: South Cambridgeshire SA (RD/Sub/SC/060) Part 3 Appendix 2 and Cambridge City Council Statement of Consultation and Audit Trails (RD/Sub/C/080)

of the Local Plan processes (specifically focusing on alternative strategies and alternative sites) which highlights where key decisions have been made with regard to alternatives.

Figure 2.1a: Where were alternatives defined in the Local Plan processes?




Figure 2.1b: Approaches selected for Proposed Submission Local

| SELECTED LOCAL PLAN APPROACHES/SITES | |
|---|---|
| <p>South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission (July 2013)</p> <p><u>Strategy</u> Over the period of 2011-2031, 19,000 new homes, including affordable housing and 85 Gypsy & Traveller pitches and 22,000 additional jobs to support the Cambridge Cluster (Policy S/5)</p> <p>Need for development met on site in the following order: (Policy S/6)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> On the edge of Cambridge; At new settlements; In the rural area at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres. <p>Major housing allocations are carried forward (Policy S/6)</p> <p>3 new strategic scale allocations are proposed for housing-led development as follows: (Policy S/6)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A new town north of Waterbeach for 8,000 to 9,000 homes, 1,400 of which by 2031; A new village based on Bourn Airfield for 3,500 homes, 1,700 of which by 2031; A major expansion of Cambourne for a fourth linked village of 1,200 homes, all of which by 2031. <p><u>Sites (see Policies SS/1 to SS/8)</u> Edge of Cambridge (4 sites) (Orchard Park / Land between Huntingdon Rd and Histon Rd/ Cambridge East / Cambridge Northern Fringe East) New settlements (3 sites) (Waterbeach / Bourn Airfield / Northstowe Extension) Most sustainable villages (1 site) (Cambourne West)</p> <p>Eight village sites were also allocated under Policy H/1 in the following villages (Sawston, Histon and Impington, Melbourn, Gamlingay, Willingham and Comberton). This is for small numbers of dwellings (largest site is 260 units)</p> | <p>Cambridge Local Plan Submission (July 2013)</p> <p><u>Strategy</u> Over the period of 2011-2031, 14,000 new homes (Policy 3) Focus the majority of new development in and around the urban area of Cambridge (Policy 3) 22,100 net additional jobs in Cambridge including a net gain of some 8,800 jobs in the 'B' use classes (offices and industry) (Policy 2)</p> <p><u>Sites (see Policies 9-26)</u> Areas covered by existing AAPs: Cambridge East</p> <p>Areas of Major Change: Northern Fringe East and land surrounding the proposed Cambridge Science Park Station; Land south of Coldham's Lane; Southern Fringe; Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital); West Cambridge; NIAB 1; Station Areas West and the Clifton Road Area; and Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton.</p> <p>Opportunity Areas: Mitcham's Corner Eastern Gate Mill Road Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre Old Press/Mill Lane</p> <p>Site specific proposals: Sites GB1 and GB2 (Land north and south of Worts' Causeway), Sites GB3 and GB4 (Fulbourn Road West 1 and 2),</p> |

3. BASELINE DATA

3.1 Introduction

The SEA regulations require that an Environmental (SA) report and Non-Technical Summary outlines the following information in relation to baseline data:

- The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme;
- Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC; and
- The environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental, considerations have been taken into account during its preparation.

As has already been noted the SA Addendum Report forms part of the Submission Draft SAs, adding additional detail to some elements and superceding others. The information regarding the above can be found in the following places in the Submission Draft SA reports.

Table 3.1: SEA regulation requirements

| Table 3.1: SEA regulation requirements | |
|--|---|
| <p>The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme</p> | <p>This can be found in the following SA reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). Part 2 of the SA report outlines the findings of the scoping process. Section 6.2 (and the topic appendices 1-13) describes the review of the current and future (without the plan) baseline environment. • Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014). Part 3 of the SA report outlines the findings of the scoping process. This sets out the current baseline situation and the situation without the plan (future baseline) for each SA theme. <p>Section 3 of this SA addendum outlines new work on SA frameworks that has been undertaken and how this links to the scoping of sustainability issues that was carried out for both SA processes. In addition a number of new evidence studies have been undertaken in response to the Inspectors' concerns. This new evidence supplements the baseline data found in the above reports rather than superseding it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination – Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Further Evidence (2015); • Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study (2015); • Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Viability Update (2015); • Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Study (2015); and • Local Plans CSRM – Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Transport Report (2015). |
| <p>Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC.</p> | <p>This can be found in the following SA reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). Part 2 of the SA report outlines the findings of the scoping process. Section 6.2 (and the topic appendices 1-13) describes the review of the current and future (without the plan) baseline environment. This includes existing environmental problems and those related to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC. • Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014). Part 3 of the SA report outlines the findings of the scoping process. This sets out the current baseline situation and the situation without the plan (future baseline) for each SA theme. This includes those related to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>The environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental, considerations have been taken into account during its preparation</p> | <p>This can be found in the following SA reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). Part 2 of the SA report outlines the findings of the scoping process. The review of relevant plans and programmes (and objectives) is described in Section 6.1 (and the topic appendices 1-13).• Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014). Part 3 of the SA report outlines the findings of the scoping process. This sets out the policy context (relevant plans, policies, programmes and objectives) for each SA theme. |
|---|---|

4. APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY

4.1 Joint framework for testing of strategic alternatives

In order to address the Inspectors' issue that all alternatives should be assessed to the same level, a new appraisal framework has been formulated which addresses the issues relevant to both Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. The themes, sustainability objectives and many of the decision making criteria are taken from the South Cambridgeshire SA framework. The decision making criteria have been expanded by addition of some of the key sustainability issues from the Cambridge SA framework (those that were not addressed by the South Cambridgeshire decision making criteria) and these have been highlighted in bold italic. The joint SA framework is shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Joint Strategic SA framework

| Table 4.1: Joint Strategic SA framework | | |
|--|---|--|
| Themes | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria |
| LAND | 1. Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, economic mineral reserves, productive agricultural holdings, and the degradation / loss of soils | Will it use land that has been previously developed? |
| | | Will it use land efficiently? |
| | | Will it protect and enhance the best and most versatile agricultural land? Will it minimise the degradation/loss of soils due to new development? |
| | | Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves? |
| | 2. Minimise waste production and support the reuse and recycling of waste products | Will it encourage reduction in household waste, and increase waste recovery and recycling? |
| POLLUTION | 3. Improve air quality and minimise or mitigate against sources of environmental pollution | Will it maintain or improve air quality, including in AQMA? |
| | | Will it minimise, and where possible improve on, unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour, and vibration (including compatibility with neighbouring uses)? |
| | | Will it remediate contaminated land? |
| | | Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment? |
| | | Will it ensure that new development takes sewerage infrastructure, and source protection zones into account? |
| BIODIVERSITY | 4. Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species | Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity, including positive conservation management on local wildlife sites and SSSIs |
| | 5. Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species | Will it deliver net gains in biodiversity? Will it help deliver habitat restoration, and reduce habitat fragmentation (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan Targets and maintain connectivity between green infrastructure)? |
| | 6. Improve opportunities for people to access and appreciate wildlife and green spaces | Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery of and access to green infrastructure or access to the countryside through public rights of way? |

| Table 4.1: Joint Strategic SA framework | | |
|--|---|--|
| Themes | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria |
| LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE | 7. Maintain and enhance the diversity and local distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character | Will it maintain and enhance the distinctiveness of landscape character? |
| | | Will it recognise the role of the Green Belt in maintaining the character of the City and the quality of its historic setting? |
| | | Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character including through appropriate design and scale of development? |
| | | Will it ensure the scale of development is sensitive to the existing key landmark buildings and low lying topography of the City? |
| | 8. Avoid damage to areas and sites designated for their historic interest, and protect their settings. | Will it protect or enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments, buildings of local interest and archaeology)? |
| 9. Create places, spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look good | Will it lead to developments built to a high standard of design and good place making that reflects local character, and improves the quality of the public realm? | |
| CLIMATE CHANGE | 10. Minimise impacts on climate change (including greenhouse gas emissions) | Will it promote energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies? |
| | | Will it minimise contributions to climate change through sustainable construction practices? |
| | 11. Reduce vulnerability to future climate change effects | Will it use water in a sustainable manner, and enable and encourage high levels of water efficiency? |
| | | Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding and account for all costs of flooding (including the economic, environmental and social costs)? |
| | | Will it protect and enhance existing natural flood risk management infrastructure including capitalising on the opportunity for green infrastructure to help adapt to the threats of climate change? |
| | | Will it ensure that suitable sustainable drainage measures are incorporated into developments in order to manage surface water runoff? |
| | Does it include measures to adapt to climate change (such as green and | |

