

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

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

**Index of New Settlements & Site Assessment  
Proforma**

<b>Site Number</b>	<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Site Capacity</b>	<b>Page</b>
Site 057	Bourn Airfield, Bourn	3,500 dwellings	102
Site 135	Land at Six Mile Bottom	10,000 dwellings	113
Site 194	Land north of A428, Cambourne	2,626 dwellings	121
Site 231	Land north of Waterbeach	12,750 dwellings	132
Site 231A (Council's variation of site 231)	Land north of Waterbeach	8,000 – 9,000 dwellings	144
Site 238	Bourn Airfield, Bourn	3,000 dwellings	157
Site 242	Land north west of B1050, Station Road, Longstanton (Northstowe Reserve)	897 dwellings	167
Site 248	Hanley Grange, east of A1301 and west of A11	5,000 dwellings	174
Site 251	Land at Heathfield (north of Duxford Airfield)	962 dwellings	183
Site 261	Land at Barrington Quarry	3,250 dwellings	192
Site 265	Land to the north of the A428, Cambourne	2,500 dwellings	202
Site 273	Southwell Farm, Station Road, Longstanton (part of Northstowe Reserve)	66 dwellings	213
Site 274	Land generally to the north and north east of Northstowe adjoining the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway	1,800 dwellings	220
Site 275	Old East Goods Yard, Station Road, Oakington	16 dwellings	230

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

<b>Proforma Created</b>	July 2012
<b>Proforma Last Updated</b>	August 2013. Incorporating more recent information that informed the allocation of the site in the Proposed Submission Local Plan including information published in the July 2013 Sustainability Appraisal and its audit trail.
<b>Location</b>	Bourn
<b>Site name / address</b>	Bourn Airfield, Bourn
<b>Category of site:</b>	A new settlement
<b>Description of promoter's proposal</b>	New Village to the east of Cambourne with 3,500 dwellings, employment, retail, commercial uses, outdoor, outdoor recreation and park & ride
<b>Site area (hectares) Updated August 2013</b>	141.7 ha (the promoter's site is the same as the Major Development Site area included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan. A larger area for which it is proposed to prepare an Area Action Plan is also identified, which is 282 ha)
<b>Site Number</b>	057
<b>Site description &amp; context</b>	<p>The site lies to the west of the settlements of Highfields and Caldecote, immediately south of the A428 trunk road (linking Cambridge with Bedford), to the north of the small settlement of Bourn, and to the east of the new settlement of Cambourne. By virtue of the historic use of the site as an airfield it is essentially devoid of natural vegetation and accordingly is very open in nature. The only developed parts on the site comprise aircraft hangers, industrial buildings and outside storage areas.</p> <p>Site 238 considers same site but as an extension to Cambourne.</p>
<b>Current or last use of the site</b>	Civil Aviation Authority Licensed Airfield for pilot training and private aircraft /Storage/Market/Agricultural
<b>Is the site Previously Developed Land?</b>	Yes, partly
<b>Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan?</b>	No

<p><b>Planning history</b></p>	<p>Bourn Airfield was constructed for Bomber Command in 1940 as a satellite airfield for nearby Oakington. The airfield remained in RAF hands until being passed on to Maintenance Command in 1947. By 1948 the station was closed. The last sections were sold off for agricultural use in 1961.</p> <p>2004, Local Plan – not included as a potential housing site.</p> <p>2007, Local Development Framework – not included as a potential housing site.</p> <p>Planning applications There have been a number of planning applications for creating a new settlement on this site. The last one was refused in 1994 (S/0144/94/O) which was for 3,000 dwellings. In 1992 a new settlement comprising 3,000 dwellings, industrial development, shopping and leisure facilities, education, social and recreation facilities was proposed (S/1635/92/O and S/1636/92/O). In 1989 a new settlement comprising of 3,000 dwellings was refused to include 50 acre business park, district shopping centre with superstore, community facilities, leisure facilities (including swimming pool and golf course), landscaping, public open space, community nature reserve drain (S/1109/89/O).</p> <p>There have been over the years a number of planning applications on the site for buildings and uses relating to its use as an airfield. In 1998 part of the main runway was given approval for use as open storage of dies (S/0225/98/F).</p>
<p><b>Source of site</b> (Updated August 2013)</p>	<p>The Major Development Site was suggested through the Call for Sites. The larger AAP area was proposed in a representation by the promoter to the Issues &amp; Options 1 consultation.</p>

<p><b>Tier 1: Strategic Considerations</b></p>	
<p><b>Green Belt</b></p>	<p>The site is not within the Green Belt.</p>
<p><b>Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development?</b></p>	<p>No</p>

<b>Tier 1 conclusion:</b>	The site lies to the west of the settlements of Highfields and Caldecote, immediately south of the A428 to the north of the small settlement of Bourn, and to the east of the new settlement of Cambourne. By virtue of the historic use of the site as an airfield it is essentially devoid of natural vegetation and accordingly is very open in nature. The only developed parts on the site comprise aircraft hangers, industrial buildings and outside storage areas.
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	Yes

**Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations**

<b>Designations and Constraints</b>	
<b>Heritage considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-statutory archaeological site – Excavations to the north and west have identified extensive evidence of late prehistoric and Roman settlement. There is also evidence for Roman burials within the airfield. Further information would be necessary in advance of any planning application for this site.</li> <li>• Setting of Listed Buildings. Adverse effect on open rural functional setting of Listed Building – Great Common Farmhouse 79 Broadway (Grade II) of development along western edge beyond runway.</li> <li>• Adverse effect on open rural functional setting of Listed Buildings – barns to the north of The Grange (Grade II) along south-western edge beyond runway. Possible reduced site within north and east of indicated area.</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tree Preservation Orders –TPO present in hedge lines throughout the site with a significant woodland in the south east boundary (just off site).</li> <li>• Public Rights of Way – no public rights of way across the site or immediately adjoining it.</li> <li>• Presence of protected species - Greatest impact likely to be as a result of losing grassland habitats currently found within the airfield strips. Great crested newts are known to be in the vicinity and may also be adversely affected.</li> <li>• Agricultural land of high grade - Agricultural Land Classifications Grade 2 (majority of northern part of site) and 3 (quarter of site - southern section)</li> </ul>
<b>Physical considerations?</b> (Updated August 2013)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land contamination – this site is previously military land/airfield and will require investigation. This can be dealt with by condition.</li> <li>• Air quality issues – Despite this proposal not being adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area, it is of a significant size and therefore, there is a potential for an increase in traffic and static emissions that could affect local air quality. More information is required for this location, particularly details for air quality</li> </ul>

	<p>assessment and a low emission strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise issues - East of the major development site is bounded by an Industrial estate on Bourn Airfield with medium to large sized industrial type units / uses including industrial and warehouse type uses. The Environmental Health Service has had to take enforcement action in the past due to statutory noise and odour nuisances caused to existing residential premises. The proposal would bring sensitive premises closer if the industrial units were to remain. These are unlikely to be considered compatible uses. Noise from activities and vehicular movements are material considerations with significant negative impact potential in terms of health and well being and a poor quality living environment and possible noise nuisance. Current noise has not been quantified. If noise is an issue it is unlikely that mitigation measures on the proposed development site alone can provide an acceptable ambient noise environment. Noise insulation / mitigation abatement measures could be required off-site at the industrial units but there is uncertain as to whether these would be effective. Such mitigation measures are likely to require the full cooperation of the business operators and section 106 planning / obligation requirements may be required and there are no guarantees that these can be secured. Without mitigation any detrimental economic impact on existing businesses should also be considered prior to allocation.</li> <li>• Environmental Health concerns about the site in 2012 relate to the former ThyssenKrupp manufacturing processes on the site. Note that the site is not currently in active use. The replacement of the existing industrial type uses with lower noise impact employment development more compatible with residential as required by the local plan policy proposed, with additional noise mitigation as appropriate and consideration of measures to mitigate traffic noise impacts from the A428 on future residential would address these concerns, through master planning and detailed design.</li> <li>• Noise issues - The North of the site is bounded by the busy A428. Traffic noise will need assessment in accordance with PPG 24 and associated guidance. The impact of existing noise on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well-being and providing a high quality living environment. However residential use is likely to be acceptable with careful noise mitigation. Noise likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises.</li> <li>• Topography issues – not significant, generally a level site</li> </ul>
--	---

<p><b>Townscape and landscape impact?</b></p>	<p>The proposed development lies in the Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands Landscape Character Area. The site lies south of the A428 and approximately 500m to the east of the new village of Cambourne and 500m west of the village of Highfields. Broadway runs along the east side of the development towards the village of Bourn, 2km to the south of the site.</p> <p>The site is a former airfield and is fairly level, high plateau between 60 and 70m AOD. South of the site the land falls away to Bourn and the marked valley of Bourne Brook at about 35m AOD.</p> <p>To the north and south of the site the land is fairly open and rolling, cut by the valleys of several small streams. The field pattern is of irregular medium and large scale fields separated by mature hedgerows and hedgerow trees. There are many areas of mature Oak and Ash woodland present.</p> <p>The site is relatively open and devoid of physical features that would restrict its development. There are two lines of protected trees that cut partially into the southern edges of the site, but they would not in any way prejudice development and could reasonably be accommodated within a wider scheme.</p> <p>A new village on the site would have a significant effect on the local landscape, as although it would sit within a defined site, screened by existing vegetation, the scale of the development and likely mix of buildings would still be seen above the horizon, particularly from the A428 viewed towards Bourn, and the development would begin to link Upper Cambourne and Highfields visually.</p> <p>However, the landscape impacts would be reduced due to the level terrain, the lack of higher land locally with views to the site, and the screening effect of mature hedgerows and woodlands and developing woodlands surrounding the site and lining many of the local roads and rights of way.</p>
<p><b>Can any issues be mitigated?</b> (Updated August 2013)</p>	<p>It should be possible to mitigate sufficiently the adverse impact on the setting of listed buildings near the site by having a reduced development towards the northern edge and in the south western part of the site.</p> <p>The replacement of the existing industrial type uses with lower noise impact employment development more compatible with residential as required by the local plan policy proposed, with additional noise mitigation as appropriate and consideration of measures to mitigate traffic noise impacts from the A428 on future residential would address concerns about noise impacts, through master planning and detailed design.</p> <p>The mitigation of noise from the A428 and from traffic generated on</p>

	<p>the site could be mitigated by careful design and consideration of the layout and numbers of houses and density.</p> <p>A new village must appear settled in the landscape, with distinct, rural separation between Cambourne and Highfields. This will require substantial landscape buffers between the settlements and a carefully designed structural landscape within the new development. The site is large enough to provide for the proposed level of development on the major development site as well as providing substantial mitigation through landscape buffers and structural landscaping.</p>
--	--

<b>Infrastructure</b>	
<p><b>Highways access?</b> (Updated August 2013)</p>	<p>The Highways Agency has advised that development on sites along the A428 corridor is likely to be largely Cambridge-centric but St Neots is also likely to attract a significant amount of trips. For instance rail connectivity via St Neots is likely to be an attractive alternative to Cambridge. Even a modest residual demand between these sites and St Neots could be critical.</p> <p>Conversely, there is some scope for these large sites to enhance the overall transport sustainability of Cambourne and other local settlements through better integration, with the potential to offset some of the new demand. The capacity to accommodate new development on this corridor is directly related to this scope, which will need to be demonstrated by the promoters.</p> <p>Highway Authority comments – Transport Assessment and modelling requirements – Potential for around 29,750 daily trips (based on SCATP trip rates). Requirement for transport modelling using the Cambridge Sub-Regional Model (CSRМ) to consider wider strategic impact. Full Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plans (TP) for residential, schools and employment sites required.</p> <p>Strategic Transport Issues - Cambridgeshire LTP3 sets out the transport strategy. Direct access to A428 Trunk Road (Cambridge – St. Neots – Bedford) via grade separated junction. Potential impact on junctions at either end of A428 (M11 Junction 14 and A1198 roundabout). No rail access.</p> <p>Local Transport Issues - Poor access to services by walking, although potential to create cycle corridor to Cambourne (West) and Cambridge (East – via Highfields and Coton) with suitable new and improved provision.</p> <p>Opportunity to strengthen bus services on corridor between Cambourne and Cambridge (Service 4) through appropriate enhancement of capacity.</p>

	<p>Madingley Park and Ride capacity may need upgrading.</p> <p>The County Council consolidated and confirmed its approach towards development on the St Neots and Cambourne to Cambridge Transport Corridor in its Draft Transport Strategy 2013 which provides for a development at Cambourne West and Bourn Airfield and which models the transport impacts of development proposals. The measures include: an outer Park and Ride site, extensive bus priority and bus infrastructure improvements including on the A428 and A1303 and within and between the new developments, high quality segregated bus priority measures on the A1303 between its junction with the A428 and Queens Road Cambridge, bus priority measures at the A428/A1198 roundabout, cycling infrastructure including links to Cambridge and measures to mitigate traffic impacts on local villages. The transport modelling work concludes that development locations should maximise sustainable travel alternatives to the car, particularly by providing high quality public transport. New Settlement locations are better suited to delivering the necessary infrastructure to encourage travel by non-car modes than dispersed village options.</p>
<p><b>Utility services?</b> (Updated August 2013)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity – Likely to require system reinforcement</li> <li>• Mains water – Cambridge Water Company advise that there is insufficient spare capacity within Bourn Reservoir Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties. Spare capacity will be allocated on a first come first served basis. To increase the capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and/or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</li> <li>• Gas – Cambourne benefits from a gas supply and it may be possible to link into this.</li> <li>• Mains sewerage – Major Constraints to Provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth. Bourn WwTW: This works is operating at capacity and will require new consent limits and major capital expenditure to accommodate the proposed development site. Network: The sewerage network is operating at capacity and will require a developer impact assessment to ascertain the required upgrades. This assessment and any mitigation required will be funded by the developer. The preferred option by Anglian Water to deal with the majority of the sewage from the proposed new village at Bourn Airfield is the treatment works at Papworth. There may also be capacity to upgrade the Bourn WwTW.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Drainage measures?</b> (Updated August 2013)</p>	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment is required, together with a comprehensive water management plan.</p>

<p><b>School capacity?</b> (Updated August 2013)</p>	<p>Early Years education:</p> <p>The levels of housing development would indicate that additional Early Years settings would be required to meet the demand arising from development. This possibly could be provided along with additional primary school accommodation. However, this may not always be possible and alternative approaches to enable sufficient Childcare and Early Years provision to be commissioned, may therefore need to be considered during the planning of new housing. This additional accommodation would not necessarily need to be specifically for Early Years and Childcare provision, with opportunities for co-locating and/or sharing community facilities being explored wherever possible.</p> <p>Primary education:</p> <p>County Council education officers have advised that a development of this size would need to be self-contained in relation to primary school provision. There would not be any option for mitigating development of this size within existing schools.</p> <p>The actual number and size of schools would need to be determined once more clarity around the housing mix and tenure was available. It is likely that between three and four primary schools would be needed, matching the experience of Cambourne.</p> <p>Secondary education:</p> <p>County Council education officers have advised that initial demographic forecasts suggest that there would be a requirement for a 5-6 form entry secondary school arising from the Bourn Airfield development. In the short term it would be possible to mitigate the impact of Bourn Airfield due to the close proximity to Comberton and Cambourne Village Colleges. However, these schools are both forecast to operate at capacity, and whilst there is some capacity for limited expansion neither could meet the demand of the Bourn Airfield development once completed. To meet the demand from the new development it would therefore be necessary to plan on the basis of splitting the community between two secondary schools. This would not be supported in planning and delivering a new community as it would be detrimental to the development of community cohesion.</p> <p>The County Council education officers would be unlikely to support the allocation of Bourn Airfield unless there was a policy requirement for appropriate secondary school provision to be delivered as part of the masterplan.</p>
--	---

<b>Health facilities capacity?</b>	<p>Further growth will require a new facility.</p> <p>Existing facility: Monkfield Medical Practice, Sackville Way, Great Cambourne – extension planned for extra 950 homes. Would need new facility to meet further growth.</p>
<b>Any other issues?</b>	<p>The County Council advises that new settlements, large extensions to the urban area and large areas of previously developed land such as airfields (Bourn Airfield falls into this category) are to be considered to be Strategic Development Sites. Core Strategy Policy CS18 (Waste Management Outside Allocated Areas) requires all strategic development to make provision for permanent waste management. The scale and nature of arisings, site specific circumstances and the proximity and nature of other waste management facilities are factors in determining the type of waste management facility/facilities that should be provided. This provision will be in addition to that required under Policy CS16 (Household Waste Recycling Centres) as this requirement relates to facilities which would process or recycle waste, rather than provision for waste collection and transfer.</p> <p>New settlements, in particular, may be appropriate locations for the development of combined heat and power for associated industrial and residential development.</p>
<b>Can issues be mitigated?</b>	Yes
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	Yes

**Tier 3: Site Specific Factors**

<b>Capacity</b>	
<b>Developable area</b> (Updated August 2013)	<p>The major development site (as shown on the Policies Map) comprises land that could potentially be available for development is 141.7 ha. However, the built area of the new village within the major development site will be established through an Area Action Plan for a wider area of 282 ha to also provide required strategic landscaping. Masterplanning of the new village, the range of uses required and strategic landscaping requirements will affect the area available for residential development.</p>
<b>Site capacity</b> Updated August 2013	<p>3,500 dwellings.</p> <p>As a high level confirmation of capacity, the Council's formula for large sites over 50 hectares identified in the SHLAA can be used. This applies a gross to net residential area of 40%, which allows for all non-residential uses and substantial strategic landscaping in the remaining 60%. On this basis the formula can be applied to the wider Area Action Plan area included in the Local Plan:</p>

	Area Action Plan	282 ha
	Net developable area (i.e. net residential area)	112 ha
	Total dwellings @ 30 dwellings per hectare (net)	3,360
	Total dwellings @ 35 dwellings per hectare (net)	3,920
	Total dwellings @ 40 dwellings per hectare (net)	4,480
<b>Density</b> Updated August 2013	Average net residential density across the new settlement of 40 dph. Densities will vary across the whole site with scope for higher densities in the settlement centre and lower densities around the settlement edge.	

<b>Potential Suitability</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The site is potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints.
<b>Availability</b>	
<b>Is the land in single ownership?</b>	Yes
<b>Site ownership status?</b>	Landowner
<b>Legal constraints?</b>	Not known
<b>Is there market interest in the site?</b>	Not known
<b>When would the site be available for development?</b>	Site is available immediately

<b>Achievability</b>	
<b>Phasing and delivery of the development</b> Updated August 2013	<p>The promoter has indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first dwellings could be completed on site 2011-16</li> <li>• Development period (assuming 400 per year, 9 years for 3,500 dwellings, or based on 2,267 dwellings, 6 years)</li> </ul> <p>However based upon its experience of the development of large scale new settlements at Cambourne and Northstowe the Council considers there will be a greater lead-in for such a major development. An element of flexibility is also built into the plan by development starting a year later than it might otherwise do. The Local Plan assumes housing completions towards the middle of the plan period commencing in 2022/23 and extending well beyond 2031 at an average of 220 dwellings per year.</p>

<b>Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	No.
<b>Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b> Updated August 2013	No, although there is potential for areas of contamination, as the site is previously military land/airfield. There will be significant infrastructure costs to provide improvements to the existing road network/create new links to A428, and to upgrade/increase capacity of the Papworth Everard or other relevant STW and provide flood risk mitigation measures into the appropriate watercourse catchments.
<b>Could issues identified be overcome?</b> Updated August 2013	Infrastructure requirements are capable of being overcome subject to their cost and timing. The Council will explore the extent to which infrastructure requirements can be supported by the development of the site directly and the scope for external funding sources to contribute such as City Deal.
<b>Economic viability?</b> Updated August 2013	For strategic scale sites (new settlements and large urban extensions) much depends upon the extent, cost and phasing of the infrastructure to be funded by the development, the amount of housing that can actually be accommodated on site, and the timing of its provision in relation to that of the accompanying infrastructure.

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

<b>Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013</b>
Allocated for residential development (Policy SS/6).

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

<b>Proforma Created</b>	July 2012
<b>Proforma Last Updated</b>	August 2012
<b>Location</b>	New Settlement (Carlton, Little Wilbraham & Weston Colville Parish)
<b>Site name / address</b>	Land at Six Mile Bottom
<b>Category of site:</b>	A new settlement
<b>Description of promoter's proposal</b>	A new market town, including land in East Cambridgeshire District Council's area, comprising of between 8,000 - 10,000 new homes, a town centre and two or three local centres, community uses, employment, education, hotel, range of public open space, leisure centre, golf course, energy centre and a new railway station providing direct access to Cambridge and Newmarket (321.50 hectares in South Cambridgeshire with pro-rata, between 2,500 and 3,500 new homes).
<b>Site area (hectares)</b>	918.22 ha
<b>Site Number</b>	135
<b>Site description &amp; context</b>	<p>Part of this site is in SCDC but the majority is in East Cambridgeshire, it includes the settlement known as Six Mile Bottom, which is located 7 miles east of Cambridge. The settlement is focused on a crossroad, with several farms within close proximity. Most of Six Mile Bottom is low density and well-treed, being divided into hedged paddocks associated with the Newmarket racecourse industry. To the north of the settlement lies Swynford Paddocks Hotel, set in extensive grounds.</p> <p>The majority of the site is agricultural and generally flat, with a network of drainage throughout. It is bounded to the west by the A11. The main Cambridge – Newmarket railway runs through the site.</p>
<b>Current or last use of the site</b>	Predominantly agriculture, with some pasture, woodland, stables, a hotel, public house and existing residential dwellings.
<b>Is the site Previously Developed Land?</b>	No

<b>Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan?</b>	No.
<b>Planning history</b>	4 December 2009 – At a joint member meeting the Cambridgeshire Authorities in their response to a consultation on the review of the East of England Plan (RSS) concluded as follows: “It is the view of the Cambridgeshire authorities that Six Mile Bottom is not a valid proposal within the terms of this review and that it is an unsustainable and undeliverable development, not worthy of further consideration”. 2003. The Structure Plan Examination in Public Panel Report – Concerning a new settlement at Six Mile Bottom (or Cambridge Heath as it was then called) states that “Our concerns over the provision of High Quality Public Transport and the contribution of this location to meeting the housing needs of the Sub-Region, combined with the fact that the vast majority of the land proposed for development is greenfield and of high agricultural quality, convinces us that Cambridge Heath would not represent a sustainable place for the new settlement. The benefits of this location are insufficient to outweigh its fundamental weaknesses”.
<b>Source of site</b>	Site suggested through call for sites

<b>Tier 1: Strategic Considerations</b>	
<b>Green Belt</b>	Site not within Green Belt
<b>Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone – Very small part of site within flood zone 3. Great majority in zone 1.</li> <li>• Minerals and Waste LDF designations (Core Strategy designations only) – Small part of the site is subject to sand and gravel safeguarding. Safeguarding is intended to ensure that mineral resources are adequately taken into account in land use planning decisions. It does not automatically preclude other forms of development taking place, but flags up the presence of economic mineral so that it is considered, and not unknowingly or needlessly sterilised.</li> </ul>
<b>Tier 1 conclusion:</b>	The site is not subject to strategic considerations which would make it incapable of development.
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	Yes

## Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations

<b>Designations and Constraints</b>	
<b>Heritage considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Listed Buildings – Not within SCDC (but 4 within the site)</li> <li>Non-statutory archaeological site – There are numerous Bronze Age barrows known in the area, a significant number of which are designated Scheduled Monuments (SAM 33341, 33346). A Romano-British settlement site west of Allington Hill is also a designated Scheduled Monument (SAM72).</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>County Wildlife Site – Not within SCDC but two County sites exist within the boundary.</li> <li>Local Nature Reserve – Not within SCDC.</li> <li>Public Rights of Way – Footpath network to south of Brinkley Road, Byway running to south of Allington Hill and Bungalow Hill, (Westley Bottom Road).</li> <li>Presence of protected species - Greatest impact likely to result from a loss of extensive open farmland. This site has a large brown hare population that use these fields as breeding sites. Opportunity for habitat linkage/enhancement/restoration particularly regarding hedgerows and grassland, balanced by threats to existing features.</li> <li>Agricultural land of high grade – Most of site grade 3, about one third grade 2</li> </ul>
<b>Physical considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ground Water Source Protection Zone – Almost all of site included within a protection zone. A small part in zone 1 and the remainder in zones 2 and 3. Inclusion in a Ground water Source Protection Zone does not rule out development but may influence land use or require pollution control measures.</li> <li>Land contamination - This site has an existing railway line running through it and two small areas of land of previous industrial/commercial use which will require investigation. This can be dealt with by condition.</li> <li>Air quality issues – This proposal is located close to the Councils' Air Quality Management Area and is of a significant size. Extensive and detailed air quality assessments will be required to assess the cumulative impacts of this and other proposed developments within the locality on air quality along with provision of a Low Emissions Strategy.</li> <li>Noise issues – Parts of the site will be subject to significant levels of noise from traffic on the A11 to the west and from train operation through the middle of the site. A noise assessment will be required to quantify noise impacts and consider noise attenuation measures. Residential could be acceptable with a high level of mitigation: combination of appropriate distance separation, careful orientation / positioning / design / internal layout of buildings, noise insulation and extensive noise attenuation measures.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other environmental conditions - Possible malodour risk from nearby remaining farms / commercial uses as proposals would be closer than existing residential. Minor to moderate adverse odour risk may require assessment.</li> <li>• Flooding and drainage issues (e.g. localised flooding from ground and surface water) - Reported incidents of flooding associated with highways drain and sewer in 2005 &amp; 2009.</li> <li>• Topography issues – None significant.</li> <li>• Utility services (e.g. pylons) - 2, 11kv overhead lines are located within the area. S/1296/82- 11kv, Station Road, S/1446/80 – 11kv, Swynford Paddocks.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Townscape and landscape impact?</b></p>	<p>The proposed development is in the East Anglian Chalk landscape character area. Apart from the evident transport infrastructure (the Cambridge-Newmarket railway also crosses the site west of the site) this area is deeply rural and sparsely populated, particularly to the south and east. The area is characterised by a high and rolling chalk landscape. The area is influenced by the patchwork of studs and farms towards Newmarket to the northeast. To the south and east the chalk hills are dominant. The area has a distinct grid of roads, tracks and vegetated field boundaries. However the rolling land ensures that this appears far less regimented when viewed on site.</p> <p>The site has two distinct areas, first a triangle of relatively level land between the A11 and A1304 – This is characterised by a series of large houses and farms along the A1304. The field pattern is very regular, of small to medium size. Fields and paddocks are separated by mature belts of hedges and trees, including noticeable numbers of Pines and other conifers. The area is fairly enclosed has a similar to character to the geometric landscape of studs around Newmarket. The second area is a steeply rising landscape to the southeast of the A1304. This rises from approximately 30 to 90m AOD, from the A1304 to Cambridge Hill at the east of the site. The landscape is open and rolling, with many areas of mature woodland, shelter belts and hedges separating a regular pattern of medium to very large sized fields. The horizon is almost entirely treed, but the rolling, rising land allows long views in all directions. The defining character is of an open, rural and remote landscape.</p> <p>The scale and character of the proposed development would be visible over large areas, and the likely scale and type of buildings would form developed skylines to the north, south and east. Folds and slopes within the landform of the development site would mean a high inter-visibility between sections of the development and reinforce its total dominance in the landscape when viewed from outside the site. Development would be very large in relation to the existing settlements and of such a different character that it would have a very significant adverse effect on them. The landscape would be unable to accommodate development of the proposed</p>

	<p>type and scale without total and adverse character change. The development conflicts directly with the Landscape Character of the area.</p>
<p><b>Can any issues be mitigated?</b></p>	<p>Surface drainage will be dealt with by incorporation of sustainable drainage techniques and the intention should be to ensure that the site maintains green field run off rates. The land strata is Chalk, which requires special construction methods being used to protect underlying aquifers.</p> <p>Noise can be mitigated through a package of site development management techniques such as bunding, orientation, levels, acoustic barriers etc. However this may result in part of the land being undevelopable.</p> <p>The loss of agricultural land cannot be mitigated.</p> <p>Landscaping - Due to the landform and deeply rural character, it will be very difficult to offer any landscape mitigation to development of this scale and character on this site. The scattered, rural settlements and rolling, open but intimate landscape, particularly to the south and east, make this one of the most remote and tranquil areas of the County. The effects would be particularly felt to the south, east and north where a new town would abut and dominate an area where the nearest 'B' road is over 3km away. There may be opportunities for limited, small to medium scale development landscape between the A11 and the A1304. Any development must respect and fit within the local landscape patterns and the distinctive existing landscape.</p>

<b>Infrastructure</b>	
<p><b>Highways access?</b></p>	<p>The County Council comment that all development proposals of this scale will need to be backed by a Transport Assessment and supporting Travel Plans. Any Transport Assessment will need to be based on analysis undertaken using the Cambridge Sub-Region Model developed and managed by Cambridgeshire County Council. Detailed mitigation measures and the identification of appropriate financial contributions and obligations under Section 106 will be identified based on the appraisal of the Transport Assessment for each site. The comments provide an overview of the headline transport issues for the site, and should not be regarded as a definitive list of transport requirements.</p> <p>Potential for around 85,000 daily trips (based on SCATP trip rates). Requirement for transport modelling using the Cambridge Sub-Regional Model (CSRM) to consider wider strategic impact.</p> <p>Full Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plans (TP) for residential, schools and employment sites required. Direct impact on the A11</p>

	<p>and A14 Trunk Roads. A14 capacity problems, and A11 / A14 / A1303 Interchange provides no access from A11 South to A14, both to and from Cambridge. Such access would be required to prevent traffic from using local routes to travel to Cambridge. Outcome of Highways Agency A14 study important.</p> <p>Promoter proposes new station on the Newmarket to Cambridge railway, potential timetabling and capacity issues on this line would need to be checked. Poor access to services by walking and cycling – cycle links to Great Wilbraham, Newmarket and Cambridge would be required. Bus services required linking site to Cambridge and Newmarket via neighbouring villages – potential impact on Cambridgeshire Bus Strategy although this size of settlement should ultimately support commercial services.</p> <p>Potential impact on A1304, A1303 and local roads – mitigation measures will be required.</p>
<b>Utility services?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity – Not supportable from existing network. Significant reinforcement and new network required.</li> <li>• Mains water – The site falls within the Cambridge distribution zone of the Cambridge Water Company (CWC), within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within the Cambridge distribution zone to supply the total number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and/or a new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</li> <li>• Gas – The site has no existing connection to the gas network so additional infrastructure would be needed to ensure that the site could be serviced.</li> <li>• Mains sewerage – This Teversham works is operating at capacity and will require new consent limits and major capital expenditure to accommodate the proposed development site. The sewerage network is operating at capacity and will require a developer impact assessment to ascertain the required upgrades. This assessment and any mitigation required will be funded by the developer.</li> </ul>
<b>Drainage measures?</b>	A Flood Risk Assessment is required. Together with a comprehensive water management plan.
<b>School capacity?</b>	After allowing for surplus school places, the development of a site of this size would be likely to have to make provision on site for a number of new primary schools, and for secondary school education.
<b>Health facilities capacity?</b>	Further investigation is need but it is anticipated that such a development would require extensive addition health facilities.

<b>Any other issues?</b>	None
<b>Can issues be mitigated?</b>	<p>The applicant has provided the following supporting information:- Discussions with Transco, 24 Seven, and Cambridge Water Company indicate that there are no anticipated problems servicing the new community in terms of gas, electricity and mains water supply. The site is also well located with respect to the strategic telecommunications network. With respect to foul drainage, existing works may need to be extended or a new facility built on site. There is sufficient land to master plan this in an integrated and comprehensive manner.</p> <p>Detailed sections of the site may not be developable due to site restrictions.</p>
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	No

### Tier 3: Site Specific Factors

<b>Capacity</b>	
<b>Developable area</b> (Updated August 2013)	None
<b>Site capacity</b> (Updated August 2013)	10,000 dwellings as proposed by the promoter
<b>Density</b>	40 dph

<b>Potential Suitability</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints.

<b>Availability</b>	
<b>Is the land in single ownership?</b>	No
<b>Site ownership status?</b>	A number of landowners.
<b>Legal constraints?</b>	None known.

<b>Is there market interest in the site?</b>	The Call for Sites Questionnaire states that the site has not been marketed and that the landowners have agreed terms with a national developer.
<b>When would the site be available for development?</b>	The promoter indicates the site could become available 2021-2031.

<b>Achievability</b>	
<b>Phasing and delivery of the development</b>	The promoter has provided the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first dwellings be completed on site 2021-2026</li> <li>• Development period: 25 years</li> <li>• Annual dwelling completions: 400</li> </ul>
<b>Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	Unknown
<b>Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	There are significant Infrastructure requirements/ costs associated with the development of the site as it is located in a rural location. Including significant road, drainage, and servicing costs as well as planning obligations. In particularly this site would require a comprehensive Transport assessment, Flood management, air quality and noise plan and community infrastructure programme.
<b>Could issues identified be overcome?</b>	With difficulty and this is not a site/development which is in the ownership of one client, the site requires substantial infrastructure investment.
<b>Economic viability?</b>	For strategic scale sites (new settlements and large urban extensions) much depends upon the extent, cost and phasing of the infrastructure to be funded by the development, the amount of housing that can actually be accommodated on site, and the timing of its provision in relation to that of the accompanying infrastructure. Such variables are currently unknown or unclear and so the viability of such sites cannot be appraised at this time.

<b>Site Assessment Conclusion</b>
Site with no development potential.

<b>Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013</b>
Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework.

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

<b>Proforma Created</b>	July 2012
<b>Proforma Last Updated</b>	July 2012
<b>Location</b>	New Settlement (Elsworth Parish)
<b>Site name / address</b>	Land north of A428, Cambourne
<b>Category of site:</b>	A new settlement.
<b>Description of promoter's proposal</b>	Residential development with employment, retail, community uses and public open space.
<b>Site area (hectares)</b>	164.11
<b>Site Number</b>	194
<b>Site description &amp; context</b>	<p>The site lies to the north of the A428, east of the A1198 and west of Brockley Road, Elsworth.</p> <p>Fields adjoin it to the north and separate it from the A1198 to the west. Brockley Road, an unclassified road, bounds the site to the east and the A428 trunk road to the south. There is a hedgerow to the boundary with the A1198 that screens most views across the site from the east and a post-rail fence and hedgerow to the A428 to the south. This fencing also separates a cyclepath and tree planting along the northern edge of the A428. A motel and Chinese restaurant fronting A1198 adjoins the site at its south western edge.</p> <p>The site consists of open countryside and incorporates Common Farm Cottages comprising two pairs of semi-detached houses accessed via a farm track off Brockley Road, Elsworth that lie perpendicular to the road. The land rises slightly towards A428 but is a relatively flat area with long distance views across it.</p> <p>It is characterised by large open arable fields with few obvious field boundary markings, although there are some hedgerow trees to Brockley Road and ditches to some field boundaries.</p> <p>There are two wooded areas located beyond the cottages towards the northern part of the site – both are protected by Tree Preservation Orders.</p>
<b>Current or last use of the site</b>	The site consists of agricultural land and four dwellings.

<b>Is the site Previously Developed Land?</b>	Partly – the site includes 4 dwellings creating a very small area of previously developed land.
<b>Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan?</b>	No.
<b>Planning history</b>	<p>Part of the site was put forward as an objection site for the Core Strategy in 2006. The Council ruled out this site in its initial response stating: ‘There was no need to look at new greenfield allocations at any of the Rural Centres, including Cambourne, in order to meet the housing target for this stage in the sequence as shown in Figure 3 of the Core Strategy. Increasing the densities within the existing planned footprint of Cambourne will provide a more sustainable form of development. However, the Council's view is that a physical expansion of Cambourne is not appropriate or necessary. Expansion of Cambourne would completely alter the original concept and character of the three related villages to one of a market town. The Council's view is that this cannot be done successfully given the way in which Cambourne has been and continues to be developed.’</p> <p>The Inspector in the final Inspector's report on the Core Strategy noted this view in 2006.</p> <p>C/039/55 – Erection of H.V. &amp; L.V. overhead transmission line. Approved 14-07-1955.</p>
<b>Source of site</b>	Site suggested through call for sites.

<b>Tier 1: Strategic Considerations</b>	
<b>Green Belt</b>	The site is not within the Green Belt.
<b>Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSSIs – Elsworth Wood SSSI lies approximately 470m to the east of the site. Papworth Wood SSSI lies approximately 570m to the northwest of the site. Mitigation measures will need to be considered.</li> </ul>

<b>Tier 1 conclusion:</b>	The site comprises relatively flat agricultural land. Within it are four residential dwellings and two areas of trees with Tree Preservation Orders that would need to be considered in any future proposals. The site lies within close proximity to road networks and so can be accessed by car.
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	Yes.

**Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations**

<b>Designations and Constraints</b>	
<b>Heritage considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-statutory archaeological site – the site is located adjacent to the route of the Ermine Street Roman road. The deserted settlement of Elsworth Wood is located to the east and there is also evidence for Bronze Age barrows in the vicinity. Further information would be necessary in advance of any planning application for this site.</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County Wildlife Site – Brockley End Meadow lies 900m to the east of the site. It supports populations of a nationally scarce vascular plant species (<i>Trifolium ochroleucon</i>). Mitigation measures will need to be considered.</li> <li>• Tree Preservation Orders – no site visit made by the Trees &amp; Landscape Officer, however, only one TPO of the 3 indicated on this site have any trees standing from the 2008 aerial data, this is to the north of the site - trees will need to be accommodated using current best practice and guidance unless detailed tree surveys prove otherwise.</li> <li>• Public Rights of Way – a cyclepath runs adjacent to the site, alongside its southern boundary. Development of the site will need to consider links to this cyclepath and any impact upon it.</li> <li>• Agricultural land of high grade – the site is Grade 2 agricultural land. Permanent loss of agricultural land would need to be considered.</li> <li>• Biodiversity features – greatest ecological impact likely to result is from a loss of open farmland. Ditches in this area are likely to provide habitat for water vole. There is likely to be low or no impact on other features including woodland, hedgerows, and ponds. There is potential for these features to be significantly improved. No grassland or watercourses are present on site. The site is located within the claylands: these landscapes support species and habitats characterised by hedgerows, mature trees, ponds, small watercourses, and rough grassland with species such as skylark and grey partridge. Flooded gravel and clay pits diversify the semi-natural habitats and provide habitat for various waterfowl and the great crested newt. Hedges, isolated trees and</li> </ul>

	<p>woods can give a wooded feel and provide habitat for song thrush, bullfinch and corn bunting. Hay meadows may include flower species such as knapweeds and crested dog's-tail grasses. Relict parkland and large hedgerow trees particularly of oak with associated bats, lichens and turtle doves occur. Arable farming dominates the landuse and provides habitat for skylarks, grey partridge and brown hare. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design.</p>
<p><b>Physical considerations?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hazardous installations – a high voltage overhead electricity line runs through the middle of the site so there are possible electromagnetic fields concerns (EMFs). The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) generally has the enforcement responsibility for legislation safeguarding the health and safety of the general public from such EMF sources. The HSE and Health Protection Agency should be contacted for advice on the suitability of this site for residential development.</li> <li>• Air quality issues – despite this site not being adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area, it is of a significant size and therefore, there is a potential for an increase in traffic and static emissions that could affect local air quality. More information is required for this location, particularly details for air quality assessment and a low emission strategy.</li> <li>• Noise issues – sources of noise include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Elsworth Moto Parc (Motocross Circuit) lies approximately 200m to the east – development of the site would bring noise sensitive premises closer to the circuit, which is currently relatively remote. These are unlikely to be considered compatible uses.</li> <li>2. Stirling Way Business Park lies approximately 320m to the west and is a source of commercial noise.</li> <li>3. A428 and B1198 – noise from road traffic on adjacent roads.</li> </ol> <p><i>Commercial and Motocross Noise – Mitigation:</i>  Current noise has not been quantified. If noise is an issue it is unlikely that mitigation measures on the proposed development site alone can provide an acceptable ambient noise environment. Noise insulation / mitigation abatement measures could be required offsite but there is uncertainty as to whether these would be effective. Such mitigation measures are likely to require the full cooperation of the business operators and section 106 planning / obligation requirements may be required and there are no guarantees that these can be secured. Any detrimental economic impact on existing businesses should also be considered prior to allocation. Environmental Health currently object to this site and before any consideration is given to allocating this site for residential development it is recommended that these noise constraints are thoroughly investigated and duly considered / addressed by undertaking noise impact / risk</p> </li> </ul>

	<p>assessments and consideration is given to possible on or offsite mitigation in accordance with PPG 24 and associated guidance and viability.</p> <p><i>Traffic Noise – Mitigation:</i>  The south of the site is bounded by the busy A428. Traffic noise will need assessment in accordance with PPG 24 and associated guidance. The impact of existing noise on any future residents in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well being and providing a high quality living environment. However, residential use is likely to be acceptable with careful noise mitigation through a combination of appropriate distance separation, commercial shielding, noise berms / barriers, careful orientation / positioning / design / internal layout of buildings, noise insulation scheme and extensive noise attenuation measures to mitigate traffic noise (single aspect, limited height, dual aspect with sealed non-openable windows on façade facing roads, acoustically treated alternative ventilation, no open amenity spaces such as balconies / gardens). Noise likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises.</p>
<p><b>Townscape and landscape impact?</b></p>	<p>The proposed development lies in the Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands Landscape Character Area. The site lies north of the A428 on a relatively high, plateau at approximately 65 m AOD. Adjoining the site to the west is the A1198, and to the east the minor Brockley Road. The northern end of the site is marked by a line of high voltage electricity pylons.</p> <p>The landscape is very open, rolling plateau, cut by wide stream valleys, with a field pattern of large to very large irregular fields separated by ditches or hedges.</p> <p>Mature, well spaced tree planting is a feature along many of the roadsides.</p> <p>To the north the land falls towards Papworth Everard and Elsworth with huge views possible to and from the areas of higher ground, and to the fen edge to the north.</p> <p>There is some mature planting along the eastern edge of the site, and a short section of hedge along the A1198 towards Papworth. Other than the above, the site is almost completely open with few landscape features bar two small areas of woodland. There are few hedges dividing fields within the site.</p> <p>The site occupies some of the highest land locally and forms the skyline when viewed from the approaches to Elsworth, Papworth Everard, Rogues Lane to the north and the A428.</p>

	<p>Due to its elevation and open character development on this site would form a new built skyline when viewed from local villages and roads.</p> <p>The elevated open nature of the site would also mean that the development could be visible over very long distances.</p> <p>Given the likely scale of the development and types of buildings proposed, integration of the development into the local landscape would be very difficult.</p> <p>The impact on the existing settlements and landscape will depend on the scale of development and the height and scale of the larger buildings, for example local centres.</p> <p><b>a) Landscape effects on existing settlements (Cambourne, Elsworth and Papworth Everard)</b> Development would be large in relation to the existing village settlements and would dominate the skyline and have a significant adverse effect on existing settlements and landmark buildings.</p> <p><b>b) Impact on visual amenity and character of the landscape (Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands)</b> The development is at odds with the local landscape character and would have a significant adverse effect on the local landscape.</p>
<p><b>Can any issues be mitigated?</b></p>	<p>In part – it should be possible to partly mitigate the noise and air quality issues, and impacts on the County Wildlife Site, protected trees and biodiversity. The HSE and Health Protection Agency should be contacted for advice on the suitability of this site for residential development given the high voltage electricity line that crosses the site. However, it would not be possible to mitigate the landscape impacts. The scale of the development and types of buildings proposed would be very difficult to integrate into the local landscape and would have a significant adverse effect on existing settlements and landmark buildings.</p>