| Table 4.1: Joint Strategic SA framework | | |
|---|--|--|
| Themes | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria |
| | | <i>blue infrastructure, layout and massing</i> ?) |
| HEALTH | 12. Maintain and enhance human health | Will it promote good health and encourage healthy lifestyles, and help reduce health inequalities <i>(particularly in the north and east of Cambridge)</i> ? |
| | 13. Reduce and prevent crime and reduce fear of crime | Will it reduce actual levels of crime, and will it reduce fear of crime? |
| | 14. Improve the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space. | Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space <i>(particularly in areas anticipated to experience significant population growth)</i> ? |
| HOUSING | 15. Ensure everyone has access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing | Will it support the provision of a range of quality housing of appropriate types and sizes, including affordable housing, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community including people within the District and the City <i>(including the elderly, disabled people and those in poor health)</i> ? |
| | | Will it provide for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople? |
| INCLUSIVE COMMUNITIES | 16. Redress inequalities related to age, disability, gender, race, faith, location and income | Will it improve relations between people from different backgrounds or social groups and <i>contribute to community diversity</i> ? |
| | | Will it address inequality? (related to age, disability, gender, race, faith, location and income) |
| | | Will it redress rural isolation - rurality? |
| | | <i>Will it reduce inequalities in the educational achievement level of economically active adults and develop the opportunities for everyone to acquire the skills needed to find and remain in work</i> |
| | 17. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (e.g. health, transport, education, training, leisure opportunities) | Will it provide accessibility to and improve quality of key local services and facilities, including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?) |
| <i>Will it ensure adequate provision of convenience shopping in the north west of Cambridge?</i> | | |
| Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?) | | |

| Table 4.1: Joint Strategic SA framework | | |
|--|--|--|
| Themes | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria |
| | 18. Encourage and enable the active involvement of local people in community activities | Will it encourage and enable engagement in community activities? Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions, including 'hard to reach' groups? |
| Economy and Infrastructure | 19. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy. | <i>Will it maintain and enhance competitiveness, and capitalise on Cambridge's position as one of the UK's most competitive cities?</i> Will it support business development and enhance competitiveness, enabling provision of high-quality employment land in appropriate locations to meet the needs of businesses, and the workforce? Will it promote the industries that thrive in the area? |
| | | <i>Does it address pockets of income and employment deprivation particularly in Abbey Ward and Kings Hedges? Would allocation result in development in deprived wards?</i> |
| | | <i>Will it minimise the loss of industrial floorspace in Cambridge?</i> |
| | | Will it protect the shopping hierarchy supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres? |
| | 20. Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence | Will it contribute to providing a range of employment opportunities, in accessible locations? |
| | | Will it encourage and support sustainable tourism and the rural economy? |
| | | <i>Capitalise on the value that language schools/specialist tutorial colleges contribute to the local economy, but balance this against the increased impact this may have on the housing market?</i> |
| | | <i>Does it support high-tech clusters (including high tech manufacturing) including the provision of office space for small but growing businesses and the need for high-tech headquarters?</i> |
| | 21. Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and other infrastructure | Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband? |
| | | Will it improve access to education and training for all (including timely provision of primary and secondary schools in locations where it is needed), and support |

| Table 4.1: Joint Strategic SA framework | | |
|---|--|---|
| Themes | Sustainability Objective | Decision Making Criteria |
| | | provision of skilled employees to the economy? |
| Transport | 22. Reduce the need to travel and promote more sustainable transport choices. | Will it enable shorter journeys, improve modal choice (helping to reduce the use of the private car) and integration of transport modes to encourage or facilitate the use of modes such as walking, cycling and public transport? <i>Will it build on the high modal share of cycling in the City centre?</i> |
| | | Will it support movement of freight by means other than road? |
| | | <i>Will it include infrastructure for low emission vehicles?</i> |
| | 23. Secure appropriate investment and development in transport infrastructure, and ensure the safety of the transport network. | Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity? |
| Will it make the transport network safer for all users, both motorised and non-motorised? | | |

4.2 Other aspects of methodology

4.2.1 Scoring of the assessment

Assessment against the joint strategic framework above has been used to judge the significant sustainability effects of the alternative strategy options and stages in the development sequence. The assessment key set out in Table 4.2 below has been used to guide this assessment of significance.

Table 4.2: Assessment Key

| Table 4.2: Assessment Key | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Symbol | Likely effect against the SA Objective |
| +++ | Potentially significant beneficial impact, option supports the objective |
| + | Option supports this objective although it may have only a minor beneficial impact |
| 0 | Option has no impact or effect is neutral insofar as the benefits and drawbacks appear equal and neither is considered significant |
| ? | Uncertain or insufficient information on which to determine the assessment at this stage |
| - | Option appears to conflict with the objective and may result in adverse impacts |
| --- | Potentially significant adverse impact, conflict with the objective |

4.2.2 Difficulties encountered in the assessment

The SEA regulations require that a description of any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in undertaking the assessment is set out. Both of the Local Plan SA reports sets out difficulties that have been encountered during the assessment and these are set out in the following places in those reports:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report - Difficulties encountered are set out in Section 2.7 of Part 3; and
- Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State - Difficulties encountered are set out in Section 4.7 of Part 4.

The majority of the difficulties encountered during this stage of the assessment are similar to those noted in the reports above.

5. REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

5.1 Background

The Submitted Local Plans included housing targets based on the 'Objectively Assessed Needs' identified in the Cambridge Sub Region Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The Inspectors' Preliminary Conclusions⁶ (20 May 2015) identified concerns that the Councils' approach to the identification of the full objectively assessed need has not fully taken into account market signals, particularly in relation to affordability. The Councils have commissioned additional evidence to address the issues raised. Modifications are proposed to the dwellings target in the Submitted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, to reflect the new evidence. No modification is required to the Cambridge Local Plan target.

5.2 Review of new evidence

The Councils commissioned consultants to carry out an assessment of the issues raised in the Inspectors Preliminary Conclusions. The study concludes that against a demographic starting point of 10,069 new dwellings for Cambridge and 17,579 new dwellings for South Cambridgeshire, there should be an uplift of 30% and 10% respectively to take account of market signals in each area, giving figures of 13,090 homes for Cambridge and 19,337 for South Cambridgeshire. It endorses the current requirement of 14,000 homes for Cambridge and indicates that the current figure for South Cambridgeshire of 19,000 homes should be increased to 19,500 (rounded).

In response to the new evidence, Cambridge City Council is proposing no modification, maintaining the target of 14,000 dwellings included in the Submitted Cambridge Local Plan. South Cambridgeshire District Council propose to increase the dwelling target from 19,000 to 19,500.

5.3 The impact of the new targets

5.3.1 Cambridge

The housing requirement for Cambridge remains as 14,000. As this housing requirement has been tested previously it is not necessary to re-test this requirement to determine its sustainability effects. For details of the testing carried out for this housing requirement in Cambridge please see page 198 (paragraph 4.5.8) of the Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State.

Please note that it has not been necessary to test the option of 13,090 new dwellings (this is the figure identified in the report "Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Further Evidence, October 2015"). This figure of 13,090 should be considered as a reasonable alternative and an appraisal made of its effects. However, the figure of 12,700 has already been tested for Cambridge at the issues and options stage. 13,090 and 12,700 should not be significantly different in their effects especially as the level of detail in the assessment is necessarily broad and the conclusions of this assessment should remain valid. The conclusions of the assessment of the 12,700 figure have been validated and the conclusions of the assessment remain valid for the figure of 13,090. The original assessment can be found on page 196 of the Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014).

⁶ Inspectors' Preliminary Conclusions (letter of 20 May 2015)

<https://www.scambs.gov.uk/sites/www.scambs.gov.uk/files/documents/Letter%20from%20Inspectors%20to%20Councils%20-%20Preliminary%20Conclusions%20200515.pdf>

5.3.2 South Cambridgeshire

It has not been necessary to carry out an updated SA of the new housing requirement of 19,500. This is because the changes to the housing requirement will not be significantly different to those already tested especially as the level of detail in the assessment is necessarily broad. Therefore, the approach has been to validate the assessment of the Submission Local Plan housing requirement (19,000) to ensure that the conclusions of the assessment remain valid for a housing requirement of 19,500. This review has concluded that this assessment does remain valid. The original assessment can be found in Appendix 5, page 3-A210 – A230 of the South Cambridgeshire Submission SA report.

6. STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT SEQUENCE

6.1 Background

The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans provide a development strategy to guide where growth should take place. Whilst a significant part of the development needs identified in the area will be met by existing commitments there remain strategic choices to be made about the location of future growth.

During the plan making process, the Councils considered a range of potential development locations, which were subject to SA. At a high level, this included consideration of implications of growth at each location in the existing search sequence – Cambridge Urban Area, Edge of Cambridge, New Settlements, Better Served Villages (defined as Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres). The Inspectors' Preliminary Conclusions⁷ (20 May 2015) identified concerns regarding how the Green Belt had been considered during plan making. In response, the Councils have commissioned new evidence to address a number of issues. In light of these issues, this section of the SA Addendum provides a review of the SA of broad strategy options that was included in the Councils' Submission Draft SA reports and considers the implications of the additional evidence.

6.2 Existing development sequence

The current development strategy for the Cambridge area is as set out below:

1. Within the urban area of Cambridge, subject to capacity and environmental considerations;
2. On the periphery of the built up area of Cambridge, subject to a review of the Green Belt;
3. In a new settlement close to Cambridge;
4. Within the built up area of market towns, larger villages and previously established new settlements where good public transport access to Cambridge exists or can be provided, provided that growth in car commuting can be minimised;
5. By extensions to market towns, larger villages and previously established new settlements where good public transport access to Cambridge exists or can be provided, provided that growth in car commuting can be minimised⁸.

One of the issues for the new round of plans is to consider whether this sequence remains appropriate, and how much development should take place at each location.

6.3 Purpose of the SA

This section of the report provides an updated SA of the stages of the development sequence taking into account new evidence on a number of issues:

- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination – Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Further Evidence(2015);
- Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study (2015);
- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Viability Update (2015);
- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Study (2015);
- Local Plans CSRM Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Transport Report.(Atkins, November 2015).

⁷ Inspectors' Preliminary Conclusions (letter of 20 May 2015)

<https://www.scambs.gov.uk/sites/www.scambs.gov.uk/files/documents/Letter%20from%20Inspectors%20to%20Councils%20-%20Preliminary%20Conclusions%20200515.pdf>

⁸ Policy 22 - Regional Planning Guidance Note 6: Regional Planning Guidance for East Anglia to 2016 (2000) (RD/NP/131)

This is an assessment, carried out to an appropriate level of details for a strategic assessment, of the sustainability implications of focusing on different stages of the development sequence (Cambridge Urban Area, Edge of Cambridge, New Settlements, more sustainable villages, and although not part of the development sequence for comparison the less sustainable villages).

6.4 Results of the assessment

Please see Table 5.1 and Table 5.2 of the main SA Addendum Report for the appraisal results. In conclusion, the updated evidence base and changes to the SA framework have not changed the results of the assessment significantly.

The assessment concludes that the most sustainable level of the development sequence is within Cambridge. Development will have many sustainability benefits including protecting the distinctive setting of Cambridge through safeguarding the Green Belt and the associated biodiversity of the Green Belt. However, the scale of potential development within the urban area is severely constrained so will form a fairly small part of the overall strategy, forming a small but vital component of all of the alternatives.

With regard to the edge of Cambridge, the assessment has confirmed that there are sustainability benefits to development on the edge of Cambridge. With regard to transport, development on the edge of Cambridge remains the best performing option with regard to modal share and performs positively due to short distances to the city, low public transport journey times, and in many cases proximity to high frequency public transport. However, the modal share results hide the fact that these locations are in already congested areas of the city where there is little scope to create more capacity for more cars, forcing new trips to be undertaken by active modes. The Local Plans CSRM report shows that different development options do not result in radically different levels of traffic growth, travel times or delay. Whilst there are variations, these are in the context of very high overall traffic growth where significant amounts of development are already committed. Viability evidence has confirmed that sites on the edge of Cambridge do offer higher sales values than options further from the city meaning facilities and infrastructure are more viable. This offers benefits in terms of potential to secure higher funding through Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) / Section 106. Cambridge is proposing to secure a higher rate of CIL than South Cambridgeshire, and this higher rate has the potential to be applied to edge of Cambridge sites. However, the Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study (2015) has concluded that it is unlikely that any development within identified sectors (apart from a few small exceptions) could be accommodated without substantial harm to the Green Belt purposes. Therefore, the conclusions remain that, notwithstanding some of the positive sustainability effects that development on the edge of Cambridge demonstrates, it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development here without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt.

With regard to new settlements, they could have significant landscape impacts. However, they will help to protect Green Belt and the setting of Cambridge and have the potential to use areas of previously developed land. New settlements could incorporate significant public transport routes to Cambridge, and new town and local centres as appropriate, to ensure that residents have convenient access to local services and facilities by walking, cycling and public transport. They have the potential to enable focussed investment in public transport and cycling infrastructure, delivering high quality services to provide a significantly higher modal share of travel by non-car modes than village based growth options. The Local Plans CSRM report found that the greater distance from Cambridge would mean higher levels of car use than an edge of Cambridge focus but site specific transport measures would reduce the impact of growth, increasing the proportion of trips made by non-car modes, including shift towards Park & Ride. Viability evidence has confirmed that sites on the edge of Cambridge do offer higher sales values

than new settlement sites. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements. Transport schemes identified to support new settlements are expensive, but would also provide benefit to existing communities. Given the cost of transport schemes required for the sites, it is unlikely that off-site infrastructure and substantial services could be delivered through CIL/S106 alone. However, it is expected that City Deal funding would be available to support delivery of major infrastructure required to make the new settlements viable and sustainable.

With regard to village led development such a strategy would be likely to deliver incremental improvements at best, rather than focused investment. Traffic impacts would be spread more around the district, but there would be a higher modal share for car use. A distribution to smaller sites would have a more incremental impact on the landscape and townscape, but village expansions could negatively impact on village character. The conclusions remain that development at these levels are not as positive as for edge of Cambridge and New Settlements and that they should remain at the bottom of the development sequence.

7. SITE OPTIONS

7.1 Background

The SA process considered a wide range of sites which could potentially be allocated to address identified development needs. The SA Addendum Report presents sites across the two districts on a like for like basis, include those located in the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge. It aims to make comparison between sites in different locations more accessible, by presenting summary tables which include sites at locations in the development sequence.

The Councils considered a wide range of sites during the plan making process. This included suggestions received through the Issues and Options consultations, and consideration through both Councils' Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAA)⁹, which included 'calls for sites'. During the SA scoping process, each Council developed site appraisal criteria, which were used to test sites in their district, reflecting the sustainability issues identified. Joint criteria were developed for the edge of Cambridge.

7.2 Identifying Sites

Options for growth sites have been categorised into areas identified in the development sequence:

- Cambridge Urban Area
- Edge of Cambridge
- New Settlements
- Rural Centres & Minor Rural Centres

The sites tested reflect the sites identified in the SA processes up to submission, with the exception of sites that have gained planning permission and sites at Group and Infill villages (these have not been tested) and the addition of more Green Belt sites than were tested as part of the Submission Local Plans.