<b>Infrastructure</b>	
<p><b>Highways access?</b></p>	<p>The Highway Agency has advised that the A428 corridor is seriously limited in capacity between the A1 and A1198. At present there is no realistic prospect of resolving this. However, the A428 corridor is within the remit of the A14 strategic study, further adding to the uncertainties.</p> <p>Regarding the sites in the A428 corridor, (estimated capacity of approximately 11,721 dwellings on 21 sites), three quarters of this total is accounted for on just 3 sites along the southern edge of the A428. Development on these sites is likely to be largely Cambridge-</p>

	<p>centric but St Neots is also likely to attract a significant amount of trips. For instance rail connectivity via St Neots is likely to be an attractive alternative to Cambridge. Even a modest residual demand between these sites and St Neots could be critical.</p> <p>Conversely, there is some scope for these larger sites to enhance to the overall transport sustainability of Cambourne and other local settlements through better integration, with the potential to offset some of the new demand. The capacity to accommodate new development on this corridor is directly related to this scope, which will need to be demonstrated by the promoters.</p> <p>The local highways authority comment that all development proposals of this scale will need to be backed by a Transport Assessment and supporting Travel Plans. Any Transport Assessment will need to be based on analysis undertaken using the Cambridge Sub-Region Model developed and managed by Cambridgeshire County Council. Detailed mitigation measures and the identification of appropriate financial contributions and obligations under Section 106 will be identified based on the appraisal of the Transport Assessment for each site. The comments provide an overview of the headline transport issues for the site, and should not be regarded as a definitive list of transport requirements.</p> <p>This development would have a direct impact on A428 Trunk Road with potential capacity issues at the Cambourne Junction and on corridor between Cambridge and St. Neots / Bedford, particularly junctions at either end of this section of A428 (A1198 roundabout and M11 Junction 14). A1303 Madingley Road corridor into Cambridge has capacity problems (especially at M11 Junction 13). The site has no rail access.</p> <p>Poor access to services by walking, with potential to create walk and cycle routes to Cambourne constrained by severance impact of A428 dual carriageway. Potential for strategic cycle route to Cambridge (East – via Highfields and Coton) with suitable new and improved provision. Opportunity to strengthen bus services on corridor between Cambourne and Cambridge (Service 4) through appropriate enhancement of capacity, although location of site would add time penalty, abortive routing and extra costs to existing services. Madingley Park and Ride capacity may need upgrading.</p>
<p><b>Utility services?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity – development of this site is not supportable from existing network, therefore significant reinforcement and new network required.</li> <li>• Mains water – the site falls within the Bourn Reservoir distribution zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3900 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within the Bourn Reservoir distribution</li> </ul>

	<p>zone to supply the total number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites with the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in the capacity of the Bourn Reservoir distribution zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or a new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gas – Cambourne is already served by gas (although it is not provided by National Grid) and significant system reinforcement is likely to be necessary to accommodate the development of this site.</li> <li>• Mains sewerage – Utton’s Drove WwTW is operating close to capacity and therefore has limited capacity to accommodate this site. A revised consent will be required for this prior to connection. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre-development assessment will be required to ascertain any required upgrades. The developer will have to fund this assessment and any mitigation required. Swavesey Internal Drainage Board are concerned if it is intended that the foul sewage effluent from this development be directed to the Utton’s Drove Sewage Treatment Works and discharged into the Swavesey Drain catchment. The Council will be well aware of the issues that have arisen with such discharges and their effect on the Drain and the standard of protection provided to its catchment. At this stage, therefore, the Board must raise and record its concerns relating to development of this site.</li> </ul>
<b>Drainage measures?</b>	No FRA has been provided.
<b>School capacity?</b>	<p>Early Years education</p> <p>The levels of housing development would indicate that additional Early Years settings would be required to meet the demand arising from development. This possibly could be provided along with additional primary school accommodation. However, this may not always be possible and alternative approaches to enable sufficient Childcare and Early Years provision to be commissioned, may therefore need to be considered during the planning of new housing. This additional accommodation would not necessarily need to be specifically for Early Years and Childcare provision, with opportunities for co-locating and/or sharing community facilities being explored wherever possible.</p> <p>Primary education:</p> <p>Jeavons Wood Primary School, Eastgate, Cambourne has a planned admission number of 60 and 420 spaces. The figures are the same for the two other primary schools in the village, namely, Monkfield Park Primary School, School Lane, Cambourne and The Vine Inter-Church Primary School, The Vines, Cambourne. This totals 180 PAN</p>

	<p>and 1260 spaces. Surplus capacity of places at these schools in Cambourne is currently 21 places.</p> <p>It is estimated, based on a net developable area of approximately 65.6ha that 2624 dwellings could result from development of this land. Associated school places and early years places has not been calculated as the fig is not known, however, an estimate would be a requirement for 5 FE primary school to meet the needs arising from it. These could be incorporated into the development site.</p> <p>Secondary education:</p> <p>The site falls within the catchment of Swavesey Village College. Its PAN is 240 and a capacity of 1200. There is no capacity at this college.</p> <p>2624 dwellings would equate to approximately 4.37 FE. A 4 FE provides 600 places and would be sufficient to serve 2,400 homes but would be a very small secondary school.</p> <p>A recent approval of planning application S/1898/11 for a Secondary School on land west of Cambourne was granted. It is planned that this will open in September 2013, and cater for 750 pupils, aged 11 to 16, with a catchment area covering Cambourne. There is scope to expand the school to provide up to 8FE, subject to the necessary planning permissions and funding.</p>
<b>Health facilities capacity?</b>	Monkfield Medical Practice, Cambourne – an extension to accommodate the additional 950 dwellings agreed at Cambourne has already been agreed. A new facility would need to be provided to accommodate any further growth.
<b>Any other issues?</b>	N/A
<b>Can issues be mitigated?</b>	In part – through improvements and upgrades to schools and major utilities. However the development would have a direct impact on A428 with potential capacity issues.
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	No

**Tier 3: Site Specific Factors**

<b>Capacity</b>	
<b>Developable area</b>	None (if unconstrained 65.64 ha).
<b>Site capacity</b>	None (if unconstrained 2,626 dwellings).
<b>Density</b>	40 dph

<b>Potential Suitability</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints.

<b>Availability</b>	
<b>Is the land in single ownership?</b>	Yes.
<b>Site ownership status?</b>	Landowner.
<b>Legal constraints?</b>	None known.
<b>Is there market interest in the site?</b>	No.
<b>When would the site be available for development?</b>	The promoter indicates the site could become available in 2011-16.

<b>Achievability</b>	
<b>Phasing and delivery of the development</b>	No information is provided by the promoter on when the first dwellings could be completed on site or the possible phasing of the development.
<b>Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	No.
<b>Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	No.
<b>Could issues identified be overcome?</b>	None identified
<b>Economic viability?</b>	For strategic scale sites (new settlements and large urban extensions) much depends upon the extent, cost and phasing of the infrastructure to be funded by the development, the amount of housing that can actually be accommodated on site, and the timing of its provision in relation to that of the accompanying infrastructure. Such variables are currently unknown or unclear and so the viability of such sites cannot be appraised at this time.

<b>Site Assessment Conclusion</b>
Site with no development potential.

<b>Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013</b>
Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework.

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

<b>Proforma Created</b>	July 2012
<b>Proforma Last Updated</b>	August 2013
<b>Location</b>	New Settlement (Waterbeach Parish)
<b>Site name / address</b>	Land north of Waterbeach
<b>Category of site:</b>	A new settlement
<b>Description of promoter's proposal</b> (Updated August 2013)	Mixed use new community comprising up to 12,750 dwellings forming a linked urban extension to Waterbeach, with employment, town centre, local centres, education, sports facilities, new train station and bus interchanges, a rapid bus service alongside the A10, and public open space including parkland around Denny Abbey Scheduled Monument. The promoter's proposed capacity was revised to 10,500 dwellings in their response to the Issues and Options 1 Consultation.
<b>Site area</b> (hectares)	558 ha
<b>Site Number</b>	231
<b>Site description &amp; context</b>	A flat site to the immediate north of Waterbeach comprising Waterbeach Barracks and a disused airfield, large arable fields and farms, a golf course, rough grassland, scattered woodland and water features. Denny Abbey sits within the north western corner of the site. A Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) sits within the south eastern corner of the site. The A10 runs down its western flank and beyond it is the Cambridge Research Park. The railway line between Cambridge and Ely runs down its eastern flank. Site boundaries are sometimes hedged with scattered trees.
<b>Current or last use of the site</b>	Military Barracks / Agriculture
<b>Is the site Previously Developed Land?</b> (Updated August 2013)	Yes in part.
<b>Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan?</b>	None

<p><b>Planning history</b></p>	<p>2007. The Core Strategy Inspectors Report found there was no justification at the present time for the Core Strategy to identify Waterbeach as a location for a second new settlement, nor to include a more general reference to an additional settlement.</p> <p>2003. The Structure Plan Examination in Public Panel Report – Concerning a new settlement at Waterbeach it states that “were the transport obstacles capable of being overcome at some point in the future and particularly if the rail shuttle could be implemented, we are satisfied that Waterbeach would be a good location for a development contributing to the longer term growth of the Sub-Region”.</p> <p>“However, should a second new settlement be required to meet the development requirements of the Cambridge Sub-Region, either towards the end of the Plan period or, more likely, beyond 2016, we would regard Waterbeach as the most sustainable of the locations we have examined at the EIP.”</p> <p>“We are satisfied on the information before us that within this Structure Plan period (to 2016) a second new settlement is unlikely to be needed. The strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region has identified sufficient capacity, based on RPG6 projections, to cope with housing requirements up to 2016 and for some years beyond. The only circumstances in which a further requirement might arise would be if it emerged that Cambridge Airport was unlikely to become available in the foreseeable future. In these circumstances we are in no doubt that a second new settlement would be the next most sustainable solution for a major development once capacity in other locations identified in the Structure Plan is exhausted”.</p> <p>1991. Planning application S/3099/88/O for 1,500 dwellings, employment, open space and retail on a site to the north of but partially overlapping with this site. Appeal dismissed in 1991 alongside other new settlement sites on the A10 corridor. The reasons for this site being refused permission being largely an inability to demonstrate safe access arrangements onto the A10 and impact on the setting of Denny Abbey.</p>
<p><b>Source of site</b></p>	<p>Site suggested through call for sites</p>

<p><b>Tier 1: Strategic Considerations</b></p>	
<p><b>Green Belt</b></p>	<p>The site is not within the Green Belt.</p>
<p><b>Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone – very small pockets of land around the boundaries lie within flood zones 2 and 3.</li> <li>• Scheduled Monument - Denny Abbey is designated as a Scheduled Monument. The development of this site has the potential to have a significant impact on the setting of Denny</li> </ul>

<p><b>potential to make the site unsuitable for development?</b></p>	<p>Abbey and its surrounding landscape (Scheduled Monument Number 13219). English Heritage comment that development here may impact on the setting of Denny Abbey, a scheduled monument which draws considerable significance from the long views and relative isolation of its setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Listed Buildings – English Heritage comment that Waterbeach Barracks has some historic interest, although the buildings on the site are not recognised through designations.</li> <li>• Minerals and Waste LDF designations – large parts of the site are subject to sand and gravel safeguarding. Safeguarding is intended to ensure that mineral resources are adequately taken into account in land use planning decisions. It does not automatically preclude other forms of development taking place, but flags up the presence of economic mineral so that it is considered, and not unknowingly or needlessly sterilised.</li> </ul> <p>RLW Estates have submitted a document entitled ‘A Vision for Denny Abbey’ which sets out the mitigation that is proposed for the Abbey as a result of the proposed new community of Denny St Francis. Mitigation is to be achieved through taking a masterplan approach to minimise heritage impacts, appropriate screening and landscaping, the transfer of land to English Heritage or the Farmland Museum to form a substantial landscaped area surrounding the Abbey, and funding to create an appropriate landscape setting and for its ongoing management. English Heritage have commented that the siting and design of development, together with compensatory measures can reduce the degree of damage to the setting of the Abbey. The section of Car Dyke running along part of the western boundary is unscheduled unlike portions to the north west and south of the site, but is of interest, and should be preserved in any development. Overall there is scope to mitigate identified impacts.</p>
<p><b>Tier 1 conclusion:</b></p>	<p>A flat site to the immediate north of Waterbeach comprising Waterbeach Barracks and a disused airfield, large arable fields and farms, a golf course, rough grassland, scattered woodland and water features. Denny Abbey sits within the north western corner of the site. A Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) sits within the south eastern corner of the site. Not subject to strategic considerations which may make the site unsuitable for development other than impact on the setting of Denny Abbey which appear to be capable of mitigation although this may reduce the net developable area of the site.</p>
<p><b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>

## Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations

<b>Designations and Constraints</b>	
<b>Heritage considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation Area – Southern tip of the site lies close to the village Conservation Area (CA). Potential for adverse effect on the CA due to intensification of use and loss of green open spaces at entrance on approach to village and CA.</li> <li>• Listed Buildings - Partly surrounds LBs at Denny Abbey, including Abbey (Grade I) and Refectory (Grade I). Potential for major adverse effect on settings due to obscuring significant views to and from group and loss of functional countryside context. A survey of the significance of former airfield buildings and site is incomplete but the site surrounds recently designated LBs. Potential for major adverse effect on setting due to obscuring significant views to and from the buildings and loss of functional context.</li> <li>• Non-statutory archaeological site - The site's western boundaries are formed by the Carr Dyke and associated Roman road, and Roman settlement remains are also likely to survive in the area.</li> </ul> <p>There is potential to mitigate impacts. The site proposer has submitted a report which sets out a strategy for the protection and enhancement of the setting of Denny Abbey which has been considered in the Tier 1 part of this assessment.</p>
<b>Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Rights of Way – Byway to eastern part of site primarily running north-south connecting Waterbeach to New Farm.</li> <li>• Presence of protected species – Due to the range of habitats currently found in this site an impact would be upon a range of species. The site is currently subject to a low level of human disturbance. The site contains some populations of plants unrecorded elsewhere within the county. Any development of this large site would require extensive ecological investigation (possibly over several years) as part of the EIA process. Opportunity for habitat linkage/enhancement/restoration balanced by threats to existing features.</li> <li>• Agricultural land of high grade – majority of site is classified as Grade 2, with some Grade 3. Airfield is unclassified.</li> </ul> <p>The loss of agricultural land cannot be mitigated.</p>
<b>Physical considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land contamination – This site has a number of potential sources of contamination- previous military land, areas of filled ground, a sewerage works and also adjacent to railway line and landfill. This would require investigation which should be carried out at a pre-app stage, not dealt with by condition. A Study submitted by the proposer identifies possible contamination and states that mitigation measures may be required if the site is redeveloped. These could include: on-site remediation, removal</li> </ul>

	<p>of contaminated material off-site or on-site and the breaking of possible linkages to human receptors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality issues - Despite this proposal not being adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area, it is of a significant size and therefore there is a potential for an increase in traffic and static emissions that could affect local air quality. More information is required for this location, particularly details for air quality assessment and a low emission strategy.</li> <li>• Noise issues – Parts of the site will be subject to significant levels of noise from traffic on the A10 to the west and from train operation to the east. A noise assessment will be required to quantify noise impacts and consider noise attenuation measures. Residential could be acceptable with a high level of mitigation: combination of appropriate distance separation, careful orientation / positioning / design / internal layout of buildings, noise insulation and extensive noise attenuation measures.</li> <li>• Other environmental conditions – land at the south eastern corner of the site is affected by odour from the existing waste water treatment works (WWTW) on the site. Part of the site is currently within a WWTW safeguarding Area of the Cambridgeshire &amp; Peterborough Minerals and Waste LDF. Core Strategy policy CS31 establishes a presumption against allowing development that would be occupied by people because of the impact on amenity caused by offensive odours from the site. Where new development is proposed it must be accompanied by an odour assessment report. Similar considerations would apply to the proposed replacement WWTW which is mentioned in the proposers supporting statement.</li> <li>• Utility services (e.g. pylons) – Sewers cross the site.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Townscape and landscape impact?</b></p>	<p>The proposed development lies in the Fens Landscape character area. The landscape is largely flat and open. The area is influenced by long views to the fenland, the urban edge of Cambridge and the chalk hills to the south east and the rivers Ouse and cam and their associated flood defences. The field pattern is regular and generally of large and very large fields, separated by ditches, drainage channels and intermittent hedges, which together with shelter belts and occasional pockets of woodland often combine to form a vegetated horizon.</p> <p>The north, and particularly the east boundaries offer very extensive views into the site and to the surrounding landscapes. Denny Abbey is a prominent visible feature to the north of the site, while to the east and west are long views over the fens to the chalk hills west and south west of Cambridge and to the Isle of Ely and its Cathedral to the north. The north and east of the site are deeply rural, quiet and tranquil. The landscape is defined by old and ancient features – lines of pollarded willows and old oaks following drainage canals and old hedgerows, a relatively detailed local field pattern, raised byways and tracks, and wide views to historical features. To the south some large</p>

	<p>buildings and housing developments associated with the barracks are visible.</p> <p>The proposed development in its proposed scale and form will have a significant adverse effect on the local and wider landscape. Very long views are available to and from the site from high ground (the Stretham – Haddenham ridge to the north, chalk hills to the south and east and more local fen views) and a development of the proposed scale will form the dominant feature in many of these views, which are currently wide and almost entirely rural. More locally large scale development will dominate the local villages of Waterbeach and Chittering, and will adversely affect the settings of the local historic monuments, listed buildings and the local mature, rural fenland landscape character.</p> <p>It would be very difficult to integrate a development of the proposed scale into the local landscape, particularly given the described and likely transport connections and suggestions for ‘Parkland’ around Denny Abbey. It may be possible to provide some more limited development to the south and west of the site on the current footprint of the barracks and parts of the airfield. A well designed landscape scheme and a sensitive layout respecting the form and scale of Waterbeach, the setting of Denny Abby and the local landscape character could possibly be successful. Large buildings currently exist on the site and it can be seen that development of a similar scale could be accommodated in some locations. Development to the north and east of the site will be very difficult without significantly harming the setting of Denny Abbey and the open, tranquil and rural, landscape character.</p>
<p><b>Can any issues be mitigated?</b></p>	<p>There is potential to mitigate impacts. The site proposer has submitted a report which sets out a strategy for the protection and enhancement of the setting of Denny Abbey which would reduce the level of adverse impact on the Listed Buildings. Development would create the opportunity for habitat linkage/enhancement/restoration. It should be possible to mitigate noise, land contamination, and malodour issues successfully. Loss of agricultural land cannot be mitigated. It would be very difficult to integrate a development of the proposed scale into the local landscape without an adverse impact on the local landscape, particularly given the described and likely transport connections and suggestions for ‘Parkland’ around Denny Abbey. It may be possible to provide some more limited development to the south and west of the site based on the current footprint of the barracks and the airfield. A larger development would have some adverse impacts on landscape quality.</p>

<b>Infrastructure</b>	
<p><b>Highways access?</b> (Updated August 2013)</p>	<p>Regarding SHLAA sites in the Milton/ Waterbeach area the Highways Agency comment that the vast majority of this grouping consists of the barracks site as a new settlement with the remainder essentially in-fill sites. On the whole, the in-fill sites are less likely to present an unacceptable pressure on the A14 given the majority of travel demand will be focused on Cambridge and credible alternatives to car travel could be available.</p> <p>Early approaches by the promoters of the Waterbeach barracks site have indicated their recognition of the extensive transport challenges they face. They have indicated the need for a substantial package of measures, both highway and sustainable transport, to make this site work. There is also scope for substantial internalisation within such a site. The biggest impacts of this site are likely to relate to Cambridge rather than the strategic road network (SRN), although even residual impacts from a site this size could be critical. All this would suggest there is capacity to accommodate a significant proportion of the development capacity here.</p> <p>The County Council comment that all development proposals of this scale will need to be backed by a Transport Assessment and supporting Travel Plans. Any Transport Assessment will need to be based on analysis undertaken using the Cambridge Sub-Region Model developed and managed by Cambridgeshire County Council. Detailed mitigation measures and the identification of appropriate financial contributions and obligations under Section 106 will be identified based on the appraisal of the Transport Assessment for each site. The comments provide an overview of the headline transport issues for the site, and should not be regarded as a definitive list of transport requirements. Potential for around 108,375 daily trips (based on SCATP trip rates). Cambridgeshire LTP3 and Cambridge Area Transport Strategy will need to be taken into account. Direct impact on the A10 and A14 Trunk Roads. A10 capacity problems (single carriageway road – likely to require upgrading to dual carriageway between Waterbeach and A14). A14 capacity problems and A10 / A14 junction capacity issues – outcome of Highways Agency A14 study likely to be critical. Promoter proposes new train station on the Ely to Cambridge railway line – potential timetabling and capacity issues on this line would need to be checked. No major enhancements planned in the Network Rail, Route Utilisation Strategy. Opportunity to strengthen bus services on corridor between Waterbeach and Cambridge by a rapid service alongside the A10 with potential to link into CGB at Science Park. Opportunities to link to existing walking and cycle routes (such as NCN11) into Cambridge and other key sites such as Science Park. Potential requirement to enhance Park and Ride site on A10 at Milton to provide greater capacity. A10 corridor will need to be considered –</p>

	<p>capacity constraints at the A14 Junction and along corridor into Cambridge will need to be addressed. Reliance on A10 for access – limited local network to provide alternative options.</p> <p>Background information - In November 2011, the Government committed itself to increasing capacity and improving performance on the A14 in its Autumn Statement, which also states that this will support proposed housing developments in Northstowe, Waterbeach and Alconbury. It then states that the Government will explore innovative ways of financing this work, including tolls, which will also be investigated for other new capacity proposals. By spring 2012, the Government expected to have developed proposals with local partners for improvements to the A14 road and the other local transport networks. At July 2012 these had not yet been published.</p> <p>UPDATE: In July 2013 a package of roadworks to the A14 were announced which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widening of the Cambridge Northern Bypass between Milton and Girton and enhancement of the Girton Interchange;</li> <li>• Provision of high standard roads for local traffic use running in parallel to an enhanced A14 carriageway between Girton and the area near the current Trinity Foot A14 junction;</li> <li>• Construction of a bypass to the south of Huntingdon between the area near Trinity Foot and the A1, at both ends tying in with the existing A14.</li> </ul> <p>Construction is currently planned to start in 2016.</p>
--	---

<p><b>Utility services?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity - Existing Primary substation at Landbeach could support this development. Could compromise capacity available at Histon grid required to support other major developments such as Northstowe. Network reinforcement required. The supporting statement from the proposer refers to their intention to implement a sustainable energy strategy for the site potentially including wind, solar PV and biomass fuelled combined heat and power.</li> <li>• Mains water – The site falls within the Cambridge distribution zone of the Cambridge Water Company (CWC), within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within the Cambridge distribution zone to supply the total number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and/or a new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</li> <li>• Gas – Waterbeach is connected to the national gas grid. A development of this scale would require substantial network reinforcement.</li> <li>• Mains sewerage - The WWTW on site has capacity but will require new consent limits and major capital expenditure to accommodate this proposed development site. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a developer impact assessment will be required to ascertain the required upgrades, if any. This assessment and any mitigation required will be funded by the developer. The developers supporting statement refers to the provision of a new WWTW to the east of the site beyond the railway line on land in their control.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Drainage measures?</b></p>	<p>A drainage strategy has been submitted, which aims to ensure no additional runoff from the development than existing by the use of sustainable drainage systems.</p>
<p><b>School capacity?</b></p>	<p>Waterbeach has one primary school with a PAN of 60 and school capacity of 420, and lies within the catchment of Cottenham Village College with a PAN of 180 and school capacity of 900 children. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there was a deficit of 25 primary places in Waterbeach taking account of planned development in Waterbeach, and a small deficit of 18 secondary places taking account of planned development across the village college catchment area.</p> <p>The development of this site for 12,750 dwellings, after allowing for surplus school places, would be likely to have to make provision on site for 7 new primary schools and 2 new secondary schools.</p>

<b>Health facilities capacity?</b>	The existing Medical Practice in Waterbeach could be extended to serve early residents from development at Waterbeach. A number of new Medical Practices would need to be established to provide for the on-going health care needs of a new settlement of the scale proposed.
<b>Any other issues?</b>	None
<b>Can issues be mitigated?</b>	The provision of utilities, schools and health infrastructure should be capable of mitigation. The transport impacts of a development of this size in this location will be significant and the extent to which these can be successfully mitigated whilst maintaining scheme viability is unknown.