7.3 Site Assessment

The SA Addendum Report has been prepared in order to present site assessments on a like for like basis and to the same level. Reflecting the joint assessment of strategic approaches in the SA Addendum Report, the assessment of individual sites has built on this, by presenting sites in a joint appraisal format. This enables sites in all locations to be appraised on a consistent basis and the information presented in a consistent format.

The site appraisal criteria used in the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire SAs are closely aligned. Table 7.1 below sets out the joint criteria that have been applied to the site assessments in this SA Addendum Report.

7.4 Site Appraisal Results

The Site Appraisal results are presented in Annex 1 of the main SA Addendum Report. This includes a list of the sites tested, and proformas for each of the sites.

In summary, for sites in the Cambridge Urban Area, most sites utilise previously developed land, and avoid the use of agricultural land. A number of sites are located close to Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA). Many offer opportunities for biodiversity enhancement, and do not

⁹ Cambridge Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/strategic-housing-land-availability-assessment>

South Cambridgeshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)
<https://www.scambs.gov.uk/content/strategic-housing-land-availability-assessment>

impact on designated sites. However, they offer limited opportunities for Green infrastructure enhancement. As they are in the urban area, they avoid the Green Belt. Access to services and facilities varies by location, but they offer benefits in terms of access to employment. As would be expected, transport accessibility scores highly, offering access to public transport, and shorter distances for non-car modes.

For sites on the Edge of Cambridge there are few opportunities to use previously development land, and larger sites would result in significant loss of agricultural land. Many are also near to AQMA. Some sites would have negative impacts on biodiversity which would require mitigation, but larger sites also offer opportunities for the delivery of new Green Infrastructure. The Edge of Cambridge sites are largely in the Green Belt, and the significant majority of sites would have significant negative impacts on Green Belt purposes. A number of small sites are identified which would not have significant impacts. In terms of accessibility, they offer the next nearest development opportunity to the City. Although not all sites are accessible to existing public transport networks, larger sites would offer the opportunity for public transport improvements.

For New Settlements, sites north of Waterbeach and at Bourn Airfield offer opportunities to reuse previously developed land, although they still include significant elements of agricultural land. They are located further from the AQMAs. There are potentially negative impacts on biodiversity which would require mitigation, but larger sites also offer opportunities for the delivery of new Green Infrastructure. Sites are located outside the Green Belt, and generally have lesser landscape townscape impacts than sites on the edge of Cambridge. In terms of transport and accessibility, sites are further from Cambridge, but offer opportunities to deliver services, facilities and employment on site. The scale of development provides opportunities for investment in public transport.

For the large number of small sites in Better Served Villages, site specific impacts varied greatly. Limited opportunities to reuse previously developed land were identified, but the impact on agricultural land is generally lower as the sites are generally relatively small in scale. Some sites had negative impacts on landscape and townscape and the Green Belt, but others avoided these impacts. Access to services, facilities and employment were generally poorer than other levels of the development sequence, and the scale of site meant more limited opportunities for enhancement. In terms of transport, sites generally would have poorer access to public transport.

Table 7.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria

| Table 7.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria | |
|---|---|
| SA issue | Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria |
| Land | |
| Previously Developed Land | Will it use land that has been previously developed? RED = Not on PDL AMBER = Partially on PDL GREEN = Entirely on PDL |
| Agricultural Land | RED = Significant loss (20 ha or more) of grades 1 and 2 land AMBER = Minor loss of grade 1 and 2 land GREEN = Development would not affect grade 1 and 2 land. |
| Minerals | Will it avoid the sterilisation of economic mineral reserves? RED = Site or a significant part of it falls within an allocated or safeguarded area, development would have significant negative impacts AMBER = Site or a significant part of it falls within an allocated or safeguarded area, development would have minor negative impacts GREEN = Site is not within an allocated or safeguarded area. |
| Environmental quality and pollution (incorporating water and air SEA topics) | |
| Air Quality / AQMA | Will it maintain or improve air quality? RED = Site lies near source of air pollution, or development could impact on air quality, significant adverse impact AMBER = Site lies near source of air pollution, or development could impact on air quality with minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation. GREEN = Minimal, no impact, reduced impact DARK GREEN = Would remove existing source of air pollution, significant positive impact. Is the site within or near to an AQMA, the M11 or the A14? RED = Within or adjacent to an AQMA, M11 or A14 AMBER = <1000m of an AQMA, M11 or A14 GREEN = >1000m of an AQMA, M11, or A14 |
| Pollution | Will it minimise, and where possible improve on, unacceptable levels of noise, light pollution, odour, and vibration? RED = Significant adverse impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation |

| Table 7.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria | |
|--|--|
| SA issue | Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria |
| | <p>AMBER = Adverse impacts capable of adequate mitigation GREEN = No adverse effects or capable of full mitigation DARK GREEN = Would remove existing significant source of pollution.</p> |
| Contamination | <p>Is there possible contamination on the site?</p> <p>RED = All or a significant part of the site within an area with a history of contamination which, due to physical constraints or economic viability, is incapable of appropriate mitigation during the plan period AMBER = Site partially within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination, or capable of remediation appropriate to proposed development (potential to achieve benefits subject to appropriate mitigation) GREEN = Site not within or adjacent to an area with a history of contamination</p> |
| Water | <p>Will it protect and where possible enhance the quality of the water environment?</p> <p>RED = Development has potential to effect water quality, with significant negative impacts incapable of mitigation. AMBER = Development has potential to affect water quality, with minor negative impacts incapable of mitigation. GREEN = No impact / Capable of full mitigation or minor positive impact DARK GREEN = Would remove existing source of water pollution with significant positive impact</p> |
| Biodiversity | |
| Designated Sites | <p>Will it conserve protected species and protect sites designated for nature conservation interest, and geodiversity, including positive conservation management on local wildlife sites and SSSIs?</p> <p>RED = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species and impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation AMBER = Contains or is adjacent to an existing site designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species and impacts capable of appropriate mitigation GREEN = Does not contain, is not adjacent to site designated for nature conservation or recognised as containing protected species, or local area will be developed as greenspace. No or negligible impacts DARK GREEN = Significant positive impact on protected sites and species</p> |
| Biodiversity / TPO | <p>Will it deliver net gains in biodiversity? Will it help deliver habitat restoration, and reduce habitat fragmentation (helping to achieve Biodiversity Action Plan Targets)?</p> <p>RED = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links incapable of appropriate mitigation AMBER = Development would have a negative impact on existing features or network links but capable of appropriate mitigation GREEN = Development could have a positive impact by enhancing existing features and adding new features or network links</p> |

| Table 7.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria | |
|--|--|
| SA issue | Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria |
| | <p>Are there trees on site or immediately adjacent protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)?</p> <p>RED = Development likely to have a significant adverse impact on the protected trees incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>AMBER = Any adverse impact on protected trees capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>GREEN = Site does not contain or adjoin any protected trees</p> |
| Green Infrastructure | <p>Will it improve access to wildlife and green spaces, through delivery of and access to green infrastructure?</p> <p>RED = Development involves a loss of existing green infrastructure which is incapable of appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>AMBER = No significant opportunities, or loss of existing green infrastructure capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>GREEN = Development could deliver significant new green infrastructure</p> |
| Landscape, townscape and cultural heritage (incorporating landscape and cultural heritage SEA topics) | |
| Landscape | <p>Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape character?</p> <p>RED = Significant negative impact on landscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>AMBER = negative impact on landscape character, incapable of mitigation.</p> <p>GREEN = No impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local landscape character, or provide minor improvements)</p> <p>DARK GREEN = Development would relate to local landscape character and offer significant opportunities for landscape enhancement</p> |
| Townscape | <p>Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of townscape character including through appropriate design and scale of development?</p> <p>Will it ensure the scale of development is sensitive to the existing key landmark buildings and low lying topography of the City?</p> <p>RED = Significant negative impact on townscape character, no satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p>AMBER = negative impact on townscape character, incapable of mitigation.</p> <p>GREEN = No impact (generally compatible, or capable of being made compatible with local townscape character, or provide minor improvements)</p> <p>DARK GREEN = Development would relate to local townscape character and offer significant opportunities for townscape enhancement</p> |
| Green Belt | <p>Will it recognise the role of the Green Belt in maintaining the character of the City and the quality of its historic setting?</p> <p>DARK RED: Very high and high impacts on Greenbelt purposes (very significant negative impact)</p> <p>RED = High / medium impacts on Greenbelt purposes (significant negative impact)</p> <p>AMBER = Medium and medium/minor impacts on Greenbelt purposes</p> <p>GREEN = No or negligible impact or positive impact on Green Belt purposes</p> |
| Heritage | <p>Will it protect or enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation areas, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments, buildings of local interest and archaeology)?</p> |