<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	Yes.
--	------

**Tier 3: Site Specific Factors**

<b>Capacity</b>	
<b>Developable area</b> (Updated August 2013)	To be determined through Masterplanning. Note that the reference to a developable area of 223.47 ha in previous SHLAA proformas was the result of the application to the SHLAA site boundary of a gross to net residential site formula used for the majority of SHLAA sites. However as set out in the SHLAA report for sites over 100 ha we would follow the dwelling capacity figures proposed in the Call for Sites questionnaires. A developable area figure should not have been included.
<b>Site capacity</b> (Updated August 2013)	The promoter sought a capacity of 12,750 new dwellings at the call for sites stage in 2011, and subsequently revised this to 10,500 in representations to the July 2012 Issues and Options 1 consultation.
<b>Density</b>	40 dph

<b>Potential Suitability</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The site is potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints.

<b>Availability</b>	
<b>Is the land in single ownership?</b>	No

<b>Site ownership status?</b>	Two organisations effectively own or control the land making up the site, RLW Estates and the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO). No known ownership constraints.
<b>Legal constraints?</b>	The Ministry of Defence (MoD) part of the site is subject to application of the Crichel Down Rules. In brief these can require certain lands to be offered back to the original owner or their successors at current market value. RLW estates do not consider this represents a constraint on development.
<b>Is there market interest in the site?</b>	RLW Estates has developed a delivery model that will enable effective implementation of the scheme.  DIO have confirmed availability of the MoD site for housing-led development.
<b>When would the site be available for development?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is available immediately.</li> <li>• The assessment is based on the Call for Sites Questionnaire.</li> </ul>

<b>Achievability</b>	
<b>Phasing and delivery of the development</b>	The promoter has told us that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first dwellings be completed on site 2011-16</li> <li>• Development period - Greater than 20 years</li> <li>• Phasing – 2011-16: 1,150 homes, 2016-21: 3,250 homes, 2021-26: 3,250 homes, 2031+ 1,850 homes</li> </ul>
<b>Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	None known
<b>Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	Infrastructure requirements in relation to net developable area and the site footprint. A reduced site footprint may not be able to fund all essential infrastructure including works to the A10 and other transport infrastructure including the new railway station.
<b>Could issues identified be overcome?</b>	Unknown at this time.
<b>Economic viability?</b>	For strategic scale sites (new settlements and large urban extensions) much depends upon the extent, cost and phasing of the infrastructure to be funded by the development, the amount of housing that can actually be accommodated on site, and the timing of its provision in relation to that of the accompanying infrastructure. Such variables are currently unknown or unclear and so the viability of such sites cannot be appraised at this time.

**Site Assessment Conclusion** (updated August 2013)

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

This site assessment was used to generate three site options in the Issues and Options 1 consultation in July 2012. One for a new town for the majority of the site, one for a reduced new town excluding the rural landscapes to the east not in MOD ownership, and one for a village extension limited to the barracks area only. The reduced new town would reduce the landscape impacts of development but not allow for the relocation of the railway station. The barracks only option would further mitigate the impacts of development on the townscape and landscape. Both of the smaller site options would increase the proportion of the site which consists of previously developed land.

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

Neither the promoter's site or any of the specific site options consulted on are included in the plan but a site for 8,000 to 9,000 homes is allocated for residential development on a site similar to site option 2 (Policy SS/5). See separate proforma for the allocated site (site 231a).

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

<b>Proforma Created</b>	August 2013
<b>Proforma Last Updated</b>	August 2013 (based upon the July 2012 SHLAA proforma for site 231 for up to 12,750 dwellings and incorporating more recent information that informed the allocation of the site in the proposed Submission Local Plan including information from the Sustainability Appraisal and audit trail.
<b>Location</b>	New Settlement (Waterbeach Parish)
<b>Site name / address</b>	Land north of Waterbeach
<b>Category of site:</b>	A new settlement. Council's proposed site as a variation of promoter's site (site 231).
<b>Description of promoter's proposal</b>	Mixed use new community comprising 8,000 to 9,000 dwellings forming a new town to the north of Waterbeach village, with employment, town centre, local centres, education, sports facilities, new train station and bus interchanges, a segregated bus route to Cambridge, and public open space and including an appropriate setting for the Denny Abbey Scheduled Monument and village separation.
<b>Site area (hectares)</b>	Major Development Site 407.3 ha. Area within the Area Action Plan boundary 578 ha.
<b>Site Number</b>	231a - Council variation of site 231
<b>Site description &amp; context</b>	A flat site to the immediate north of Waterbeach comprising Waterbeach Barracks and a disused airfield, large arable fields and farms, a golf course, rough grassland, scattered woodland and water features. Denny Abbey sits within the north western corner of the site. A Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) sits within the south eastern corner of the site. The A10 runs down its western flank and beyond it is the Cambridge Research Park. The railway line between Cambridge and Ely runs down its eastern flank. Site boundaries are sometimes hedged with scattered trees.
<b>Current or last use of the site</b>	Military Barracks / Agriculture
<b>Is the site Previously Developed Land?</b>	Yes in part.

<b>Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan?</b>	None
<b>Planning history</b>	<p>2007. The Core Strategy Inspectors Report found there was no justification at the present time for the Core Strategy to identify Waterbeach as a location for a second new settlement, nor to include a more general reference to an additional settlement.</p> <p>2003. The Structure Plan Examination in Public Panel Report – Concerning a new settlement at Waterbeach it states that “were the transport obstacles capable of being overcome at some point in the future and particularly if the rail shuttle could be implemented, we are satisfied that Waterbeach would be a good location for a development contributing to the longer term growth of the Sub-Region”.</p> <p>“However, should a second new settlement be required to meet the development requirements of the Cambridge Sub-Region, either towards the end of the Plan period or, more likely, beyond 2016, we would regard Waterbeach as the most sustainable of the locations we have examined at the EIP.”</p> <p>“We are satisfied on the information before us that within this Structure Plan period (to 2016) a second new settlement is unlikely to be needed. The strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region has identified sufficient capacity, based on RPG6 projections, to cope with housing requirements up to 2016 and for some years beyond. The only circumstances in which a further requirement might arise would be if it emerged that Cambridge Airport was unlikely to become available in the foreseeable future. In these circumstances we are in no doubt that a second new settlement would be the next most sustainable solution for a major development once capacity in other locations identified in the Structure Plan is exhausted”.</p> <p>1991. Planning application S/3099/88/O for 1,500 dwellings, employment, open space and retail on a site to the north of but partially overlapping with this site. Appeal dismissed in 1991 alongside other new settlement sites on the A10 corridor. The reasons for this site being refused permission being largely an inability to demonstrate safe access arrangements onto the A10 and impact on the setting of Denny Abbey.</p>
<b>Source of site</b>	Council variation of the site proposed through the Call for Sites (site 231).

<b>Tier 1: Strategic Considerations</b>	
<b>Green Belt</b>	The site is not within the Green Belt.
<b>Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone – very small pockets of land around the boundaries lie within flood zones 2 and 3.</li> <li>• Scheduled Monument - Denny Abbey is designated as a Scheduled Monument. The development of this site has the potential to have a significant impact on the setting of Denny Abbey and its surrounding landscape (Scheduled Monument Number 13219). English Heritage comment that development here may impact on the setting of Denny Abbey, a scheduled monument which draws considerable significance from the long views and relative isolation of its setting.</li> <li>• Listed Buildings – English Heritage comment that Waterbeach Barracks has some historic interest, although the buildings on the site are not recognised through designations.</li> <li>• Minerals and Waste LDF designations – large parts of the site are subject to sand and gravel safeguarding. Safeguarding is intended to ensure that mineral resources are adequately taken into account in land use planning decisions. It does not automatically preclude other forms of development taking place, but flags up the presence of economic mineral so that it is considered, and not unknowingly or needlessly sterilised.</li> </ul> <p>RLW Estates have submitted a document entitled 'A Vision for Denny Abbey' which sets out the mitigation that is proposed for the Abbey as a result of the proposed new community of Denny St Francis. Mitigation is to be achieved through taking a masterplan approach to minimise heritage impacts, appropriate screening and landscaping, the transfer of land to English Heritage or the Farmland Museum to form a substantial landscaped area surrounding the Abbey, and funding to create an appropriate landscape setting and for its ongoing management. English Heritage have commented that the siting and design of development, together with compensatory measures can reduce the degree of damage to the setting of the Abbey. The section of Car Dyke running along part of the western boundary is unscheduled unlike portions to the north west and south of the site, but is of interest, and should be preserved in any development. Overall there is scope to mitigate identified impacts. Detailed examination of the boundary of the Major Development Site has ensured the protection of a significant landscape setting to the south and east of Denny Abbey.</p>

<b>Tier 1 conclusion:</b>	A flat site to the immediate north of Waterbeach comprising Waterbeach Barracks and a disused airfield, large arable fields and farms, a golf course, rough grassland, scattered woodland and water features. Denny Abbey sits within the north western corner of the site. A Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) sits within the south eastern corner of the site. Not subject to strategic considerations which may make the site unsuitable for development other than impact on the setting of Denny Abbey which appear to be capable of mitigation.
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	Yes

**Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations**

<b>Designations and Constraints</b>	
<b>Heritage considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation Area – Southern tip of the site lies close to the village Conservation Area (CA). Potential for adverse effect on the CA due to intensification of use and loss of green open spaces at entrance on approach to village and CA.</li> <li>• Listed Buildings - Partly surrounds LBs at Denny Abbey, including Abbey (Grade I) and Refectory (Grade I). Potential for major adverse effect on settings due to obscuring significant views to and from group and loss of functional countryside context. A survey of the significance of former airfield buildings and site is incomplete but the site surrounds recently designated LBs. Potential for major adverse effect on setting due to obscuring significant views to and from the buildings and loss of functional context.</li> <li>• Non-statutory archaeological site - The site's western boundaries are formed by the Carr Dyke and associated Roman road, and Roman settlement remains are also likely to survive in the area.</li> </ul> <p>There is potential to mitigate impacts. The site proposer has submitted a report which sets out a strategy for the protection and enhancement of the setting of Denny Abbey which has been considered in the Tier 1 part of this assessment.</p> <p>Detailed examination of the boundary within which built development should be located (for the Local Plan) ensures the protection of a significant landscape setting to the south and east of Denny Abbey.</p>

<p><b>Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Rights of Way – Byway to eastern part of site primarily running north-south connecting Waterbeach to New Farm.</li> <li>• Presence of protected species – Due to the range of habitats currently found in this site an impact would be upon a range of species. The site is currently subject to a low level of human disturbance. The site contains some populations of plants unrecorded elsewhere within the county. Any development of this large site would require extensive ecological investigation (possibly over several years) as part of the EIA process. Opportunity for habitat linkage/enhancement/restoration balanced by threats to existing features.</li> <li>• Agricultural land of high grade – majority of site is classified as Grade 2, with some Grade 3. Airfield is unclassified.</li> </ul> <p>The loss of agricultural land cannot be mitigated.</p>
<p><b>Physical considerations?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land contamination – This site has a number of potential sources of contamination- previous military land, areas of filled ground, a sewerage works and also adjacent to railway line and landfill. This would require investigation which should be carried out at a pre-app stage, not dealt with by condition. A Study submitted by the proposer identifies possible contamination and states that mitigation measures may be required if the site is redeveloped. These could include: on-site remediation, removal of contaminated material off-site or on-site and the breaking of possible linkages to human receptors</li> <li>• Air quality issues - Despite this proposal not being adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area, it is of a significant size and therefore there is a potential for an increase in traffic and static emissions that could affect local air quality. More information is required for this location, particularly details for air quality assessment and a low emission strategy.</li> <li>• Noise issues – Parts of the site will be subject to significant levels of noise from traffic on the A10 to the west and from train operation to the east. A noise assessment will be required to quantify noise impacts and consider noise attenuation measures. Residential could be acceptable with a high level of mitigation: combination of appropriate distance separation, careful orientation / positioning / design / internal layout of buildings, noise insulation and extensive noise attenuation measures.</li> <li>• Other environmental conditions – land at the south eastern corner of the site is affected by odour from the existing waste water treatment works (WWTW) on the site. Part of the site is currently within a WWTW safeguarding Area of the Cambridgeshire &amp; Peterborough Minerals and Waste LDF. Core Strategy policy CS31 establishes a presumption against allowing development that would be occupied by people because of the impact on amenity caused by offensive odours from the site. Where new development is proposed it must be accompanied by an odour assessment report. Similar considerations would apply</li> </ul>

	<p>to the proposed replacement WWTW which is mentioned in the proposers supporting statement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utility services (e.g. pylons) – Sewers cross the site.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Townscape and landscape impact?</b></p>	<p>The proposed development lies in the Fens Landscape character area. The landscape is largely flat and open. The area is influenced by long views to the fenland, the urban edge of Cambridge and the chalk hills to the south east and the rivers Ouse and Cam and their associated flood defences. The field pattern is regular and generally of large and very large fields, separated by ditches, drainage channels and intermittent hedges, which together with shelter belts and occasional pockets of woodland often combine to form a vegetated horizon.</p> <p>The north, and particularly the east boundaries offer very extensive views into the site and to the surrounding landscapes. Denny Abbey is a prominent visible feature to the north of the site, while to the east and west are long views over the fens to the chalk hills west and south west of Cambridge and to the Isle of Ely and its Cathedral to the north. The north and east of the site are deeply rural, quiet and tranquil. The landscape is defined by old and ancient features – lines of pollarded willows and old oaks following drainage canals and old hedgerows, a relatively detailed local field pattern, raised byways and tracks, and wide views to historical features. To the south some large buildings and housing developments associated with the barracks are visible.</p> <p>The proposed development in its proposed scale and form will have an adverse effect on the local and wider landscape. Very long views are available to and from the site from high ground (the Stretham – Haddenham ridge to the north, chalk hills to the south and east and more local fen views) and a development of the proposed scale will form the dominant feature in many of these views, which are currently wide and almost entirely rural. More locally large scale development will affect the local villages of Waterbeach and Chittering, and will have some impact on the settings of the local historic monuments, listed buildings and the local mature, rural fenland landscape character, although these impacts have been mitigated by setting back the northern boundary of development away from Denny Abbey and by requiring strategic landscaping to maintain the village character of Waterbeach.</p> <p>The Local Plan proposal and site boundary provides for built development to be restricted to the middle and south of the site allowing for effective separation from Denny Abbey to protect its setting and historic significance and to retain existing open views to the east from the Abbey. The effect of this has been to reduce the housing capacity of the site to between 8,000 and 9,000 dwellings from the 10,500 dwellings sought by the proposer. Large buildings currently exist on the site and it can be seen that development of a</p>

	similar scale could be accommodated in some locations.
<b>Can any issues be mitigated?</b>	There is potential to mitigate impacts which are reflected in the Major Development Site included in the Local Plan. Development would create the opportunity for habitat linkage/enhancement/restoration. It should be possible to mitigate noise, land contamination, and malodour issues successfully. Loss of agricultural land cannot be mitigated. It would be very difficult to integrate a development of the proposed scale into the local landscape without some adverse impact on the local landscape but this impact has been minimised by setting the edge of built development well to the south of Denny Abbey to protect its setting and the protection of views out from it to the east and by Local Plan measures to maintain the village character of Waterbeach.

<b>Infrastructure</b>	
<b>Highways access?</b>	<p>Regarding SHLAA sites in the Milton/ Waterbeach area the Highways Agency comment that the vast majority of this grouping consists of the barracks site as a new settlement with the remainder essentially in-fill sites. On the whole, the in-fill sites are less likely to present an unacceptable pressure on the A14 given the majority of travel demand will be focused on Cambridge and credible alternatives to car travel could be available.</p> <p>Early approaches by the promoters of the Waterbeach barracks site have indicated their recognition of the extensive transport challenges they face. They have indicated the need for a substantial package of measures, both highway and sustainable transport, to make this site work. There is also scope for substantial internalisation within such a site. The biggest impacts of this site are likely to relate to routes to Cambridge rather than the strategic road network (SRN).</p> <p>The County Council's original comments were that all development proposals of this scale will need to be backed by a Transport Assessment and supporting Travel Plans. Any Transport Assessment will need to be based on analysis undertaken using the Cambridge Sub-Region Model developed and managed by Cambridgeshire County Council. Detailed mitigation measures and the identification of appropriate financial contributions and obligations under Section 106 will be identified based on the appraisal of the Transport Assessment for each site. The comments provide an overview of the headline transport issues for the site, and should not be regarded as a definitive list of transport requirements. Potential for around 108,375 daily trips (based on SCATP trip rates). Cambridgeshire LTP3 and Cambridge Area Transport Strategy will need to be taken into account. Direct impact on the A10 and A14 Trunk Roads. A10 capacity problems (single carriageway road – likely to require upgrading to dual carriageway between Waterbeach and A14). A14 capacity problems and A10 / A14 junction capacity</p>

	<p>issues – outcome of Highways Agency A14 study likely to be critical. Promoter proposes new train station on the Ely to Cambridge railway line – potential timetabling and capacity issues on this line would need to be checked. No major enhancements planned in the Network Rail, Route Utilisation Strategy. Opportunity to strengthen bus services on corridor between Waterbeach and Cambridge by a rapid service alongside the A10 with potential to link into CGB at Science Park. Opportunities to link to existing walking and cycle routes (such as NCN11) into Cambridge and other key sites such as Science Park. Potential requirement to enhance Park and Ride site on A10 at Milton to provide greater capacity. A10 corridor will need to be considered – capacity constraints at the A14 Junction and along corridor into Cambridge will need to be addressed. Reliance on A10 for access – limited local network to provide alternative options.</p> <p>The County Council consolidated and confirmed its approach towards development on the Ely to Cambridge Transport Corridor in its Draft Transport Strategy 2013 which provides for a new town to the north of Waterbeach and which models the transport impacts of development proposals. The measures include: a Park and Ride site, capacity improvements on the A10, capacity improvements to the A10/A14 junction, a relocated railway station with more frequent services handling longer trains with greater passenger capacity, a busway between the new town and north Cambridge and cycling improvements. The transport modelling work concludes that development locations should maximise sustainable travel alternatives to the car, particularly by providing high quality public transport. New Settlement locations are better suited to delivering the necessary infrastructure to encourage travel by non-car modes than dispersed village options.</p> <p>In July 2013 a package of roadworks to the A14 were announced which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widening of the Cambridge Northern Bypass between Milton and Girton and enhancement of the Girton Interchange;</li> <li>• Provision of high standard roads for local traffic use running in parallel to an enhanced A14 carriageway between Girton and the area near the current Trinity Foot A14 junction;</li> <li>• Construction of a bypass to the south of Huntingdon between the area near Trinity Foot and the A1, at both ends tying in with the existing A14.</li> </ul> <p>Construction is currently planned to start in 2016.</p>
--	---