| Table 7.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria | |
|--|---|
| SA issue | Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria |
| | <p>RED = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such sites, buildings and features with potential for significant negative impacts incapable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>AMBER = Site contains, is adjacent to, or within the setting of such sites buildings and features with potential for negative impacts capable of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>GREEN = Site does not contain or adjoin such sites, buildings and features, and there is no impact to the setting</p> <p>DARK GREEN = Significant opportunities for enhancement</p> |
| Climate change | |
| Renewables | <p>Will it support the use of renewable energy resources?</p> <p>AMBER = Standard requirements for renewables would apply</p> <p>GREEN = Development would create significant opportunities for renewable energy.</p> <p>DARK GREEN = Development would create significant additional opportunities for renewable energy.</p> |
| Flood Risk | <p>Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding?</p> <p>RED = Flood Zone 3 / high risk.</p> <p>AMBER = Flood Zone 2 / medium risk</p> <p>GREEN = Flood Zone 1 / low risk</p> |
| Human health and well being | |
| Open Space | <p>Will it increase the quantity and quality of publically accessible open space (particularly in areas anticipated to experience significant population growth)?</p> <p>RED = The site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of open space and is located in a ward or parish with identified deficiency, or would lead to loss of open space without suitable replacement.</p> <p>AMBER = The site by virtue of its size is not able to provide the minimum standard of open space.</p> <p>GREEN = Assumes minimum on-site provision to adopted plan standards is provided onsite</p> <p>DARK GREEN = Development would create the opportunity to deliver significantly enhanced provision of new public open spaces in excess of adopted plan standards.</p> <p>SUB INDICATORS</p> <p>How far is the nearest outdoor sports facilities?</p> <p>RED = >3km</p> <p>AMBER = 1-3km</p> <p>GREEN = <1km or allocation is for or includes a significant element of employment or is for another non-residential use</p> <p>How far is the nearest play space for children and teenagers?</p> |

| Table 7.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria | |
|---|---|
| SA issue | Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria |
| | RED =>800m AMBER =400 -800m GREEN =<400m |
| Gypsy & Traveller | Will it provide for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople? RED = Would result in loss of existing sites AMBER = No Impact GREEN = Would deliver additional pitches |
| Access to Services | How far is the site from the nearest District or Local centre? How far is the site from edge of defined Cambridge City Centre? How far is the nearest health centre or GP service? RED =>800m AMBER =400 - 800m GREEN =<400m |
| KEY LOCAL FACILITIES | Will it improve quality and range of key local services and facilities including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc?) RED = Development would result in loss of an existing facilities, major negative impact. AMBER = No impact on facilities (or satisfactory mitigation proposed), or minor benefits GREEN = New local facilities or improved existing facilities are proposed of significant benefit |
| Community Facilities | Will it encourage engagement in community activities? RED = Allocation would lead to loss of community facilities GREEN = Development would not lead to the loss of any community facilities or replacement /appropriate mitigation possible |
| Integration with Existing Communities | How well would the development on the site integrate with existing communities? RED = Limited scope for integration with existing communities / isolated and/or separated by non-residential land uses AMBER = Adequate scope for integration with existing communities GREEN = Good scope for integration with existing communities / of sufficient scale to create a new community. |
| Economy and Infrastructure (incorporating material assets SEA topic) | |
| Deprivation (Cambridge) | Does it address pockets of income and employment deprivation particularly in Abbey Ward and Kings Hedges? Would allocation result in development in deprived wards? AMBER = Not within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within Cambridge according to the Index of Multiple |

| Table 7.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria | |
|--|---|
| SA issue | Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria |
| | Deprivation 2010. GREEN = Within or adjacent to the 40% most deprived Local Super Output Areas (LSOA) within Cambridge |
| Shopping | Will it protect the shopping hierarchy supporting the vitality and viability of Cambridge, town, district and local centres? RED = Significant negative effect on vitality or viability of existing centres. AMBER = Negative effect on vitality or viability of existing centres. GREEN = No effect or would support the vitality and viability of existing centres |
| Employment Accessibility | Will it contribute to providing a range of employment opportunities, in accessible locations? RED = >3km AMBER = 1-3km GREEN = <1km or allocation is for or includes a significant element of employment or is for another non-residential use Note: Accessibility to Nearest Area of Employment with 2000+ employees has been updated to use the 2011 census data which is now available, as before using Lower Super Output Areas (LSOA). Major new developments, which could include employment hubs, will be considered to be highly accessible. Where assumptions are made regarding site options this will be highlighted. Accession modelling has not been available, but a distance threshold has been applied. |
| Employment Land | Will it maintain and enhance competitiveness, and capitalise on Cambridge's position as one of the UK's most competitive cities? Will it support business development and enhance competitiveness, enabling provision of high-quality employment land in appropriate locations to meet the needs of businesses, and the workforce? RED = Significant loss of employment land and job opportunities not mitigated by alternative allocation in the area AMBER = Some loss of employment land and job opportunities mitigated by alternative allocation in the area GREEN = No loss of employment land / Minor new provision DARK GREEN= Development would significantly enhance employment opportunities |
| Utilities | Will it improve the level of investment in key community services and infrastructure, including communications infrastructure and broadband? RED = Significant upgrades likely to be required but constraints incapable of appropriate mitigation AMBER = Significant upgrades likely to be required, constraints capable of appropriate mitigation GREEN = Existing infrastructure likely to be sufficient |
| Education | Is there sufficient education capacity? RED = School capacity not sufficient, constraints cannot be appropriately mitigated. AMBER = School capacity not sufficient, constraints can be appropriately mitigated GREEN= Non-residential development / surplus school places |

| Table 7.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria | |
|--|--|
| SA issue | Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria |
| | <p>How far is the nearest primary school? RED =>800m AMBER =400 - 800m GREEN = <400m</p> <p>How far is the nearest secondary school? RED = Greater than 3km AMBER =1 to 3 km GREEN = Within 1km (or site large enough to provide new)</p> |
| Transport | |
| Sustainable Transport | <p>What type of public transport service is accessible at the edge of the site? RED = Service does not meet the requirements of a high quality public transport (HQPT) AMBER = service meets requirements of high quality public transport in most but not all instances GREEN = High quality public transport service</p> <p>How far is the site from an existing or proposed train station? RED = >800m AMBER = 400 - 800m GREEN = <400m</p> <p>What type of cycle routes are accessible near to the site?: DARK RED = no cycling provision and traffic speeds >30mph with high vehicular traffic volume. RED = No cycling provision or a cycle lane less than 1.5m width with medium volume of traffic. Having to cross a busy junction with high cycle accident rate to access local facilities/school. Poor quality off road path. AMBER = Medium quality off-road path. GREEN = Quiet residential street speed below 30mph, cycle lane with 1.5m minimum width, high quality off-road path e.g. cycleway adjacent to guided busway. DARK GREEN = Quiet residential street designed for 20mph speeds, high quality off-road paths with good segregation from pedestrians, uni-directional hybrid cycle lanes.</p> |
| Sustainable Transport | <p>SCDC Would development reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable transport choices: SCDC Sub-indicator: Distance to a bus stop / rail station SCDC Sub-indicator: Frequency of Public Transport</p> |

| Table 7.1: Joint Site Assessment Criteria | |
|--|---|
| SA issue | Joint Decision-aiding questions / Site Appraisal Criteria |
| | <p>SCDC Sub-Indicator: Typical public transport journey time to Cambridge City Centre SCDC Sub-indicator: Distance for cycling to City Centre</p> <p>DARK RED = Score 0-4 from 4 sub criteria RED = Score 5-9 from 4 criteria below AMBER = Score 10-14 from 4 criteria GREEN = Score 15-19 from 4 criteria DARK GREEN = Score 19-25 from 4 criteria</p> |
| Access | <p>Will it provide safe access to the highway network, where there is available capacity? RED = Insufficient capacity/ access. Negative effects incapable of appropriate mitigation. AMBER = Insufficient capacity / access. Negative effects capable of appropriate mitigation. GREEN = No capacity / access constraints identified that cannot be fully mitigated</p> |
| Non Car Facilities | <p>Will it make the transport network safer for all users, both motorised and non-motorised? RED = Significant negative impact to public transport, walking or cycling facilities AMBER = No impacts / Minor impacts GREEN = Significant improvements to public transport, cycling, walking facilities</p> |

8. STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES

8.1 Introduction

The Submission Draft SA reports included an appraisal of development 'packages'. This was combined groups of sites which could potentially be identified in the Local Plans to meet the identified needs, based on a range of different strategic choices.

This section provides an updated review of alternative strategies, informed by the updated assessments elsewhere in the report. The potential to allocate land on the edge of Cambridge, requiring a Green Belt review, is considered on an equal basis with other strategic options.

8.2 Considering alternative approaches to development

The SAs, including the SA Addendum Report, have confirmed that, subject to site specific considerations, development within Cambridge remains the top of the search sequence. Alternatives which do not seek additional development in the Cambridge urban area are therefore not considered reasonable. New allocations in the urban area of Cambridge, at the top of the development sequence, are capable of delivering 1,470 new dwellings beyond the commitments identified above.

Alternatives remain regarding how the remainder of housing need within the two authorities' areas should be met. The strategic options are presented below:

- **Option 1 - Waterbeach New Town, Cambourne West and Village Focus:** This new settlement focused option includes provision from the partial completion by 2031 of a new town at Waterbeach, with the remainder after 2031, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne and development at larger villages comprising Rural Centre and Minor Rural Centre villages.
- **Option 2 - Bourn Airfield New Settlement and Village Focus:** This new settlement focused option includes the completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield within the plan period, and limited development at Rural Centre and Minor Rural Centre villages to meet the remaining requirement.
- **Option 3 - Cambourne and Village Focus:** This village focused option includes completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne, with the remainder of new development focused on other villages. In order to meet the required level of development, a range of village sites would be required, requiring allocation of most of the village sites identified as options during the issues and options process. At Waterbeach, there would be no new settlement, but the redevelopment of the built area of the barracks themselves would accommodate around 900 dwellings.
- **Option 4 - Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement, and Cambourne West Focus:** This combined new settlement focused option includes provision from the partial completion by 2031 of a new town at Waterbeach, the partial completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne. This would be supported by selected development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.
- **Option 5 - Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement and Village Focus:** This combined new settlement focused option includes provision from the partial completion by 2031 of a new town at Waterbeach, the partial completion of a new settlement at Bourn Airfield (but more than Option 4 assumes), and development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.
- **Option 6 - Edge of Cambridge and Village Focus:** This Edge of Cambridge focused option assumes 2 or 3 large urban extensions to Cambridge on land currently in the Green Belt. This

would accommodate around 4000 dwellings. This would be supported by selected village sites at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, with a focus on previously developed land.

- **Option 7 – Edge of Cambridge, Waterbeach New Town, Cambourne West and Village Focus:** This combined edge of Cambridge and new settlement focused option assumes 1 or 2 large urban extensions to Cambridge on land currently in the Green Belt, accommodating around 2000 dwellings. The remaining development needs would be accommodated through the partial completion of a new town at Waterbeach, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne and limited development at villages.
- **Option 8 – Edge of Cambridge, Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield New Settlement, Cambourne West and Village Focus:** This combined edge of Cambridge and new settlement focused option assumes delivery of smaller sites on land currently in the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge, provision from the partial completion of a new town at Waterbeach, the completion of an extension to the existing new settlement at Cambourne and selected development at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.

8.3 Sustainability appraisal of strategic alternatives

The sustainability appraisal presented in this section builds upon the appraisal undertaken on the alternative site packages as part of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan SA. The original assessment can be found in Appendix 4 of the South Cambridgeshire Submission Draft SA report¹⁰. The SA takes into account new evidence on a number of issues:

- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Examination – Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Further Evidence (2015);
- Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study (2015);
- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Viability Update (2015);
- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Study (2015); and
- Local Plans CSRM Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Transport Report (Atkins, November 2015).

The previous SA identified specific sets of sites to carry out the assessment. A more general approach is now taken, as this is more appropriate to a strategic assessment. The packages cannot be directly applied again due to passage of time, for example some sites have been built, or have planning permission.

8.4 Results of the assessment

The results of the assessment are shown in Table 7.2 and Table 7.3 of the main SA Addendum Report. In summary, the updated evidence base and changes to the SA framework have not changed the results of the assessment significantly and mirror the conclusions of the SA of the development sequence.

Options which include development in the Green Belt (Options 6, 7 and 8) have some sustainability benefits with regard to sustainable transport and with regards to viability and access to services. Viability evidence has confirmed that sites on the edge of Cambridge offer higher sales values than options further from the city meaning potentially greater funding being available for facilities and infrastructure. This offers benefits in terms of potential to secure higher funding through Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) / Section 106. Cambridge is proposing to secure a higher rate of CIL than South Cambridgeshire, and this higher rate has the potential to be applied to edge of Cambridge sites. With regard to transport, development on the edge of Cambridge remains the best performing option with regard to modal share and performs

¹⁰ South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). (Ref: RD/Sub/SC/060)

positively due to short distances to the city, low public transport journey times, and in many cases proximity to high frequency public transport. However, the modal share results hide the fact that these locations are in already congested areas of the city where there is little scope to create more capacity for more cars, forcing new trips to be undertaken by active modes. The Inner Green Belt Study (2015) has concluded that it is unlikely that any development (apart from a few small exceptions) could be accommodated without substantial harm to the Green Belt purposes. Therefore, the conclusions remain that it would not be possible to deliver significant additional development on the edge of Cambridge without significant detriment to the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt.

With regard to village led development (Option 3) such a strategy would be likely to deliver incremental improvements at best, rather than focused investment. Traffic impacts would be spread more around the district, but there would be a higher modal share for car use (up to 80% for a purely village based strategy). A distribution to smaller sites would have a more incremental impact on the landscape and townscape, but village expansions could negatively impact on village character.

Options which include large amounts of development in new settlements (Options 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8) would help to protect Green Belt and the setting of Cambridge (less so in options 7 and 8 which also include edge of Cambridge development) but new settlements do not score as positively as edge of Cambridge development, mainly due to issues related to sustainable transport and viability. However, the new transport evidence has found that although the greater distance from Cambridge would mean higher levels of car use than an edge of Cambridge focus site specific transport measures would reduce the impact of growth, increasing the proportion of trips made by non-car modes, including shift towards Park & Ride. New evidence has been commissioned in response to the challenges identified in delivering self-contained and viable new settlements. Viability work has confirmed that the fact that higher property values within and close to the City Centre make edge of Cambridge a more attractive location for development than new settlements meaning that facilities and infrastructure are more viable in these locations. The Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015 identifies the costs associated with new settlements. These costs are higher than incremental growth of existing settlements (edge of Cambridge). Given the cost of transport schemes required for the sites, it is unlikely that off site infrastructure and substantial services could be delivered through CIL alone. However, it is expected that City Deal funding would be available to support delivery of major infrastructure required to make the new settlements viable and sustainable.