<p><b>Utility services?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity - Existing Primary substation at Landbeach could support this development. Could compromise capacity available at Histon grid required to support other major developments such as Northstowe. Network reinforcement required. The supporting statement from the proposer refers to their intention to implement a sustainable energy strategy for the site potentially including wind, solar PV and biomass fuelled combined heat and power.</li> <li>• Mains water – The site falls within the Cambridge distribution zone of the Cambridge Water Company (CWC), within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within the Cambridge distribution zone to supply the total number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and/or a new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</li> <li>• Gas – Waterbeach is connected to the national gas grid. A development of this scale would require substantial network reinforcement.</li> <li>• Mains sewerage - The WWTW on site has capacity but will require new consent limits and major capital expenditure to accommodate this proposed development site. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a developer impact assessment will be required to ascertain the required upgrades, if any. This assessment and any mitigation required will be funded by the developer. The developers supporting statement refers to the provision of a new WWTW to the east of the site beyond the railway line on land in their control.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Drainage measures?</b></p>	<p>A drainage strategy has been submitted, which aims to ensure no additional runoff from the development than existing by the use of sustainable drainage systems.</p>

<p><b>School capacity?</b></p>	<p>Waterbeach has one primary school with a PAN of 60 and school capacity of 420, and lies within the catchment of Cottenham Village College with a PAN of 180 and school capacity of 900 children. County Council Education officer's have commented that a development of this size (a development of around 10,000 homes was assumed at the time the comments were made) will need to be self-contained in terms of mitigating the impact of development. However, it is not appropriate to consider it in total isolation and the impact and integration of the existing Waterbeach school and community will need to be considered. The development of a new town would require changes to the current pattern of secondary school provision. Therefore, this allocation, if made, should be supported by a clear planning policy framework requiring education provision in the New Town to be planned to include and accommodate the existing community in addition to the new community from the outset. For a development of this scale a significant number of new primary schools will be required. It is likely that provision similar to that proposed at Northstowe would be required. The final size of the new secondary school would need to be linked closely to the housing mix and tenure of any development proposals. These are not formal County Council comments at this stage.</p>
<p><b>Health facilities capacity?</b></p>	<p>The existing Medical Practice in Waterbeach could be extended to serve early residents from development at Waterbeach. A number of new Medical Practices would need to be established to provide for the on-going health care needs of a new settlement of the scale proposed.</p>
<p><b>Any other issues?</b></p>	<p>None</p>
<p><b>Can issues be mitigated?</b></p>	<p>The provision of utilities, schools, health and transport infrastructure for a development of this size in this location will be significant. It is not possible to undertake a detailed review of the viability of the largest new settlement proposals. Waterbeach new town is proposed for delivery from 2026 to well beyond the emerging plan period and will need ongoing and detailed review and monitoring of its capacity to deliver growth and associated infrastructure over a long time span through varying market cycles. Like Northstowe, developer funding is likely to need to be supplemented from other funding sources during the lifetime of the development e.g. City Deal.</p>
<p><b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b></p>	<p>Yes.</p>

### Tier 3: Site Specific Factors

<b>Capacity</b>									
<b>Developable area</b>	The major development site comprises 407.3 ha of land that could be potentially available for development taking into account its analysis of the area to be protected from development to provide an appropriate setting for Denny Abbey. However, the built area of the town within the major development site will be established through an Area Action Plan. Masterplanning of the new town and strategic landscaping requirements and the range of uses required will affect the area available for residential development.								
<b>Site capacity</b>	<p>8,000 to 9,000 dwellings.</p> <p>As a high level confirmation of capacity, the Council's formula for large sites over 50 hectares identified in the SHLAA can be used. This applies a gross to net residential area of 40%, which allows for all non-residential uses and substantial strategic landscaping in the remaining 60%. On this basis the formula can be applied to the wider Area Action Plan area included in the Local Plan.</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">Area Action Plan</td> <td style="text-align: right;">578 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">Net developable area (i.e. net residential area)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">231 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">Total dwellings @ 35 dwellings per hectare (net)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">8,085</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">Total dwellings @ 40 dwellings per hectare (net)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">9,248</td> </tr> </table>	Area Action Plan	578 ha	Net developable area (i.e. net residential area)	231 ha	Total dwellings @ 35 dwellings per hectare (net)	8,085	Total dwellings @ 40 dwellings per hectare (net)	9,248
Area Action Plan	578 ha								
Net developable area (i.e. net residential area)	231 ha								
Total dwellings @ 35 dwellings per hectare (net)	8,085								
Total dwellings @ 40 dwellings per hectare (net)	9,248								
<b>Density</b>	Average net residential density across the new town of 40 dph. Densities will vary across the whole site with higher densities in the settlement centre and lower densities around the settlement edge.								

<b>Potential Suitability</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The site is potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints.

<b>Availability</b>	
<b>Is the land in single ownership?</b>	No
<b>Site ownership status?</b>	Two organisations effectively own or control the land making up the site, RLW Estates and the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO). No known ownership constraints.
<b>Legal constraints?</b>	The Ministry of Defence (MoD) part of the site is subject to application of the Crichel Down Rules. In brief these can require certain lands to be offered back to the original owner or their successors at current market value. RLW estates do not consider this represents a constraint on development.

<b>Is there market interest in the site?</b>	<p>RLW Estates has developed a delivery model that it says will enable effective implementation of the scheme.</p> <p>DIO have confirmed availability of the MoD site for housing-led development.</p>
<b>When would the site be available for development?</b>	The promoter has indicated that the site is available immediately.

<b>Achievability</b>	
<b>Phasing and delivery of the development</b>	Based upon experience of the development of large scale new settlements at Cambourne and Northstowe the Council considers there will be a significant lead-in time for such a major development. The Local Plan assumes housing completions towards the end of the plan period commencing in 2026/27 with 1,400 dwellings completed by 2031 and extending well beyond 2031.
<b>Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	None known
<b>Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	Infrastructure requirements, especially off-site.
<b>Could issues identified be overcome?</b>	Infrastructure requirements are capable of being overcome subject to their cost and timing. The Council will explore the extent to which infrastructure requirements can be supported by the development of the site directly and the scope for external funding sources to contribute such as City Deal.
<b>Economic viability?</b>	For strategic scale sites (new settlements and large urban extensions) much depends upon the extent, cost and phasing of the infrastructure to be funded by the development, the amount of housing that can actually be accommodated on site, and the timing of its provision in relation to that of the accompanying infrastructure.

<b>Site Assessment Conclusion</b>
-----------------------------------

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

<b>Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013</b>
--

Allocated for residential development (Policy SS/5).
--

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

<b>Proforma Created</b>	July 2012
<b>Proforma Last Updated</b>	August 2013
<b>Location</b>	Bourn
<b>Site name / address</b>	Bourn Airfield, Bourn
<b>Category of site:</b>	A new settlement
<b>Description of promoter's proposal</b>	Expansion of Cambourne to provide a new neighbourhood of up to 3,000 dwellings with education, employment, social and community facilities, shops and services, public open space, with high quality public transport (including potential Park & Ride)
<b>Site area (hectares)</b>	141.7 ha.
<b>Site Number</b>	238
<b>Site description &amp; context</b>	The site lies to the west of the settlements of Highfields and Caldecote, immediately south of the A428 trunk road (linking Cambridge with Bedford), to the north of the small settlement of Bourn, and to the east of the new settlement of Cambourne. By virtue of the historic use of the site as an airfield it is essentially devoid of natural vegetation and accordingly is very open in nature. The only developed parts on the site comprise aircraft hangers, industrial buildings and outside storage areas.
<b>Current or last use of the site</b>	Civil Aviation Authority Licensed Airfield for pilot training and private aircraft/storage/markets/agriculture
<b>Is the site Previously Developed Land?</b>	Yes, partly
<b>Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan?</b>	No
<b>Planning history</b>	Bourn Airfield was constructed for Bomber Command in 1940 as a satellite airfield for nearby Oakington. The airfield remained in RAF hands until being passed on to Maintenance Command in 1947. By 1948 the station was closed. The last sections were sold off for agricultural use in 1961.

	<p>2004, Local Plan – not included as a potential housing site</p> <p>2007, Local Development Framework – not included as a potential housing site</p> <p>Planning applications There have been a number of planning applications for creating a new settlement on this site. The last one was refused in 1994 (S/0144/94/O) which was for 3,000 dwellings. In 1992 a new settlement comprising 3,000 dwellings, industrial development, shopping and leisure facilities, education, social and recreation facilities was proposed (S/1635/92/O and S/1636/92/O). In 1989 a new settlement comprising of 3,000 dwellings was refused to include 50 acre business park, district shopping centre with superstore, community facilities, leisure facilities (including swimming pool and golf course), landscaping, public open space, community nature reserve drain (S/1109/89/O).</p> <p>There have been over the years a number of planning applications on the site for buildings and uses relating to its use as an airfield. In 1998 part of the main runway was given approval for use as open storage of dies (S/0225/98/F).</p>
<b>Source of site</b>	Site suggested through call for sites

<b>Tier 1: Strategic Considerations</b>	
<b>Green Belt</b>	The site is not within the Green Belt.
<b>Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development?</b>	No
<b>Tier 1 conclusion:</b>	The site lies to the west of the settlements of Highfields and Caldecote, immediately south of the A428 to the north of the small settlement of Bourn, and to the east of the new settlement of Cambourne. By virtue of the historic use of the site as an airfield it is essentially devoid of natural vegetation and accordingly is very open in nature. The only developed parts on the site comprise aircraft hangers, industrial buildings and outside storage areas.
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	Yes

## Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations

<b>Designations and Constraints</b>	
<b>Heritage considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-statutory archaeological site – Excavations to the north and west have identified extensive evidence of late prehistoric and Roman settlement. There is also evidence for Roman burials within the airfield. Further information would be necessary in advance of any planning application for this site.</li> <li>• Setting of Listed Buildings. Adverse effect on open rural functional setting of Listed Building – Great Common Farmhouse 79 Broadway (Grade II) of development along western edge beyond runway. Adverse effect on open rural functional setting of Listed Buildings – barns to the north of The Grange (Grade II) along south-western edge beyond runway. Possible reduced site within north and east of indicated area.</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tree Preservation Orders –TPO present in hedge lines throughout the site with a significant woodland in the south east boundary (just off site).</li> <li>• Public Rights of Way – no public rights of way across the site or immediately adjoining it.</li> <li>• Biodiversity features - Greatest impact likely to be as a result of loosing grassland habitats currently found within the airfield strips. Great crested newts are known to be in the vicinity and may also be adversely affected.</li> <li>• Agricultural land of high grade - Agricultural Land Classifications Grade 2 (majority of northern section) and 3 (quarter of southern section)</li> </ul>
<b>Physical considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land contamination – this site is previously military land/airfield and will require investigation. This can be dealt with by condition.</li> <li>• Air quality issues – Despite this proposal not being adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area, it is of a significant size and therefore, there is a potential for an increase in traffic and static emissions that could affect local air quality. More information is required for this location, particularly details for air quality assessment and a low emission strategy.</li> <li>• Noise issues – East of the site is bounded by an Industrial estate on Bourn Airfield with medium to large sized industrial type units / uses including industrial and warehouse type uses. The Environmental Health Service has had to take enforcement action in the past due to statutory noise and odour nuisances caused to existing residential premises. The proposal would bring sensitive premises closer if the industrial units were to remain. These are unlikely to be considered compatible uses. Noise from activities and vehicular movements are material considerations with significant negative impact potential in terms of health and well being and a poor quality living environment and possible noise nuisance. Current noise has not been</li> </ul>

	<p>quantified. If noise is an issue it is unlikely that mitigation measures on the proposed development site alone can provide an acceptable ambient noise environment. Noise insulation / mitigation abatement measures could be required off-site at the industrial units but there is uncertain as to whether these would be effective. Such mitigation measures are likely to require the full cooperation of the business operators and section 106 planning / obligation requirements may be required and there are no guarantees that these can be secured. Without mitigation any detrimental economic impact on existing businesses should also be considered prior to allocation.</p> <p>Environmental Health in July 2012 objected to this site and before any consideration is given to allocating this site for residential development it is recommended that these noise and odour constraints are thoroughly investigated and duly considered / addressed by undertaking odour and noise impact / risk assessments and consideration is given to possible on or off site mitigation in accordance with PPG 24 Planning and Noise and associated guidance and viability. Noise issues - The North of the site is bounded by the busy A428. Traffic noise will need assessment in accordance with PPG 24 and associated guidance. The impact of existing noise on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well-being and providing a high quality living environment. However residential use is likely to be acceptable with careful noise mitigation. Noise likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises.</p> <p>Noise issues - The North of the site is bounded by the busy A428. Traffic noise will need assessment in accordance with PPG 24 and associated guidance. The impact of existing noise on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well-being and providing a high quality living environment. However residential use is likely to be acceptable with careful noise mitigation. Noise likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topography issues – not significant, generally a level site</li> </ul>
<p><b>Townscape and landscape impact?</b></p>	<p>Given the design principles behind the existing development at Cambourne there will be a substantial landscape buffer (and Broadway) between Cambourne and the proposed development, and so presenting the two as a continuous settlement in the landscape and linking the two may prove difficult.</p> <p>However, the landscape impacts would be reduced due to the level terrain, the lack of higher land locally with views to the site, and the screening effect of mature hedgerows and woodlands and developing woodlands surrounding the site and lining many of the local roads and rights of way.</p> <p>As Cambourne has developed in the form of three distinct linked</p>

	<p>communities (Lower, Great and Upper Cambourne) it is likely that any development on this site would follow a similar pattern. Whilst linked with Cambourne, it is likely that it would need to appear settled in the landscape, with distinct, rural separation between Upper Cambourne and Highfields. This will require substantial landscape buffers between the settlements and a carefully designed structural landscape within the new development. For enough separation space between the villages, and to retain a village scale of building, it may be necessary to reduce dwelling numbers from those proposed.</p>
<p><b>Can any issues be mitigated?</b></p>	<p>It should be possible to partly mitigate the adverse impact on the setting of listed buildings near the site by having a reduced development towards the northern edge and in the south western part of the site.</p> <p>It may not be possible to mitigate the noise from adjoining industrial uses by noise insulation and abatement measures since it is uncertain whether it would be effective. Environmental Health in July 2012 objected to the allocation of this site for housing.</p> <p>The mitigation of noise from the A428 and from traffic generated on the site could be mitigated by careful design and consideration of the layout and numbers of houses and density.</p> <p>To mitigate the impact of this extension to Cambourne it will be necessary to have enough separation space between Upper Cambourne and Highfields, and to retain a village scale of building to reduce dwelling numbers from those proposed.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Infrastructure</b></p>	
<p><b>Highways access?</b></p>	<p>The Highways Agency has advised that development on sites along the A428 corridor is likely to be largely Cambridge-centric but St Neots is also likely to attract a significant amount of trips. For instance rail connectivity via St Neots is likely to be an attractive alternative to Cambridge. Even a modest residual demand between these sites and St Neots could be critical.</p> <p>Conversely, there is some scope for these large sites to enhance the overall transport sustainability of Cambourne and other local settlements through better integration, with the potential to offset some of the new demand. The capacity to accommodate new development on this corridor is directly related to this scope, which will need to be demonstrated by the promoters.</p> <p>Highway Authority comments – Transport Assessment and modelling requirements – Potential for around 29,750 daily trips (based on SCATP trip rates). Requirement for transport modelling using the Cambridge Sub-Regional Model (CSRМ) to consider wider strategic impact. Full Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plans (TP) for</p>

	<p>residential, schools and employment sites required.</p> <p>Strategic Transport Issues - Cambridgeshire LTP3 sets out the transport strategy. Direct access to A428 Trunk Road (Cambridge – St. Neots – Bedford) via grade separated junction. Potential impact on junctions at either end of A428 (M11 Junction 14 and A1198 roundabout). No rail access.</p> <p>Local Transport Issues - Poor access to services by walking, although potential to create cycle corridor to Cambourne (West) and Cambridge (East – via Highfields and Coton) with suitable new and improved provision.</p> <p>Opportunity to strengthen bus services on corridor between Cambourne and Cambridge (Service 4) through appropriate enhancement of capacity.</p> <p>Madingley Park and Ride capacity may need upgrading.</p>
<p><b>Utility services?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity – Likely to require system reinforcement</li> <li>• Mains water – Cambridge Water Company advise that there is insufficient spare capacity within Bourn Reservoir Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties. Spare capacity will be allocated on a first come first served basis. To increase the capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and/or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</li> <li>• Gas – Cambourne benefits from a gas supply and it may be possible to link into this.</li> <li>• Mains sewerage – ‘Red’ – Major Constraints to Provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth. WwTW: The Bourn works is operating at capacity and will require new consent limits and major capital expenditure to accommodate the proposed development site. Network: The sewerage network is operating at capacity and will require a developer impact assessment to ascertain the required upgrades. This assessment and any mitigation required will be funded by the developer.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Drainage measures?</b></p>	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment is required, together with a comprehensive water management plan.</p> <p>The Middle Level Commissioners Internal Drainage Board are concerned should the foul sewage effluent from any other development areas be intended to be directed to the Uttons Drove STW and discharged into the Swavesey Drain catchment. Issues have arisen with such discharges and their effect on the Drain and the standard of protection provided to its catchment. At this stage, therefore, the Board must raise and record its concerns relating to the site.</p>

<p><b>School capacity?</b> (Updated August 2013)</p>	<p>Early Years education:</p> <p>The levels of housing development would indicate that additional Early Years settings would be required to meet the demand arising from development. This possibly could be provided along with additional primary school accommodation. However, this may not always be possible and alternative approaches to enable sufficient Childcare and Early Years provision to be commissioned, may therefore need to be considered during the planning of new housing. This additional accommodation would not necessarily need to be specifically for Early Years and Childcare provision, with opportunities for co-locating and/or sharing community facilities being explored wherever possible.</p> <p>Primary education:</p> <p>Bourn Church of England Primary School, Riddy Lane, Bourn has a PAN of 22 and school capacity of 154 spaces. Caldecote Primary School, Highfields Road, Highfields Caldecote has a PAN of 30 and school capacity of 210 spaces. In Cambourne, Jeavons Wood Primary School, Eastgate, Cambourne has a PAN of 60 and 420 spaces. The figures are the same for the two other primary schools in the village, namely, Monkfield Park Primary School, School Lane, Cambourne and The Vine Inter-Church Primary School, The Vines, Cambourne. This totals 180 PAN and 1260 spaces. Surplus capacity of spaces at these schools in Cambourne is currently 21 places.</p> <p>Associated school places and early years placed has not been calculated as the figure is not known, however, an estimate would be a requirement for 4FE primary school to meet the needs arising from it. These could be incorporated into the development site.</p> <p>Secondary education:</p> <p>The site falls within the catchment of Comberton Village Cottage (CVC). CVC is a 10FE (1500 places) school, and current forecasts predict that the CVC will be at maximum capacity of 1500 places for 11-16 year olds by September 2013 – accordingly there is no capacity at this college.</p> <p>A resolution to approve a new Village College/Secondary School on land to the west of Cambourne was given in January 2012. This school, which is planned to open in September 2013, will be a 5 FE 750-place facility. There is also sufficient land for further extension of the secondary school or provision of sixth form facilities, if required, subject to the necessary planning permissions and funding. Accordingly, this facility could potentially meet some of the secondary school place requirements from development of this site. However, this will very much dependent on whether or not any of the other</p>
--	--

	promoted sites are taken forward i.e. Land West of Cambourne.
<b>Health facilities capacity?</b>	Further growth will require a new facility.  Existing facility: Monkfield Medical Practice, Sackville Way, Great Cambourne – extension planned for extra 950 homes. Would need new facility to meet further growth.
<b>Any other issues?</b>	The County Council advises that new settlements, large extensions to the urban area and large areas of previously developed land such as airfields (Bourn Airfield falls into this category) are to be considered to be Strategic Development Sites. Core Strategy Policy CS18 (Waste Management Outside Allocated Areas) requires all strategic development to make provision for permanent waste management. The scale and nature of arisings, site specific circumstances and the proximity and nature of other waste management facilities are factors in determining the type of waste management facility/facilities that should be provided. This provision will be in addition to that required under Policy CS16 (Household Waste Recycling Centres) as this requirement relates to facilities which would process or recycle waste, rather than provision for waste collection and transfer.  New settlements, in particular, may be appropriate locations for the development of combined heat and power for associated industrial and residential development.
<b>Can issues be mitigated?</b>	Yes

<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	Yes
--	-----

**Tier 3: Site Specific Factors**

<b>Capacity</b>	
<b>Developable area</b> (Updated August 2013)	To be determined through Masterplanning. Note that the reference to a developable area of 56.68 ha in previous SHLAA proformas was the result of the application to the SHLAA site boundary of a gross to net residential site formula used for the majority of SHLAA sites. However as set out in the SHLAA report, for sites over 100 ha we would follow the dwelling capacity figures proposed in the Call for Sites questionnaires. A developable area figure should not have been included.
<b>Site capacity</b>	3,000
<b>Density</b>	40dph

<b>Potential Suitability</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The site is potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints.

<b>Availability</b>	
<b>Is the land in single ownership?</b>	Yes
<b>Site ownership status?</b>	Landowner
<b>Legal constraints?</b>	Not known
<b>Is there market interest in the site?</b>	Not known
<b>When would the site be available for development?</b>	Site is available immediately

<b>Achievability</b>	
<b>Phasing and delivery of the development</b>	The promoter has indicated that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first dwellings could be completed on site 2011-16</li> <li>• Development period (assuming 400 per year, 9 years for 3,500 dwellings, or based on 2,267 dwellings, 6 years)</li> </ul>
<b>Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	No.
<b>Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b> (Updated August 2013)	No, although there is potential for areas of contamination, as the site is previously military land/airfield. There will be significant infrastructure costs to provide improvements to the existing road network/create new links to A428, and to upgrade/increase capacity to the Bourn STW.
<b>Could issues identified be overcome?</b>	Yes
<b>Economic viability?</b>	For strategic scale sites (new settlements and large urban extensions) much depends upon the extent, cost and phasing of the

	<p>infrastructure to be funded by the development, the amount of housing that can actually be accommodated on site, and the timing of its provision in relation to that of the accompanying infrastructure. Such variables are currently unknown or unclear and so the viability of such sites cannot be appraised at this time.</p>
--	--

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

<b>Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013</b>	
<p>This proposal for 3,000 dwellings has not been allocated but the same site has been allocated for 3,500 dwellings (Policy SS/6), see site 057.</p>	

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

<b>Proforma Created</b>	July 2012
<b>Proforma Last Updated</b>	August 2013
<b>Location</b>	New Settlement (Longstanton Parish)
<b>Site name / address</b>	Land north west of B1050, Station Road, Longstanton (Northstowe Reserve)
<b>Category of site:</b>	A new settlement
<b>Description of promoter's proposal</b>	To form an extension to the new town of Northstowe, residential development comprising approximately 900 dwellings with employment, retail, community uses, commercial uses and public open space
<b>Site area (hectares)</b>	56.08 ha.
<b>Site Number</b>	242
<b>Site description &amp; context</b>	The site is located to the north of the village of Longstanton on the B1050, which heads northwards into Willingham. Its northern boundary abuts the route of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway. It is primarily agricultural land with the B1050 bypass running through it to the south and developed land including buildings to the north-eastern part of the site adjacent the B1050. The land abuts the core site of the new town of Northstowe and is identified in the Northstowe Area Action Plan 2007 (NAAP) as forming the strategic reserve land under policy NS/3/g.
<b>Current or last use of the site</b>	Mainly farming and other business uses
<b>Is the site Previously Developed Land?</b>	The majority of the land is undeveloped though there is an established business and yard to the north, which is accessed off the B1050.
<b>Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan?</b>	Allocated for development. See policy NS/3/1/g of the adopted NAAP.
<b>Planning history</b>	2004, Local Plan – not included as a potential housing site.  2007, Local Development Framework (Core Strategy) – ST/2 Housing Provision – Northstowe identified as a location for future housing development.

	2007, Northstowe Area Action Plan – identified as part of the strategic reserve land.  No previous planning applications for any large scale residential development.
<b>Source of site</b>	Site suggested through call for sites

<b>Tier 1: Strategic Considerations</b>	
<b>Green Belt</b>	The site is not within or adjacent to the Green Belt.
<b>Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood Zone – a small part of the site to the west is within Flood Zones 2 and 3a (The Northstowe Development Framework Document (DFD) that has recently been submitted identifies this land as open space).</li> <li>Minerals and Waste LDF designations (Core Strategy designations only) – approximately half of the site is within a Sand and Gravel Minerals Safeguarding Area.</li> </ul> <p>Allocated for development. See policy NS/3/1/g of the adopted NAAP.</p>
<b>Tier 1 conclusion:</b>	This site has already been identified as part of the strategic reserve land for Northstowe in the NAAP. It falls outside of the greenbelt and is largely agricultural in nature. Only a small part of the site is within flood zones.
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	Yes

<b>Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations</b>
---

<b>Designations and Constraints</b>	
<b>Heritage considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-statutory archaeological site - Cropmarks in the area identify the location of a Roman settlement. Sample excavation of this site has demonstrated continuity into the Saxon period. Archaeological investigations to the south indicate a substantial Bronze Age and Iron Age component to this landscape. Further information would be necessary in advance of any planning application for this site.</li> </ul> <p>With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the historic environment.</p>
<b>Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>County Wildlife Site - Adjacent to a County Wildlife Site alongside the Guided Busway.</li> <li>Public Rights of Way – bridleway along the Guided Busway.</li> <li>Biodiversity features - Greatest impact likely to result from human disturbance of currently inaccessible farmland habitats. Badgers within Fish Ponds Wood may be an issue.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agricultural land of high grade (i.e. Agricultural Land Classification Grade 1, 2, 3a) – approximately 2/3 of the site is Grade 2.</li> </ul> <p>It should be possible to mitigate impacts upon any wildlife habitats through well designed buffer zones and the recreation of habitats offsite.</p>
<b>Physical considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land contamination - This site is adjacent to the Guided Busway (old railway line), an area of industrial / commercial land and also an area of filled land. The site will require investigation, but this can be dealt with by condition.</li> <li>• Air quality issues - Close to the Councils' Air Quality Management Area. Extensive and detailed air quality assessments will be required to assess the cumulative impacts of this and other proposed developments within the locality on air quality along with provision of a Low Emissions Strategy.</li> <li>• Noise issues - Close proximity to the B1050 bypass to the South &amp; East and the CGB to the North with prevailing winds from the South West. Traffic noise will need assessment in accordance with PPG 24 and associated guidance and the impact of existing diffuse traffic noise on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well being and providing a high quality living environment. Residential use is likely to be acceptable with careful noise mitigation and noise likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises. No objection in principle as an adequate level of protection against noise can be secured by condition.</li> <li>• Noise issues - Industrial Noise - South East of the site is close to Hydro Eu Ltd, Station Road a medium to large sized industrial type unit / uses. Noise from activities / plant and equipment and vehicle movements are material considerations with significant negative impact potential in terms of health and well being and a poor quality living environment and possible noise nuisance. It is unlikely that mitigation measures on the proposed development site alone can provide an acceptable ambient noise environment. It is recommended that these noise, odour and dust constraints are thoroughly investigated and duly considered / addressed including consideration of mitigation by undertaking odour and noise impact / risk assessments in accordance with PPG 24 Planning and Noise and associated guidance.</li> <li>• Noise issues - possible noise and malodour from nearby Southwell Farm, Station Road as proposals would be closer than existing residential. No history of complaints. Minor to moderate adverse noise / odour risk but no objection in principle on this issue.</li> <li>• Noise issues - Some minor to moderate additional off-site road traffic noise generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance. Possible to mitigate but may require s106 agreements.</li> </ul>
<b>Townscape and landscape impact?</b>	<p>The proposed development lies in the Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands, but is heavily influenced by the valley of the River Great Ouse to the west and the fenland landscape a short distance to the north and east. The area is generally low lying – from 5-15m AOD, but rising to rolling clay hills south of the A14, which are</p>

	<p>generally 20-50m AOD. Small changes in level are very noticeable and low hills of 20m AOD give wide panoramic views over the landscape. It should be possible to mitigate the visual impact to a certain extent through well designed built form and appropriate soft landscaping. The field pattern is of large and very large regular fields separated by hedges, drains and ditches and occasional shelter belts. Although the landscape remains generally open, the vegetation combines to produce an almost continuous line of trees and hedges on a low horizon. The landscape becomes more closed and detailed around the edge of the local villages, with a number of small fields and paddocks separated by tall, mature hedges. Wide views are available across the entire site from Gravel Bridge Road to the north west the Longstanton By-Pass to the south, and from the CGB. The eastern B1050 boundary is more closed and includes existing dwellings. Development would be large in relation to the existing village settlements and would adversely affect the landscape setting of Longstanton to the extent that it may be difficult to view Longstanton as separate from Northstowe. The development is at odds with the local landscape character and would have an adverse effect on the local landscape by adding a substantial urban extension into an open and rural landscape. To successfully set the proposed development into the existing landscape, and to preserve a landscape setting to Longstanton, substantial structural landscape will be required to the north, west and south of the development, giving genuine rural separation between the development and the village, and a soft, integrated edge treatment. Structural landscape will also be required within the development with some views to existing horizons and landscape features retained.</p>
<p><b>Can any issues be mitigated?</b></p>	<p>It should be possible to mitigate the visual impact to a certain extent through well designed built form and appropriate soft landscaping. The field pattern is of large and very large regular fields separated by hedges, drains and ditches and occasional shelter belts. Although the landscape remains generally open, the vegetation combines to produce an almost continuous line of trees and hedges on a low horizon. To successfully set the proposed development into the existing landscape, and to preserve a landscape setting to Longstanton, substantial structural landscape will be required to the north, west and south of the development, giving genuine rural separation between the development and the village, and a soft, integrated edge treatment. Structural landscape will also be required within the development with some views to existing horizons and landscape features retained.</p> <p>It should be possible to mitigate noise nuisances.</p>

<b>Infrastructure</b>	
<p><b>Highways access?</b></p>	<p>Regarding sites in the Dry Drayton / Longstanton / Oakington / Willingham area (estimated capacity of 5,300 dwellings on 22 sites)</p>

	<p>the Highways Agency comment that this grouping is far closer to Cambridge and is heavily reliant on the A14 for strategic access. It is difficult to see more than a small proportion of these sites being deliverable prior to major improvements to the A14, and even this could require substantial mitigation measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The B1050 runs through the site and there are existing roundabouts where access could be gained. Capacity on the B1050 may become an issue as the core area of Northstowe is developed. Given the volume of traffic that could be using this road there could be the need to divert traffic away from residential areas. The scale of the site and the existing route of the B1050 would allow for this to be achieved if necessary.</li> <li>• The County Council is considering access to this site as part of the Phase I of the Northstowe Site.</li> </ul>
<b>Utility services?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity - The site would not supportable from existing network and that significant reinforcement and new network required.</li> <li>• Mains water - The site falls within the Cambridge Water Company Madingley Reservoir Distribution Zone and there is insufficient spare capacity to supply the number of proposed properties. Spare capacity will be allocated on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</li> <li>• Gas - There is a medium pressure gas pipeline along route of B1050, which according to the generic advice from National Grid will be suitable for most larger developments, however these will require a Pressure Reduction Station to be built to allow a local low pressure infrastructure to be laid around the developments.</li> <li>• Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the WWTW to accommodate this development site. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre-development assessment will be required to ascertain the specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the developer.</li> </ul>
<b>Drainage measures?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No FRA been carried out</li> <li>• The development site is near the boundary of the Old West Internal Drainage District, which does not have any capacity to accept any direct discharge into its system above the green field run off rate. All surface water from the site would have to be balanced before it is released into the Boards system.</li> <li>• There are concerns about the foul sewage effluent from any development areas be intended to be directed to the Uttons Drove STW and discharged into the Swavesey Drain catchment.</li> </ul>
<b>School capacity?</b>	<p>As an extension of Northstowe children within the development would attend one of the seven proposed primary schools and the proposed secondary school that are identified in the Development Framework Document to serve the new town. As the reserve land would be one of the last phases of Northstowe to be developed the capacity of these schools, and their ability to extend would need to be assessed nearer to the time. As the DFD is considering this site the location of schools, and their site size will be taken into account.</p>

<b>Health facilities capacity?</b>	Any major new settlements outside of Cambridge will almost certainly require significant Health infrastructure and these facilities would be planned as part of Northstowe. The surgeries in Longstanton and Willingham could be extended but by the time this land comes to be developed Northstowe should have its own facilities, the location and site areas needed for these facilities will be considered as part of the DFD.
<b>Any other issues?</b>	Due to break clauses / termination rights, agricultural tenancies will not be a constraint, further details can be provided if necessary
<b>Can issues be mitigated?</b>	Yes – the majority of the constraints relate to capacity within the relevant network and the consultees identify that in all cases capacity could be increased. This increase in capacity would have implications for the viability of any development.

<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	Yes
--	-----

**Tier 3: Site Specific Factors**

<b>Capacity</b>	
<b>Developable area</b>	22.43 ha
<b>Site capacity</b>	897 dwellings
<b>Density</b>	40 dph

<b>Potential Suitability</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The site is potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints.

<b>Availability</b>	
<b>Is the land in single ownership?</b>	The site is in multiple ownership but the developer has options on the land.
<b>Site ownership status?</b>	The site is owned by individual landowners and a developer has options on it.
<b>Legal constraints?</b>	Unknown
<b>Is there market interest in the site?</b>	Options already on the land

<b>When would the site be available for development?</b>	The promoter indicates that the site is available immediately. Though would likely to come forward as one of the last phases of Northstowe.
--	---

<b>Achievability</b>	
<b>Phasing and delivery of the development</b>	The promoter indicates first dwellings could be completed on site 2011-16.
<b>Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	Given the proximity of the site to the facilities that will be developed at Northstowe and the Cambridgeshire Guided Bus demand for housing is likely to be higher than at other sites.
<b>Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	The main cost factors relate to increasing capacity in the necessary infrastructure. However significant investment in the surrounding infrastructure will happen as a result of Northstowe itself.
<b>Could issues identified be overcome?</b>	Yes - through S106 payments or CIL.
<b>Economic viability?</b>	For strategic scale sites (new settlements and large urban extensions) much depends upon the extent, cost and phasing of the infrastructure to be funded by the development, the amount of housing that can actually be accommodated on site, and the timing of its provision in relation to that of the accompanying infrastructure. Such variables are currently unknown or unclear and so the viability of such sites cannot be appraised at this time.

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

<b>Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013</b>
Allocated for development (Policy SS/7), as part of the Northstowe Extension, although it will not increase the overall capacity of Northstowe.

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

**Site Assessment Proforma**

<b>Proforma Created</b>	July 2012
<b>Proforma Last Updated</b>	August 2013
<b>Location</b>	Hanley Grange, east of A1301 and west of A11
<b>Site name / address</b>	Hanley Grange, east of A1301 and west of A11
<b>Category of site:</b>	A new settlement.
<b>Description of promoter's proposal</b>	Hanley Grange new settlement comprising 5,000 dwellings, employment, retail, community uses, commercial uses and public open space.
<b>Site area (hectares)</b>	264.56 ha
<b>Site Number</b>	248
<b>Site description &amp; context</b>	<p>The site comprises a very large area of land south of Pampisford, contained between the A1301 and A11 roads. The site is situated to the west of Duxford and immediately to the north west of Hinxton.</p> <p>The land is largely in agricultural use although Hinxton Grange with it's associated buildings, are situated in the middle of the site. An avenue of trees leads from the A1301 to Hinxton Grange and ornamental tree planting is also associated with the Grange's designed park-like landscape setting. The disused railway line that follows the line of the A11 at the upper part of the site is now occupied by a narrow plantation woodland. However, the remainder of the site is very open, particularly to long distance views to the north-west; with the site visible from as far away as Magog Down.</p>
<b>Current or last use of the site</b>	The site is predominantly in agricultural use, with some buildings in the centre of the site associated with Hinxton Grange.
<b>Is the site Previously Developed Land?</b>	Only a very small part at Hinxton Grange in the centre of the site.
<b>Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan?</b>	No

<b>Planning history</b>	The site was discussed at the public examination into the Regional Spatial Strategy in 2005/6 and was selected by the Government in 2007 as one of the fifteen short listed candidates to become an Ecotown. Prior to the announcement of the Government's decision, Jarrow / Tesco decided to withdraw the site and to promote it through the development plan process.
<b>Source of site</b>	Site suggested through Call for Sites.

<b>Tier 1: Strategic Considerations</b>	
<b>Green Belt?</b>	The site is not within the Green Belt.
<b>Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Listed Buildings - Grade II Listed Hinxton Grange and associated Grade II Listed stable and coach house are located in the middle of the site.</li> </ul>
<b>Tier 1 conclusion:</b>	This is a very large, predominantly arable, site to the south of Pampisford between the A1301 and A11 roads, with no strategic constraints identified that would prevent the site from being developed.
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	Yes.

### Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations

<b>Designations and Constraints</b>	
<b>Heritage considerations?</b> (Updated June 2013)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conservation Areas - within close proximity are three Conservation Areas, Pampisford 700m to north, Hinxton 250m to south, and Duxford 1,100m to west, which also contain a number of listed buildings including Grade II* listed churches and manor houses.</li> <li>Listed Buildings - the site surrounds the Grade II Listed Hinxton Grange and its associated Grade II Listed stable and coach house set within ornamental grounds. Grade II* registered garden at Pampisford Hall lies approximately 840m to the north.</li> <li>Scheduled Monuments - Brent Ditch Scheduled Monument lies approximately 450m to east and north of the site. It is one of four defensive ditches in Cambridgeshire to protect land in the east by preventing easy access along the Icknield Way. A further Scheduled Monument lies approximately 1.1km to the north and</li> </ul>

	<p>comprises two adjacent medieval moated sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-statutory archaeological site – the site contains evidence for significant archaeology including aerial photographic evidence for enclosures of probable late prehistoric and/or Roman date. County Archaeologists would require further information in advance of any planning application for this site before it is able to advise on the suitability of the site for development.</li> </ul> <p>Several historic environment constraints and significant sites and settings potentially compromised. The need to preserve the setting of numerous historic features and areas imposes constraints on the development. However, with an appropriate scale of development and careful design it should be possible to mitigate these impacts. Significant archaeological interest is likely and will need early assessment.</p>
<p><b>Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations?</b> (Updated June 2013)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County Wildlife Sites - Bush Park County Wildlife Site lies approximately 750m to east. The River Cam CWS lies approximately 600m west of the site. The Shelford-Haverhill Disused Railway – Pampisford / Great Abington CWSs lie over 2km from the site.</li> <li>• Site of Special Scientific Interest - Groundwater and spring flows to nearby wetland SSSI e.g. Sawston Hall Meadows (approximately 1.2 km north), Dernford Fen, Thriplow Peat Holes, Thriplow Meadows, Fowlmere Watercress Beds. Development will place additional pressure on an overstretched system. The river has faced reduced flows in recent summer droughts. Surface run-off and pollution into the River Cam would reduce water quality, and provide pathways for eutrophication of aquatic and riparian habitats as well as SSSI.</li> <li>• Biodiversity features - The river and surrounding land supports a wide range of protected species and it is likely that the standard suite of Cambridgeshire protected species will be present (great crested newts / bats / badger / water vole / otter / reptiles). The chalk substrate in the area is quite a hotspot for scarce arable plants, and a prime location for enhancement to encourage stone curlew back into Cambridgeshire. Unconfirmed reports of stone curlew have been made to SCDC Ecology Officer. Site also likely to be of importance for brown hare and farmland birds. The proposer has undertaken an extended phase 1 habitat survey and desk study which shows there are no statutory and non statutory ecological designations on the site although Sawston Hall Meadows SSSI is approximately 1.2km north of Hanley Grange. There are records of protected species in the area and the bird survey indicates the presence of BAP species and one Schedule 1 species. Surveys have established that there are no Great Crested Newts present on the site.</li> <li>• Agricultural land of high grade (i.e. Agricultural Land Classification Grade 1, 2, 3a) - Grade 2.</li> </ul>

	<p>Several natural environment constraints which would require further survey and investigation. However, with an appropriate scale of development and careful design it should be possible to mitigate these impacts. The loss of agricultural land cannot be mitigated.</p>
<p><b>Physical considerations?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ground Water Source Protection Zone - The site falls within Groundwater Protection Zones 1, 2 and 3. The site lies over the Granta Chalk Aquifer and the impact of development over a source of groundwater is an important consideration. Any development will need to ensure that suitable pollution provision measures are incorporated in order to ensure that groundwater is not put at risk.</li> <li>• Air quality issues - although not close to an Air Quality Management Area, the proposal is of a significant size and close to busy road infrastructures. There is a potential for significant increases in traffic emissions and static emissions that could affect local air quality. Air quality would not give reason for objection although extensive and detailed air quality assessments, in line with local policy, will be required to assess the impact of such a development at pre-application stage.</li> <li>• Noise issues - Road &amp; Rail Transport General &amp; Wind Turbine Proposals - the west of the site is bounded by and runs parallel to the A1301 and a mainline railway to east. Traffic noise will need assessment in accordance with PPG 24 and associated guidance. The impact of existing noise on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well being and providing a high quality living environment. However residential use is likely to be acceptable with careful noise mitigation – combination of appropriate distance separation, careful orientation / positioning / design / internal layout of buildings, noise insulation scheme and extensive noise attenuation measures to mitigate traffic noise (single aspect, limited height, dual aspect with sealed non-openable windows on façade facing Roads, acoustically treated alternative ventilation, no open amenity spaces such as balconies / gardens). Commercial shielding or noise berms / barriers options? Noise likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises. Therefore no objection in principle on grounds of transport.</li> <li>• Wind Turbine Proposals - SCDC has had pre-application discussions with the Genome Campus regarding proposals for 2 medium to large wind turbines on land immediately to the south. These uses may be incompatible and in conflict and it is uncertain whether mitigation measures on the proposed development site alone can provide an acceptable ambient noise environment. If these two uses were to coexist there is the potential that the turbines may cause a noise nuisance resulting in a worst case shutting down of the turbines to abate any nuisance. These conflicts should be carefully considered before allocating this site for residential development and it is</li> </ul>

	<p>recommended that various interested parties thoroughly investigate and duly consider this noise constraint in accordance with PPG 24 Planning and Noise and associated guidance ETSU-R-97 Rating of Wind Turbine Noise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise issues - some minor to moderate additional off-site road traffic noise generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance. Possible to mitigate but may require s106 agreements.</li> <li>• Flooding and drainage issues – there are no immediate flooding problems. However, the main river flood plain touches the western part of the site. Non Main River flooding reported in Hinxton High Street and in Pampisford parish, Brewery Road and Station Road.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Townscape and landscape impact?</b> (Updated June 2013)</p>	<p>The area forms part of the East Anglian Chalk Landscape character area and is heavily influenced by the valley of the River Cam lying 700m to the west. The open nature of the chalklands and the spurred scarp face and lower rolling hills beyond to the north generate some of the finest views in Cambridgeshire and the distance views and open visibility are an essentially part of its landscape character.</p> <p>The chalk scarp itself is characteristically devoid of settlement with the exception of the sequence of isolated Granges, outlying agricultural estates of a monastery. The Granges at Heydon, Chrishall, Duxford, Hinxton and Little Abington were used for sheep farming and following Dissolution many became gentrified farms, including Hinxton Grange, which has a small ornamental park-like enclosure around it.</p> <p>Several villages surround the site, the closest (Hinxton, Ickleton and Pampisford) are relatively small, with a strong historical character and defined separation between and with little large-scale development. They are concentrated in the river valleys, which are well wooded and have a small scale, detailed and intimate landscape contrasting with the higher areas of chalk. The proposed development would physically link several villages and could, with other proposals, produce a continuous ribbon of linked villages running 13km south of Cambridge. On its own the development would link Hinxton, Ickleton Pampisford and Sawston as a 7km development.</p> <p>The form, scale and character of the proposal is likely to be at odds with the local landscape and settlement pattern, overwhelming the local village character and small-scale river valley landscape. The scale and extent of the development will ensure that it becomes the dominant feature in the landscape. This will result in a very substantial negative effect on the adjacent villages and local landscape character and on views from the countryside beyond the site. Part of the site would be clearly visible in valued and much-enjoyed views from the Cambridge Green Belt – particularly from</p>