9. GREEN BELT IN THE SA

9.1 Introduction

This section of the report discusses the treatment of Green Belt in SA and how the issue of Green Belt has been addressed by the Councils in plan making and how the SA forms part of this consideration. Please note that this discussion has been introduced in the report to counter the objection raised that Green Belt is not a SA issue and should be excluded from consideration in the SA (Pigeon SA Review para 3.5).

9.2 The treatment of Green Belt in SA

Schedule 2 of the SEA regulations¹¹ sets out the information that should be contained in an environmental (SA) report. This states that the report should contain an assessment of the likely significant effects on the environment...on issues such as (k) cultural heritage, including architectural and archaeological heritage and (l) landscape. Given the role that the Cambridge Green Belt plays in protecting the historic character and landscape setting of Cambridge, Green Belt is considered to be a key issue to include in the assessment.

Planning Practice Guidance on SA of Local Plans (<http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk>) stresses in several places that the plan and the alternatives should be assessed with reference to the characteristics of the area (the baseline). The Planning Advisory Service document "Principles of Plan Making"¹² has a chapter entitled "Chapter 6 – The role of Sustainability Appraisal" and this chapter includes guidance on the role that SA has in the filtering and appraisal of options (and how issues related to the Green Belt can be used to assist in this filtering). When discussing filtering options the document states that Green Belt can be used as part of a set of exclusionary criteria, which effectively act as a first sieve of sites. The guidance makes it clear that if sites don't satisfy these exclusionary criteria they aren't 'reasonable' alternatives and should be discounted.

It is clear from the above guidance that:

- Effect on Green Belt is a valid SA objective if SA scoping shows that Green Belt is a relevant issue; and
- The effect of a site on Green Belt can be used as an exclusionary criteria meaning that the site is not considered reasonable and is not taken forward to the next level of consideration / assessment.

9.3 How the issue of Green Belt was considered in the SAs

9.3.1 Cambridge

The Green Belt is recognised in the Cambridge SA scoping report¹³, having been identified through the scoping process as an important issue related to the area's context in terms of landscape, townscape and cultural heritage. Paragraph 9.3.4 outlines the importance of the Green Belt stating that "the Green Belt acts to preserve the character of the City and the quality of its historic setting by maintaining the distinction between neighbouring communities." Green Belt was also identified as a sustainability issue in three of the functional areas of the city, the South, East and West Cambridge areas.

Once information was collected on important sustainability issues, the Council's consultants then used these issues to develop the SA framework and the pro-formas used to sieve and assess

¹¹ Statutory Instrument No. 1633. The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

¹² <http://www.pas.gov.uk/chapter-6-the-role-of-sustainability-appraisal>

¹³ Cambridge Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (URS Limited, June 2012) (Ref: RD/LP/210)

potential development sites. The importance of Green Belt is reflected in the SA framework under the functional area section of the SA framework under the South, East and West functional areas.

9.3.2 South Cambridgeshire

The Green Belt is recognised in the South Cambridgeshire SA scoping report, having been identified through the scoping process as an important issue related to the area's context in terms of landscape, townscape and cultural heritage¹⁴. Once information was collected on important sustainability issues, the Council then used these issues to develop the SA framework and the pro-formas used to sieve and assess potential development sites. The SA framework for South Cambridgeshire does not explicitly mention Green Belt. However, the references to Green Belt in the scoping work outlined above make it clear that Green Belt issues are significant and contribute to the 'Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character' objective¹⁵.

With regard to the site pro-formas Green Belt was included as an explicit issue in the pro forma that was developed to assess the suitability of sites proposed for development on the edge of Cambridge, and the SA of the sites themselves, as set out in section 4.4 paragraphs 4.4.4 (page 285) and Table 4.5 (pages 296 – 303) and Appendix 2 pages 622 – 639) of RD/Sub/C/030 and Chapter 3 (pages 8 – 10) and Appendix 1 (pages 15 – 31) of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal of the Issues and Options 2 Part 1 document.

9.4 How Green Belt has been addressed in plan making

Section 3 of the Councils' Overall Development Strategy paper outlines how the Councils have considered the requirements of paragraphs 84 and 85 of the NPPF that account is taken of promoting sustainable patterns of development and, of the consequences for sustainable development if development is channelled to locations outside the Green Belt.

The Overall Development Strategy paper details the consideration of the options structured around each stage of the development sequence and considers the consequences and issues related to the strategic choices available to the Council, and the consideration of sustainable patterns of development (as required by NPPF paragraph 84 and 85) in the context of an area with a tightly drawn Green Belt around the historic city of Cambridge.

¹⁴ South Cambridgeshire SA (RD/Sub/SC/060) Part 2 (Scoping) Appendix 1 Issue 13.2. Green Belt.

¹⁵ For examples, Table 9.3 Assessment Matrix for Appraisal of Site Options included in the South Cambs Scoping Report refers to green belt at the Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character Objective (South Cambs SA (RD/Sub/SC/060) Part 2 page 2-65)

10. PREFERRED APPROACH

10.1 Outline of the reasons for selecting the alternative approaches dealt with at this stage of the SA

The Submission Draft SA reports extensively document the reasons behind the identification of options during the Issues and Options process, the consideration of those options, and the reasons for the selection of the preferred approach. In this SA Addendum Report the Councils have considered:

- Strategy Options regarding development at different levels of the development sequence, identified as they reflect the broad strategic alternatives available for growth in the Cambridge area;
- A wide range of site options that could be allocated at different levels of the search sequence. This is a reassessment of sites previously tested as part of the Submission Draft SAs. Sites on the edge of Cambridge are considered on an equal basis with sites elsewhere; and
- Options regarding packages of development that could be identified to meet development needs, identified as they broadly represent strategic choices available to meet the remaining development needs after existing commitments are considered.

10.2 The preferred approach

In summary the preferred approach to the development strategy reflects the Submitted Local Plans:

- Development within Cambridge where there is capacity;
- Additional development on the edge of Cambridge where this would not cause significant harm to Green Belt purposes at:
 - Worts' Causeway
 - Darwin Green (small additional area to existing site)
 - Fulbourn Road (employment allocations)
- New Settlements at North of Waterbeach and at Bourn Airfield;
- Extension of Cambourne at Cambourne West; and
- Limited Village allocations at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.

Modifications are proposed in response to the Green Belt Review 2015:

- Additional employment development opportunity south of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus
- Amendment to the land south of Fulbourn Road employment allocation.

In addition, further redevelopment capacity has been identified at Cambridge East North of Cherry Hinton.

10.3 Reason for selection of the preferred approach

The Councils recognise the merits of land on the edge of Cambridge in accessibility terms and the transport evidence confirms that situation, although it makes clear that major new development on the edge of Cambridge on congested radial routes have their own transport issues and are not necessarily cheap to deliver. The independent Green Belt evidence supports the findings of the Councils' own evidence that the release of land on the edge of Cambridge can be expected to compromise substantially the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt, with two exceptions. Modifications are proposed to respond to these two exceptions, one modification to reduce the size of an allocation in the submitted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and one provisional

modification to allocate a new employment allocation as an extension to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus.

The evidence also looks at the potential to deliver sustainable new settlements, as an alternative to sites on the edge of Cambridge. They can provide viable and deliverable developments, that will be able to contribute to strategic off site infrastructure and provide high quality public transport links to Cambridge, that will attract significant levels of patronage and also provide wider benefits to existing communities. The City Deal is a significant opportunity to deliver sustainable transport to serve the wider area and with its focus on supporting the delivery of the development strategy is an important fund intended to assist with any funding shortfalls that might arise.

Having weighed all those factors, and considering the results of the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum, the Councils maintain their view that the development strategy in the submitted plans, with limited modifications, provides the right balance for this plan period and will provide a range of deliverable sites for the plan period and beyond, and that sustainability will be secured.

11. PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE PLANS

11.1 Screening the effects of the Proposed Changes

The Councils have proposed some modifications to the Local Plans. A screening exercise has been undertaken of the major modifications proposed and updated conclusions drawn where necessary. The majority of the modifications proposed to the Local Plans will not change the sustainability effects of the Local Plans. The exceptions to this are:

- Cambridge Local Plan: The plan will no longer have a significant positive impact on climate change mitigation, renewable energy and water due to changes to Policies 27 and 28 (removal of the zero carbon requirements and allowable solutions and the relaxation of the water requirements). The plan will still have a positive effect but not a significant positive effect;
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan: Policy CC/2 will no longer have a significant positive effect on climate change mitigation. Due to the change in the policy as a result of the Written Ministerial Statement on wind energy, the assessment of the policy has changed from significant positive to minor positive as it will effectively rule out promotion of wind energy developments; and
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan: New Policy E/1b Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension. As this is a new policy that has not been subject to assessment, an assessment has been undertaken and is reported in Table 10.3 of the main SA Addendum Report. This assessment found that the policy will have a significant positive effect on economy, work and investment providing a high quality biomedical development on the edge of Cambridge with locational benefits. No significant negative or uncertain effects were identified.

Please also note that there have been some modifications to Policy H/1 and Parish Council led Allocations for Residential Development in Villages have been included. This modification was agreed for inclusion in the submission Local Plan at the 11th February 2014 meeting of the Planning Policy and Localism Portfolio Holder, and by Council on 13th March 2014 and the modification has been subject to original Sustainability Appraisal accompanying the South Cambridgeshire Submission Local Plan (see Part 3, Appendix 6). For completeness, this has been included as Annex 2 of this SA addendum. This consultation provides an opportunity for consultation to be carried out by the District Council ahead of consideration at the examination.

11.2 Likely significant cumulative effects

Cumulative effects are considered in two ways in SA:

- Cumulative effects considering the potential effects of other programmes and plans in combination with the effects of the Local Plan; and
- Cumulative effects of the policies / proposals within the plan and how they interact with each other.

The cumulative effects of the plans have already been assessed in the following sections of the Submission Draft SA reports:

- Cambridge Final SA for Submission to the Secretary of State – from page 490 onwards.
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report – Part 3.

The approach taken to cumulative effects assessment is slightly different in each SA. The Cambridge SA incorporates consideration of both aspects of cumulative effects assessment in the overall plan assessment itself, not carrying out a separate assessment. Therefore, Table 10.2 in

the main SA Addendum Report (which summarises the effect of the plan as a whole) is effectively an assessment of the cumulative effects of the plan (with the proposed modifications).

The South Cambridgeshire SA presents separate cumulative effects assessments, one in relation to the effects in association with other plans and programmes (see Table 4.4 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report – Part 3) and one in relation to how the policies within the plan will interact with each other to cause cumulative effects (see Table 4.5 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission SA report – Part 3).

Both of these tables have been validated as part of this work to review whether the assessment has changed. It is confirmed that the cumulative assessment has not significantly changed in response to the proposed modifications or new evidence. This is due to the fact that the proposed modifications are relatively minor.

11.3 Consideration of A428 and A10 transport schemes

Some transport schemes identified in the LTP providing wider benefits for the area would also be required to serve Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield on the A428 corridor and Waterbeach new town on the A10. The following conclusions can be drawn:

- With regard to agricultural land, there will be a residual unavoidable permanent loss of agricultural land which is cumulatively likely to be significant across the plan area (and this was reflected in the overall assessment of the cumulative impact of the Submission Draft South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. The main impact, however, is from the overall level of development proposed within the plan, with the impact of the A428 and A10 being a fairly minor part of the whole;
- With regard to Green Belt, there will be some minor negative effects on Green Belt as some of the A428 and A10 schemes are partly located in the Green Belt. This is likely to cause minor residual negative impacts (and this is also reflected below in the assessment of the plan as a whole);
- With regard to the impacts on nature conservation and heritage, these are seen as minor negative and can be reduced through planning and environmental assessment procedures. If works were able to be carried out on line for the A428 schemes rather than beyond the existing highway boundary this might alleviate some of the adverse effects.

11.4 Mitigation measures

It is a requirement of the SEA regulations that measures are provided to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment (commonly known as mitigation measures). Please note that mitigation measures are included in the following places:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Submission. SA report (ENVIRON, March 2014). Part 3 outlines mitigation measures with details included in the accompanying assessment appendices 5 and 6.
- Sustainability Appraisal of the Cambridge Local Plan 2014. Final Appraisal for Submission to the Secretary of State (URS Limited, March 2014). Part 4 outlines the results of the various elements of the SA broken down into appraisal of the development strategy options (Section 4.2), appraisal of policy options (Section 4.3), appraisal of site options (Section 4.4) and appraisal of the Proposed Submission Local Plan (Section 4.5) and this includes mitigation measures.
- The only Local Plan modification that has necessitated a new assessment is that of the New Policy E/1b Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension and the mitigation measures suggested are included in Table 11.3 of the main SA Addendum Report.

12. CONSULTATION AND NEXT STEPS

12.1 Consultation on the SA Addendum Report

The Councils are inviting responses to this SA Addendum Report alongside modifications proposed to the Local Plans, and accompanied by the additional evidence documents prepared in response to the Inspectors' Letter. Consultees are free to comment on any issue raised in the SA Addendum Report and the Councils will consider all responses.

The SA Addendum Report will be subject to consultation between the following dates: 2nd December and 25th January 2016.

12.2 Next steps for the Local Plans

The next steps for the Local Plans are as follows:

- Council meeting to consider outcome of further work and whether modifications should be proposed to the Submission Local Plans – November, 2015;
- Public consultation on the proposed modifications to the Local Plans – between 2nd December 2015 and 25th January 2016; and
- Consideration of public consultation responses and submission of further work and proposed modifications to the Local Plan Inspectors.

12.3 Next steps for the SAs

After the Public Examination the Councils may need to make some changes to the Local Plans based on the Inspector's recommendations. Planning Practice Guidance (available at <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk>) states that it is up to the local planning authority to decide whether SA reports should be amended following proposed changes to an emerging plan after Examination. A screening exercise will be undertaken by the Councils and if it is deemed that necessary changes are significant, and were not previously subject to SA, then further SA will be undertaken and the SA reports will be updated accordingly.

Once the Local Plans are adopted, Sustainability Appraisal (SA) adoption statements (one for each Local Plan) will need to be published in accordance with the SEA regulations. The regulations state that as soon as reasonably practicable after the adoption of a plan a statement should be produced and published setting out how environmental considerations and opinions expressed through consultation have been taken into account in the planning process.

The SEA regulations set out the particulars that should be covered by the statement as follows:

- How environmental (sustainability) considerations have been integrated into the Local Plan;
- How the Environmental (SA) Report has been taken into account;
- How opinions expressed in response to consultation have been taken into account;
- The reasons for choosing the Local Plan as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with; and

The measures that are to be taken to monitor the significant environmental (sustainability) effects of the implementation of the Local Plan.

13. POST CONSULTATION UPDATE (MARCH 2016)

13.1 Update following Consultation

The SAA was updated in March 2016 following public consultation. Further details of this update are included in Chapter 10 of the main SA Addendum report.

The SA Addendum Report was subject to consultation between the following dates: 2nd December and 25th January 2016. Representations received were reported to meetings of both Councils in March 2016. Full representations can be viewed on the Councils' website. Appendix 9 identifies the number of representations received through the consultation to each section of the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum, a summary of the key issues raised, an assessment of the issues raised, and any changes made.

A number of site specific comments were received to the scoring of individual criteria within site assessment proforma in Annex 1 of the SAA (these are considered in Appendix 10). Where new sites or significant variations of sites have been submitted, for completeness these have been reappraised and added to Annex 1. Where changes have been made to existing proforma, these have been updated in Annex 1.

Annex 1 of the SAA included a summary spreadsheet, capturing the results of all the individual site assessments for easy comparison. This has been updated, to include the revised scores and new site assessments mentioned above .

As a result of the Proposed Modifications consultations, a small number of additional or amended proposed modifications were identified related to both Local Plans. A screening exercise has been undertaken (updating table 10.1 and 10.2 of Chapter 10 the SAA), which concluded that the additional changes do not impact on the outcome of the appraisal.