	<p>Magog Down. The additional infrastructure required to connect the proposed development would add further damage.</p> <p>Through careful planning, phasing and design mitigation measures can be incorporated into the site's design to reduce the visual impact of the development. However, mitigation of a large-scale development would be very difficult. To integrate into the landscape the development would have to be designed to the highest possible standards, and be of an entirely different character and type to recent large-scale developments and urban expansions. Even if this were possible, the effects on the landscape from infrastructure connections on the edge of the settlement, ribbon development and the linking of villages would remain.</p>
<p><b>Can any issues be mitigated?</b> (Updated June 2013)</p>	<p>No. Significant historic environment, townscape and landscape, and ecological impacts. It would be very difficult to integrate a development of the proposed scale into the local landscape without an adverse impact on the local landscape and townscape. Further investigation and possible mitigation will be required to address the physical considerations, including potential for air quality, noise and flooding.</p>

<b>Infrastructure</b>	
<p><b>Highways access?</b> (Updated June 2013)</p>	<p>Regarding the Hanley Grange site (approximate capacity 5,000 dwellings) the Highways Agency comment that this site has previously been considered as an 'ecotown' bid site. The transport assessment work done for this should still be fairly current. One of the guiding principles of the ecotown process was to develop proposals that are as self contained as possible in transport terms. If this were to be achieved then it is possible the impacts on the SRN, the M11 and A11 in particular, could be manageable. This is, however, a big 'if' – a less sustainable proposal could result in substantial impacts on these routes.</p> <p>The local highway authority would expect provision of at least two accesses, possibly three, accesses to serve the new development. Access onto the A11 will not be supported, however it should be possible to provide access onto the A1301.</p> <p>The A1301 / A505 roundabout may need to be upgraded to accommodate the additional traffic from the new settlement.</p> <p>The Highway Authority would request that there is no link between the A1301 and the A505 Causeway as this may lead to rat running through the proposed development.</p> <p>Connectivity for pedestrian and cyclists is very important for the site. In the Highway Authority's opinion a significant level of infrastructure be required to encourage more sustainable transport links which;</p>

	<p>such infrastructure will extend beyond the confines of the site.</p> <p>A full Transport Assessment will be required.</p> <p>The promoter suggests the site will need an entirely new package of infrastructure including a link to Whittlesford Train Station and the potential to extend the Guided Bus network south from Addenbrookes.</p>
<b>Utility services?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity - the site is not supportable from existing network. Significant reinforcement and new network required.</li> <li>• Mains Water - The site falls within the CWC Cambridge Distribution Zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3,000 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within Cambridge Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</li> <li>• Gas - Significant Medium Pressure reinforcement would be required.</li> <li>• Mains sewerage – a revised consent for this waste water treatment works will be required prior to being able to accommodate the full proposal. It can currently accommodate approximately 1,200 properties. An appraisal will be required to determine what the full impact would be for the full proposal. Significant infrastructure upgrades will be required to accommodate this proposal. An assessment will be required to determine the full impact of this site.</li> </ul>
<b>Drainage measures?</b>	No FRA provided.
<b>School capacity?</b>	<p>The development of this site for 5,000 dwellings could generate a small need for 538 early years places and a maximum of 1,500 primary school places and 1,075 secondary places.</p> <p>This will require the provision of new schools, which it is expected will be met through on-site provision.</p>
<b>Health facilities capacity?</b>	On-site provision.
<b>Any other issues?</b>	<p>This forms part of the site selected by CLG as one of the shortlisted Ecotowns until the owner decided to withdraw from the competition and promote the site through the development plan process.</p> <p>The proposer suggests Hanley Grange new settlement can provide a range of benefits including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- helping to meet the RSS and Core Strategy housing provision</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- affordable housing in an area of high house prices</li> <li>- housing and new employment close to the south of Cambridge high tech / bio tech cluster</li> <li>- high quality public transport links to the high tech cluster and the centre of Cambridge</li> <li>- low energy / low carbon development</li> <li>- biodiversity enhancements.</li> </ul>
<b>Can issues be mitigated?</b>	Yes, with significant upgrades to local infrastructure, including sustainable transport, utilities (electricity, mains water, gas and sewerage), drainage, school capacity and health.

<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	No.
--	-----

<b>Tier 3: Site Specific Factors</b>
--------------------------------------

<b>Capacity</b>	
<b>Developable area</b> (Updated August 2013)	None
<b>Site capacity</b> (Updated August 2013)	5,000 dwellings as proposed by the promoter
<b>Density</b>	40 dph

<b>Potential Suitability</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints.

<b>Availability</b>	
<b>Is the land in single ownership?</b>	No. The site is controlled by one major landowner plus a limited number of smaller landowners.
<b>Site ownership status?</b>	In the hands of a development company.
<b>Legal constraints?</b>	None known.
<b>Is there market interest in the site?</b>	In the hands of a development company.

<b>When would the site be available for development?</b>	The promoter has indicated that the site would be available in 2016-2021.
--	---

<b>Achievability</b>	
<b>Phasing and delivery of the development</b>	<p>The promoter has indicated the following phasing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2016-2021 – 1,200 dwellings</li> <li>• 2021-2026 – 1,500 dwellings</li> <li>• 2026-2031 - 1,500 dwellings</li> <li>• 2031+ - 800 dwellings</li> </ul>
<b>Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	None known.
<b>Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	None known.
<b>Could issues identified be overcome?</b>	
<b>Economic viability?</b>	<p>For strategic scale sites (new settlements and large urban extensions) much depends upon the extent, cost and phasing of the infrastructure to be funded by the development, the amount of housing that can actually be accommodated on site, and the timing of its provision in relation to that of the accompanying infrastructure. Such variables are currently unknown or unclear and so the viability of such sites cannot be appraised at this time.</p>

<b>Site Assessment Conclusion</b>
Site with no development potential.

<b>Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013</b>
Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework.

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

<b>Proforma Created</b>	July 2012
<b>Proforma Last Updated</b>	July 2012
<b>Location</b>	Thriplow and Whittlesford – Heathfield
<b>Site name / address</b>	Land at Heathfield (north of Duxford Airfield)
<b>Category of site:</b>	A new settlement
<b>Description of promoter's proposal</b>	A new community of 450-550 dwellings with employment, retail, community uses, commercial uses and public open space
<b>Site area (hectares)</b>	60.11
<b>Site Number</b>	251
<b>Site description &amp; context</b>	<p>The site wraps around the settlement of Heathfield and part of the Imperial War Museum (IWM) complex to the north of the A505 and west of the M11. To the north and west of the site and east beyond the M11 is open countryside. The IWM north of the A505 is not accessible to the public and consists of the former Officers Mess and associated buildings. The mess is now redundant and other buildings are being used for a mixture of uses including offices and storage of museum archives.</p> <p>The site comprises of a number of arable fields.</p>
<b>Current or last use of the site</b>	Agricultural land
<b>Is the site Previously Developed Land?</b>	No
<b>Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan?</b>	No
<b>Planning history</b>	<p>2006 LDF – A small site was considered for housing – Objection Site 21</p> <p>2004 Local Plan – Imperial War Museum had wanted local plan to include a reserve route for a bypass for Heathfield and the Museum.</p>

	<p>Need for improvements to A505 due to growth in traffic and visitors to museum. Suggestion of route north of museum to get improved museum environment by integrating the two parts of the site.</p> <p>In his 2002 report the inspector has stated</p> <p>‘ ... At present no scheme of this kind appears to be included in the Cambridgeshire Transport Plan for 2001-2006, a period which coincides with the remainder of the local plan period. I therefore see little practical point in reserving a line for a route that is unlikely to be funded during the plan period. In my view such an approach would not fit well with the advice in paragraph 5.22 of PPG12.</p> <p>9.29 The museum has indicated that, if no present commitment can be given to the scheme, it would like to see some form of reference to the route as a long-term vision. However, although the Council did not seem to be strongly opposed to that in principle, it is clearly concerned that any such a reference should not be seen as an invitation to a bypass funded by enabling development. Since the proposed route runs mainly through Green Belt land immediately to the north of Heathfield, this is an especially valid concern.</p> <p>9.30 My recommendation is that reference should be made (below present paragraph 9.45) to the long-term benefits to the Museum of a realignment of the A505 but that it should also be made clear that this will not be achieved through enabling development within the Green Belt.</p> <p>R166 - Modify the plan by adding a paragraph after paragraph 9.45 as follows:-  ‘The Museum has a long-term vision of realigning the A505 to the north of Heathfield so as to improve the environment of the Museum by removing severance and allowing the two parts of the site to be better integrated, as well as bringing other wider benefits to the village. The Council would not oppose this in principle but would not be prepared to permit enabling development within the Green Belt.’...’</p> <p>1993 Local Plan – Considered changes to the special planning policy for the Imperial War Museum. The Inspector accepted that it was appropriate to recognise the special importance of the museum by having a special policy and the wording of the policy was revised.</p> <p>1984 – Property Services Agency considering of disposing of land at Duxford Camp and wished it to be considered for shops, light industry and housing. (S/0438/84) – Objections were raised by Planning Committee including proposals contrary to local planning policies and strong opposition to any significant increase in traffic gaining access to A505 prior to road being dualled.</p>
<b>Source of site</b>	Site suggested through call for sites.

<b>Tier 1: Strategic Considerations</b>	
<b>Green Belt</b>	<p>The site is within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Green Belt Purposes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevents coalescence between settlements and with Cambridge</li> </ul> <p>Function with regard to the special character of Cambridge and it's setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages</li> <li>• A landscape which retains a strong rural character</li> </ul> <p>Site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on GB purposes and functions. Heathfield is within the outer rural area of the GB where the GB assists in retaining the rural character of the village.</p>
<b>Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone – Small part of site on northern section of site is in zone 3.</li> <li>• Scheduled Monument – A small part of a scheduled monument is within the northern part of the site – Roman settlement south of Chronicle Hills.</li> <li>• Minerals and Waste LDF designations – Duxford Waste Water Treatment Works adjoins the northern boundary and the safeguarding area relating to this extends over much of the western part of the site. Within such area the Minerals and Waste LDF states that there is a presumption against allowing development that would be occupied by people. This includes new buildings to residential, industrial, commercial, sport and recreational uses. Also small area of safeguarding for sand and gravel is within north east corner of the site.</li> <li>• Proximity to hazardous installations – HSE site 2009 partly extends into eastern part of site.</li> </ul>
<b>Tier 1 conclusion:</b>	<p>The site wraps around the settlement of Heathfield and part of the Imperial War Museum (IWM) complex to the north of the A505 and west of the M11. To the north and west of the site and east beyond the M11 is open countryside.</p> <p>The site comprises of a number of arable fields and is within the GB. The site falls within an area where development would have an adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The distribution, physical separation, setting, scale and character of Green Belt villages</li> <li>• A landscape which retains a strong rural character</li> </ul> <p>Duxford Waste Water Treatment Works adjoins the northern boundary and the safeguarding area relating to this extends over much of the western part of the site.</p>

	Small part of site on northern section of site is in flood zone 3. A small part of a scheduled monument is within the northern part of the site.
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	Yes

**Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations**

<b>Designations and Constraints</b>	
<b>Heritage considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation Area – The Duxford Airfield Conservation Area adjoins the southern eastern boundary. Significant impact if site developed.</li> <li>• Listed Buildings – To the northern side of the A505 there are within the Imperial War Museum numerous listed buildings. 20, 21, and 29 Ledo Road are Grade II listed adjacent to the boundary of the eastern part of the site. 30 and 31 Ledo Rd are Grade II some 20metres from the boundary. Significant adverse impact if site developed on setting of these buildings.</li> <li>• Non-statutory archaeological site - The site is located adjacent to the site of the designated Roman settlement at Chronicle Hills (Scheduled Monument Number 255). Recent aerial photographs also show a probable neolithic Causewayed Enclosure in the area. We would object to the development of this site.</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County Wildlife Site – Thriplow Peat Holes SSSI is north of the site (670metres);</li> <li>• Public Rights of Way – Footpath from A505 follows the western boundary of the residential area to the rear of Ringstone, Hurdles Way and Kingsway and then northwards to link with a footpath from Thriplow.</li> <li>• Presence of protected species - Greatest impact likely to result through indirect actions such as human disturbance of woodland and loss of feeding areas for bats through habitat change as grassland is lost or light pollution affects previously dark areas.</li> <li>• Agricultural land of high grade – Grade 2</li> </ul>
<b>Physical considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ground Water Source Protection Zone – Small part in east of site zone 1 and rest is zone 2.</li> <li>• Land contamination- Site is adjacent to military land and also sewage works. Would need investigation. Can be dealt with by condition.</li> <li>• Air quality issues - Despite this proposal not being adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area, it is of a significant size and therefore, there is a potential for an increase in traffic and static emissions that could affect local air quality. More information is required for this location, particularly details for air quality assessment and a low emission strategy.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise issues - The East of the site bounds the M11 and parts of the site are adjacent to the busy A505. There are high levels of ambient / diffuse traffic noise in the area and this is likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises. At least half the site nearest M11 or at least 300 metres from motorway is likely to be NEC C (empty site) for night: PPG24 advice “Planning permission should not normally be granted. Where it is considered that permission should be given, for example because there are no alternative quieter sites available, conditions should be imposed to ensure a commensurate level of protection against noise”. Residential could be acceptable with high level of mitigation. The impact of existing noise on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well-being and providing a high quality living environment. However before this site is allocated for residential development it is recommended that these noise threats / constraints are thoroughly investigated in accordance with PPG 24: Planning and Noise and associated noise guidance for any new housing. This site requires a full noise assessment including consideration of any noise attenuation measures such as noise barriers / berms and practical / technical feasibility / financial viability.</li> <li>• Noise issues - from Plant Breeding &amp; Seed Processing Premises at Church St to north east of the site. Noise risk has not been quantified so off-site mitigation may be required and no guarantee this can be secured, but overall in terms of adverse noise impact- medium risk.</li> <li>• Malodour - There is a to the North edge of the site there is a sewage treatment works with what appears to be open trickle beds' The Minerals and Waste Site Specific Plan has designated a 400 metres Waste Water Treatment Works Safeguarding Area around this site requiring an odour impact / risk assessment. An odour impact assessment and or evidence would need to be provided to demonstrate that the site would not experience significant odour problems. Odour can be widespread and indiscriminate and can only be effectively mitigated at source. May require off-site s106 agreement odour treatment works. May prejudice operation of STW.</li> </ul> <p>Due to numerous issues that have the potential to have significant impact and which are likely to be difficult to mitigate, the site should not be allocated until further assessment of the issues is undertaken and technical solutions considered and assessed in terms of viability.</p>
<p><b>Townscape and landscape impact?</b></p>	<p>The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) refers to Heathfield as being a chalkland village which was once Ministry of Defence land and property known as Duxford Camp. The village is in two separate areas comprising mainly terraced and semi-detached housing laid out in the form of crescents and closes, with open spaces between. North of the village are arable fields whilst to the</p>

	<p>south is the Imperial War Museum.</p> <p>The site wraps around Heathfield and is formed by the arable fields to the north of the village. There are limited hedges separating the fields which are flat and featureless. An area of woodland screens the sewage treatment works in the north of the site. Development of the site would have an impact on the landscape setting of Heathfield and would be of a scale of new housing and associated facilities that would dominate the village.</p> <p>The northern part of the Imperial War Museum that is currently not part of the site that is accessible to the public has a large number of listed buildings whose setting would be impacted by the site being developed. The Duxford Airfield Conservation Area Appraisal described the whole area as ‘... the finest and best-preserved example of a fighter base representative of the period up to 1945 in Britain, with an exceptionally complete group of First World War technical buildings in addition to technical and domestic buildings typical of both inter-war Expansion Periods of the RAF.’</p> <p>Development of this site would have a significant impact on the townscape of Duxford Airfield because it would be proposing a large scale development near to the collection of listed buildings that form the northern section of the airfield.</p>
<p><b>Can any issues be mitigated?</b></p>	<p>There are a number of significant impacts if this site were to be developed. It is unlikely that it would be possible to mitigate all of these. Careful design could mitigate some of the noise from the M11.</p>

<p><b>Infrastructure</b></p>	
<p><b>Highways access?</b></p>	<p>The Highway Agency states that the majority of sites in the group of Duxford / Fowlmere / Sawston / Thriplow / Whittlesford / Whittlesford Bridge are extensions to small settlements. In practice this section of the M11 is under less pressure than sections both to the north and south. While the group will add traffic flow to the M11 it is likely that any impacts could be mitigable (subject to assessment).</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority will need to consult with the Highway Agency in respect to the proposed site.</p> <p>A junction located on to the A505 would be acceptable to the Highway Authority.</p> <p>The proposed site is acceptable in principle subject to detailed design.</p>
<p><b>Utility services?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity - Not supportable from existing network. Significant reinforcement and new network required</li> <li>• Mains water - The site falls within the Cambridge Water Company (CWC) distribution zone Heydon Reservoir, within</li> </ul>

	<p>which there is a minimum spare capacity of 5450 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone less any commitments already made to developers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is insufficient spare capacity within Heydon Reservoir Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties. Spare capacity will be allocated on a first come first served basis.</li> <li>• Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</li> <li>• Gas – No gas supply to the locality.</li> <li>• Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the Duxford waste water treatment works to accommodate this development site. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre-development assessment will be required to ascertain the specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the developer.</li> </ul>
<b>Drainage measures?</b>	No FRA provided
<b>School capacity?</b>	<p>Heathfield does not contain a primary school but is located within the catchment area for Duxford Primary School, Duxford with a PAN of 35 and a school capacity of 245, and lies within the catchment of Sawston Village College with a PAN of 230 and school capacity of 1,150 children. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there was deficit of 1 primary school place in Duxford taking account of planned development in Duxford, and a deficit of 25 secondary places taking account of planned development across the village college catchment area.</p> <p>The development of this site for around 550 dwellings could generate a need for early years places and a maximum of 193 primary school places and 158 secondary school places.</p> <p>Development of this site would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or the provision of new schools.</p>
<b>Health facilities capacity?</b>	Duxford does not have a medical practice. The facility in Sawston has capacity and physical capacity to expand.
<b>Any other issues?</b>	The promoter has provided detailed information about the proposed development. A report has been submitted.
<b>Can issues be mitigated?</b>	It would be possible to partly mitigate impacts on utility services by increasing the capacity of the electricity network; upgrading the water service; and increasing the sewage network. Given the scale of the need for school places both a new primary and secondary school would be required.
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	No

### Tier 3: Site Specific Factors

<b>Capacity</b>	
<b>Developable area</b>	None. (Area if unconstrained 24.04ha)
<b>Site capacity</b>	962 dwellings
<b>Density</b>	40dph

<b>Potential Suitability</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints.

<b>Availability</b>	
<b>Is the land in single ownership?</b>	No
<b>Site ownership status?</b>	Two owners – RGR Smith Settlement Trust and Albanwise Limited.
<b>Legal constraints?</b>	No
<b>Is there market interest in the site?</b>	The site has not been marketed.
<b>When would the site be available for development?</b>	The promoter indicates the site is available immediately.

<b>Achievability</b>	
<b>Phasing and delivery of the development</b>	The promoter indicates the first dwellings could be completed on site 2011-16.
<b>Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	No
<b>Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	No

<b>Could issues identified be overcome?</b>	
<b>Economic viability?</b>	For strategic scale sites (new settlements and large urban extensions) much depends upon the extent, cost and phasing of the infrastructure to be funded by the development, the amount of housing that can actually be accommodated on site, and the timing of its provision in relation to that of the accompanying infrastructure. Such variables are currently unknown or unclear and so the viability of such sites cannot be appraised at this time.

<b>Site Assessment Conclusion</b>
Site with no development potential.

<b>Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013</b>
Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework; Green Belt.

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

**Site Assessment Proforma**

<b>Proforma Created</b>	July 2012
<b>Proforma Last Updated</b>	July 2012
<b>Location</b>	New Settlement (Barrington & Haslingfield Parish)
<b>Site name / address</b>	Land at Barrington Quarry
<b>Category of site:</b>	A new settlement
<b>Description of promoter's proposal</b>	Residential-led mixed use development of up to 3,250 dwellings with supporting infrastructure and community facilities.
<b>Site area (hectares)</b>	404.99 ha.
<b>Site Number</b>	261
<b>Site description &amp; context</b>	The site is north of Barrington. The eastern part of the site is a former quarry site, which has been extensively worked until 2008. It is currently going through a programme of restoration. The remainder of the site is farmland apart from a thin strip of land that follows the rail way line from the quarry which links to the main line railway to the south.
<b>Current or last use of the site</b>	Quarry and Cement Works – Ceased 2008 / remainder of site is farmland
<b>Is the site Previously Developed Land?</b>	Quarry and associated buildings is PDL – approximately a third of the site. Rest of site in agricultural use so not PDL.
<b>Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan?</b>	Within the eastern section of the site (in the quarry area) there is an allocation for chalk identified in the Minerals and Waste LDF (Policy SSP M4A).
<b>Planning history</b>	Planning applications 2010 - Restoration of quarry site (S/1080/10 )  2009 /2007 - Within the site are several farms which have diversified by converting their storage buildings to B8. (S/0434/09 – B8 Storage; S/2137/07 – Change of use from agricultural to B8)
<b>Source of site</b>	Site suggested through call for sites

<b>Tier 1: Strategic Considerations</b>	
<b>Green Belt</b>	The site is not within the Green Belt, but the GB extends along its northern and eastern boundary.
<b>Is the site subject</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSSI – Yes (Barrington Chalk Pit) which extends over a</li> </ul>

<b>to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development?</b>	<p>quarter of the eastern part of the site. It is an SSSI designated for its Geological Importance. While a large part of the quarry site is designated as a SSSI 'Barrington Pit', the area of interest is primarily the exposed quarry face within the north east corner of the quarry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minerals and Waste LDF designations- Approximately a half of the site is within a safeguarding area for chalk identified in the Core Strategy. Within the Site Specific Proposals DPD the extent of the former quarry is identified as an existing mineral site with a consultation area identified around it – this covers some third of the eastern part of the site.</li> </ul>
<b>Tier 1 conclusion:</b>	<p>Whilst the site is not within the Green Belt, it does include a large area of land that is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest Barrington Chalk Pit, (to the east). This site is an important asset to the surrounding villages and local area To the north is the small rural village of Harlton.</p>
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	No

**Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations**

<b>Designations and Constraints</b>	
<b>Heritage considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conservation Area – Setting Conservation Areas of Barrington, Haslingfield, Orwell, Foxton &amp; Harlton affected by development of this site.</li> <li>Barrington Conservation Area - The boundary of the Barrington Conservation Area follows the whole of the south eastern edge of the site. Major adverse effect on Barrington due to prominence of approach to village and across countryside, land levels, competition, loss of openness &amp; views, access and intensification along rural roads, intrusion into backdrops, loss of functional relationship of farmsteads to countryside, loss of views of High Street from footpaths to north &amp; east, contrary to single depth &amp; linear character of development within Conservation Area.</li> <li>Orwell Conservation Area This is to the south west of the site (200 metres) - Major adverse effect on Orwell due to prominence on axis of High Street, land levels, intensification of traffic, obscuring of countryside views of historic village &amp; Conservation Area from footpaths across countryside to east &amp; north east, &amp; loss of openness &amp; rural character including to significant farmsteads on east edge of Conservation Area.</li> <li>Haslingfield Conservation Area- This is to the north east of the site (500metres) - Adverse effect on Haslingfield due to levels, competition &amp; loss of rural approach.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harlton Conservation Area – this is to the north of the site (560metres) Adverse effect to Harlton due to development on open rural skyline unless set back on northern edge.</li> <li>• Listed Buildings – Site shares boundaries with 3 listed buildings.- Barrington Hall is Grade II listed; 9 Back Lane is Grade II and 14 West Green is Grade II*. Settings of listed buildings in Barrington, Orwell, Haslingfield &amp; Harlton. Adverse effect as above including Barrington Church (Grade I) (160metres) located to the east of the site due to loss of views of Church from north, west &amp; north-west and 14 West Green Barrington (Grade II*) due to backdrop in primary approach and intensification of West Green and loss of low key character of Green for access. Adverse effect on functional settings of listed building farmsteads including E edge of Orwell (GdII). Potential part site on core of existing development, subject to frontage and relationships to villages. Entrance near Foxton has minimal effect due to proximity to railway junction.</li> </ul> <p>English Heritage comment - This site is in an extremely prominent landscape and will be extremely intrusive. A development on this site will also adversely affect the setting of both Barrington and Orwell Conservation Areas. The quarry at Barrington remains a viable asset and should be retained for the benefit of future generations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non- statutory archaeological site - Although much of the site has been worked for chalk, previous archaeological works outside the chalk pit have identified extensive evidence for prehistoric and Roman settlement. Further information would be necessary in advance of any planning application for this site.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County Wildlife Site – North West corner of site adjoins Orwell Hill CWS – supports a population of nationally scarce vascular plant species. (grassland).</li> <li>• Tree Preservation Orders - No TPO's present on the proposed area however there are significant hedges and blocks of woodland that need to be retained using current best practice and guidance unless detailed tree surveys prove otherwise</li> <li>• Protected Village Amenity Area – a large PVAA within Barrington village adjoins the southern boundary of the site.</li> <li>• Public Rights of Way – a number of footpaths cross the site – one byway runs north to south from Orwell Road; two footpaths extend from Barrington Village north following field boundaries-one links westward to the byway and the second continues northwards to the west of the quarry site.</li> <li>• Presence of protected species - Greatest impact likely to be upon woodland habitats through disturbance and general change of use from unmanaged to amenity. Extensive loss of arable farmland.</li> <li>• Agricultural land of high grade – northern and southern section is Grade 2 with belt of Grade 3 through the middle of the site.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Physical considerations?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land contamination - This site is a former quarry and also has a number of areas of filled land. The whole site would therefore require investigation. This could be dealt with by condition.</li> <li>• Air quality issues - Despite this proposal not being adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area, it is of a significant size and therefore, there is a potential for an increase in traffic and static emissions that could affect local air quality. More information is required for this location, particularly details for air quality assessment and a low emission strategy.</li> <li>• Noise issues - The South East of the site is adjacent to Barrington Hall a venue which holds regular entertainment type events such as weddings and other celebrations with music and theatre / plays. Events such as weddings etc are also held externally in marquees and currently the sound is directed towards Barrington Quarry to mitigate noise impact on residential and avoid noise nuisance. Any entertainment noise at Barrington Hall would need assessment and insulation works at Hall may be required by s106 obligations or similar to facilitate development or locate more compatible commercial uses close to the Hall and or combination of careful design and layout. However no guarantee that offsite mitigation can be secured and viability and any detrimental economic impact on existing business should be considered prior to allocation? Site should not be fully allocated until these issues have been considered and mitigation options / feasibility etc.</li> <li>• Noise and Malodour - possible noise and malodour from nearby Farms as proposals would be closer than existing residential. No history of complaints. Minor to moderate adverse noise / odour risk but may require assessment.</li> <li>• Noise issues - Some moderate to major additional off-site road traffic noise generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance. Possible to mitigate but may require s106 agreements.</li> <li>• Flooding and drainage issues - Apart from a short section of the railway line, the site lies in Flood Zone 1.</li> <li>• Topography issues - The land rises to the north of Barrington, from approximately 20 to 70 m AOD. Steep slopes close to and skylines above existing villages are a distinctive feature. The land crests in a ridge along the northern boundary of the site between Chapel Hill and Fox Hill, falling sharply again towards Harlton to the north.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Townscape and landscape impact?</b></p>	<p>This proposal would have a significant impact of the townscape of the area due to its rural nature and the area.</p> <p>To develop a site for 3250 so close to the SSSI and the Lord's Bridge Conservation Areas together with the impact of such a development on the adjacent rural villages would be seriously detrimental to the rural character and setting of the area.</p>

	<p>The proposed development lies in the East Anglian Chalk landscape character area. The site lies to the north of the Rhee Valley and the village of Barrington and between the villages of Orwell to the west and Haslingfield to the northeast.</p> <p>The Land rises to the north of Barrington, from approximately 20 to 70 m AOD. Steep slopes close to and skylines above existing villages are a distinctive feature. The land crests in a ridge along the northern boundary of the site between Chapel Hill and Fox Hill, falling sharply again towards Harlton to the north.</p> <p>The landscape is open and rolling, with noticeably steep slopes, pockets of mature woodland and a layered skyline of mature hedges, open rolling slopes and woodland. Fields are regular and vary in scale from medium to very large. Huge views are available to the north, east and south of the site. It is a dramatic landscape, and deeply rural in character.</p> <p>Local villages run in a (spring) line east-west of the site low on the slopes, Orwell and Barrington to the south, The Eversdens, Harlton and Haslingfield to the north.</p> <p>Existing built development is largely dominated by the folds and slopes of the landscape.</p> <p>Local Landscape - Barrington Cement works occupy the northeast portion of the site, but is largely invisible being below the ridge line and screening vegetation to the north and screened by woodland to the east.</p> <p>A detailed landscape of small fields, paddocks and meadows frame the local villages. The river Rhee and the large village green to its north are dominant features in Barrington. Views to steep slopes rising immediately behind the village housing are defining features of Orwell, Harlton and Haslingfield.</p> <p>A public footpath and bridleway pass through the site.</p> <p>The form and scale of the proposed development are completely at odds with the local Landscape Character and settlement patterns. Development would be presented on a south facing slope above Barrington and Orwell, and also with clear views to the site from the A603 to the west. A new, developed skyline is likely to be formed along the northern edge when viewed from Harlton and Haslingfield.</p> <p>All local villages would be totally dominated by the scale of the development. Barrington and Orwell could become physically linked. The development would be visible over long distances, particularly from the south.</p>
--	---

	<p>Development of the more detailed and steep lower slopes would be difficult and impact even more directly on the local villages. Development of the higher slopes would form a developed skyline and suffer from an exposed, windy microclimate.</p> <p>Extensive reclamation work will be required to the chalk quarry site before it is available for development, and will require careful design to integrate successfully into the landscape.</p> <p>Landscape Effects of the Proposed Development</p> <p>a) Landscape effects on existing settlements (- - -) Development would be very large in relation to the existing settlements and of such a different character that it would have a very significant adverse effect on existing settlements.</p> <p>b) Impact on visual amenity and character of the landscape (- - -) The landscape would be unable to accommodate development of the proposed type and scale without significant and adverse character change.</p> <p>The development conflicts directly with the Landscape Character.</p> <p>Landscape Mitigation</p> <p>Apart from the quarry site, it will be very difficult to offer any landscape mitigation on this site.</p> <p>The position of the site on steeply rising, folded ground will make development highly visible from the south, presented on the south facing slope, and from the north as a developed skyline.</p> <p>The scale of the development site will dominate and link local villages, and even limited development on the lower slopes would obscure the distinctive local landscape.</p> <p>Very limited development of an appropriate scale may be possible to the east of Orwell.</p> <p>Combined with landscape restoration, development may also be possible in the quarry area.</p>
<p><b>Can any issues be mitigated?</b></p>	<p>In Part. – A full masterplanning exercise is needed to establish if this an acceptable amount of land associated with this site developable and viable considering the significant infrastructure costs associated with any scheme and the harm to the site and the surrounding area.</p>

<b>Infrastructure</b>	
<p><b>Highways access?</b></p>	<p>Sites clustered around M11 J11 while being fairly well integrated with Cambridge are likely to result in some additional pressure on the M11 corridor, though this is probably mitigable (subject to a suitable assessment of course). In general, the other sites are less likely to</p>

	<p>become a major issue for the SRN.</p> <p>It is unclear, if the land identified to link this site to the nearby A road would be sufficient, in addition this has a significant cost to the scheme which would seriously impact on the viability of the site.</p> <p>Highway Authority comments – Transport Assessment and modelling – Potential for around 29,750 daily trips (based on SCATP trip rates). Requirement for transport modelling using the Cambridge Sub-Regional Model (CSRМ) to consider wider strategic impact. Full Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plans (TP) for residential, schools and employment sites required</p> <p>Strategic Transport issues - Cambridgeshire LTP3 sets out the transport strategy. Direct access to A428 Trunk Road (Cambridge – St. Neots – Bedford) via grade separated junction. Potential impact on junctions at either end of A428 (M11 Junction 14 and A1198 roundabout). No rail access.</p> <p>Local Transport Issues – Poor access to services by walking or cycling and limited ability to connect to existing networks. Limited bus services and site difficult to incorporate into existing networks. Local traffic management measures would be required to mitigate the impact of development traffic upon local communities.</p>
<p><b>Utility services?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity – Not supportable from existing network. Significant reinforcement and new network required</li> <li>• Mains water - The site falls within the Cambridge Water Company (CWC) distribution zone Heydon Reservoir, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 5450 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within Heydon Reservoir Distribution Zone to supply the number of proposed properties. Spare capacity will be allocated on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</li> <li>• Gas – No gas exists in adjacent villages therefore further investigations will be needed if gas was to be a serious consideration as part of any scheme.</li> <li>• Mains sewage – Foxton WWTW has limited capacity to accommodate this site. A revised consent will be required for this prior to connection. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre-development assessment will be required to ascertain the specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the developer.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Drainage measures?</b></p>	<p>Full EIA and FRA required.</p>

<p><b>School capacity?</b></p>	<p>After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or the provision of new schools.</p> <p>Promoter has indicated that there will be a range of supporting community facilities which will provide for the day to day needs of the new residents</p>
<p><b>Health facilities capacity?</b></p>	<p>Further investigation required.</p>
<p><b>Any other issues?</b></p>	<p>The promoter has provided the following additional information –</p> <p>Use of this site for a sustainable new development could bring very substantial opportunities and benefits to South Cambridgeshire and the local area, including the following:</p> <p>Delivery of a major contribution to the housing demand and need within the district within the Plan period to 2031, including both market and affordable accommodation, within a sustainable new development outside the Cambridge Green Belt.</p> <p>Delivery of a fast, frequent and direct public transport connection to Cambridge</p> <p>Provide controlled public access to and interpretation of the greensand exposure within the SSSI in conjunction with Natural England; the University of Cambridge; and the Natural History Museum</p> <p>Delivery of a Country Park with formal and informal recreation facilities to serve the southern and western part of the district</p> <p>Delivery of a range of supporting commercial and other community facilities which will provide for the day to day needs of the new residents as well as for those living in close proximity to the new community.</p>
<p><b>Can issues be mitigated?</b></p>	<p>In Part – But significant work would be required and the resulting developable land may be very expensive to develop, which seriously impacts on the viability of the site</p>
<p><b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b></p>	<p>No</p>

### Tier 3: Site Specific Factors

#### Capacity

<b>Developable area</b>	None
<b>Site capacity</b>	3,250 dwellings as proposed by the promoter
<b>Density</b>	40dph

#### Potential Suitability

<b>Conclusion</b>	The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints.
-------------------	--

#### Availability

<b>Is the land in single ownership?</b>	No
<b>Site ownership status?</b>	Rugby Group Ltd and the Barrington Light Railway Company.
<b>Legal constraints?</b>	-
<b>Is there market interest in the site?</b>	The site has not been marketed.
<b>When would the site be available for development?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The promoter indicates the site could become available 2011-2016.</li> </ul> <p>Subject to the timing of the recently consented temporary fill operation and the relationship with the first phase of delivery of the new community</p>

#### Achievability

<b>Phasing and delivery of the development</b>	<p>The promoter indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first dwellings be completed on site 2011-2016</li> <li>• Development period (25 in years)</li> <li>• Annual dwelling completions (400 dwellings)</li> <li>• Phasing (i.e. number of dwellings in each year, allowing for building up to that rate for larger sites)             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2011-16 – 400</li> <li>• 2016 -21 – 1000</li> <li>• 2021 -26 – 1000</li> <li>• 2026-31 – 850</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	Unknown
<b>Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	<p>Major road/water and energy infrastructure needed</p> <p>A large area of the site is an SSSI and contaminated therefore it is important that any development considers the cost associated with mitigating such development restriction.</p> <p>In common with other major development schemes, there will be a need to balance the costs associated with delivering the development, the costs of planning obligations and related items, and the value generated by the scheme.</p>
<b>Could issues identified be overcome?</b>	<p>The cost implications of delivering this site would be significant in addition the nature and character of the area would suffer harm.</p> <p>Dialogue with the local planning authority, stakeholders and the local community to ensure that priorities for provision of infrastructure and facilities are discussed and agreed as part of the masterplanning process.</p>
<b>Economic viability?</b>	For strategic scale sites (new settlements and large urban extensions) much depends upon the extent, cost and phasing of the infrastructure to be funded by the development, the amount of housing that can actually be accommodated on site, and the timing of its provision in relation to that of the accompanying infrastructure. Such variables are currently unknown or unclear and so the viability of such sites cannot be appraised at this time.

<b>Site Assessment Conclusion</b>
Site with no development potential.

<b>Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013</b>
Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework.

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

<b>Proforma Created</b>	July 2012
<b>Proforma Last Updated</b>	August 2013
<b>Location</b>	New Settlement (Elsworth & Knapwell Parishes)
<b>Site name / address</b>	Land to the north of the A428, Cambourne
<b>Category of site:</b>	A new settlement.
<b>Description of promoter's proposal</b>	New village or linked village extension to Cambourne for up to around 2,500 dwellings with employment, education, leisure and retail uses
<b>Site area (hectares)</b>	271.65
<b>Site Number</b>	265
<b>Site description &amp; context</b>	<p>The site lies north of the Old St Neots road and west of Knapwell Road. The area is fairly open and rolling, and is cut by the valleys of several small streams. Land falls from the south towards Knapwell to the north. The main settlement of Cambourne lies directly to the south of the site, separated from it by the A428, the old St Neots Road and areas of maturing structure planting and woodland.</p> <p>The site can be accessed via the Old St Neots Road, including the roundabout junction with the A428 and Knapwell Road. Several farm accesses provide access at present. Three public footpaths run south to north from the Old St Neots road towards Knapwell.</p> <p>Within the site area are three farms: Lawn Farm on the western boundary, Coldharbour Farm in the centre, and Knapwell Wood Farm on the eastern edge. Farm complexes at Lawn Farm and Coldharbour Farm fall within the site. The group of farm buildings at Knapwell Wood Farm lie adjacent to the site's eastern boundary.</p> <p>The site contains many mature trees and hedgerows, linking areas of mature woodland. Large mature roadside trees are a feature of Knapwell Road to the east of the site. The field pattern of medium to large scale fields are bounded by mature hedgerows and hedgerows and large hedgerow trees, mainly Oak and Ash. The area contains many small areas of mature woodland, often in the valley bottoms of small streams which cut through the site, giving a distinctive layered landscape.</p> <p>The area has a very rural and tranquil character. Long views are not</p>

	so frequent as adjacent areas due to the rolling landscape and layers of vegetation.
<b>Current or last use of the site</b>	The site consists of agricultural land, Lawn Farm and Coldharbour Farm.
<b>Is the site Previously Developed Land?</b>	Partly – the site includes two farm complexes creating a very small area of previously developed land.
<b>Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan?</b>	No.
<b>Planning history</b>	<p>Part of the site was put forward as an Objection site for the Core Strategy (2006). The Council ruled out this site in its initial response stating: 'There was no need to look at new greenfield allocations at any of the Rural Centres, including Cambourne, in order to meet the housing target for this stage in the sequence as shown in Figure 3 of the Core Strategy. Increasing the densities within the existing planned footprint of Cambourne will provide a more sustainable form of development. However, the Council's view is that a physical expansion of Cambourne is not appropriate or necessary. Expansion of Cambourne would completely alter the original concept and character of the three related villages to one of a market town. The Council's view is that this cannot be done successfully given the way in which Cambourne has been and continues to be developed.'</p> <p>The Inspector in the final Inspector's report on the Core Strategy noted this view in 2006.</p>
<b>Source of site</b>	Site suggested through call for sites

<b>Tier 1: Strategic Considerations</b>	
<b>Green Belt</b>	The site is not within the Green Belt.
<b>Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSSI – Elsworth Wood SSSI lies approximately 500m to the northwest of the site. Mitigation measures will need to be considered.</li> <li>• Listed Buildings – New Inn Farm is a Grade II Listed farmhouse and a barn to the north of it is also Grade II Listed. The farm is adjacent to the site on its southern edge.</li> </ul>
<b>Tier 1 conclusion:</b>	The site is agricultural land with access to the road network. It contains several houses relating to farms. It contains a number of

	<p>wildlife features and is close to a SSSI. A group of listed farm buildings lie to the south of the site. It is fairly open and rolling agricultural landscape that is very rural and tranquil in character. Long views are not so frequent as adjacent areas due to the rolling landscape and layers of vegetation.</p> <p>The site has previously been ruled out as a potential development site due to its poor relationship to the existing development form and character of Cambourne, where the nearest facilities and services are located.</p>
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	Yes.

**Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations**

<b>Designations and Constraints</b>	
<b>Heritage considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Listed Buildings - New Inn Farm and associated barns are grade II listed and are adjacent to the site on its southern boundary. Impact on the historic setting and character of this group of farm buildings would need to be carefully assessed and mitigated to ensure that the wider development was not harmful to it. It may be possible, through masterplanning and layout design, to ensure that the site's rural agricultural setting is preserved.</li> <li>Non-statutory archaeological site - Archaeological excavations to the south, ahead of the Cambourne new settlement and A428 improvement schemes, have revealed extensive evidence for prehistoric and Roman settlement. Further information would be necessary in advance of any planning application for this site.</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>County Wildlife Site – the site is adjacent to two sections of Knapwell Roadside Verge which support nationally scarce vascular plant species (<i>Primula elatior</i>). Knapwell Wood CWS is located on the eastern edge of the site – this woodland is listed in the Cambridgeshire Inventory of ancient woodland, which retains more than 25% semi natural cover and the wood also supports nationally scarce vascular plant species (<i>Primula elatior</i>) and a plant species rare in the county (<i>Quercus petraea</i>). Brockley End Meadow lies 540m to the west of the site, which supports populations of a nationally scarce vascular plant species (<i>Trifolium ochroleucon</i>). Mitigation measures will need to be considered.</li> <li>Tree Preservation Orders – there are a considerable number of trees with Tree Preservation Orders within the site area, including Knapwell Wood. A separate table of these is attached as an appendix. They are situated on the northern area, eastern edge, western area and small groupings in the northern central part of</li> </ul>

	<p>the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Rights of Way – there are three public footpaths crossing the site: footpaths 5 &amp; 8 Knapwell and 4 Elsworth. These routes would have to be accommodated into any development.</li> <li>• Biodiversity features – greatest ecological impact likely to result is from a loss of open farmland. Protected Road Verges along the Knapwell Road contain important flora and could be lost through road improvements or services provision. Low impact on woodland as generally these are not extensive. There are a few copses providing the major wood resource and are scattered across the site. Hedgerows are suffering from severance and fragmentation. Grassland is fragmented and will be a direct loss – there is strong scope for enhancement of this feature. There are no watercourses on site and because of the apparent low number of ponds on site minimal opportunities to enhance these.</li> <li>• Agricultural land of high grade – the site is grade 2 agricultural land.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Physical considerations?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality issues – despite this proposal not being adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area, it is of a significant size and therefore, there is a potential for an increase in traffic and static emissions that could affect local air quality. More information is required for this location, particularly details for air quality assessment and a low emission strategy.</li> <li>• Topography issues – levels fall across the site towards the north.</li> <li>• Noise issues – sources of noise include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Elsworth Moto Parc (Motocross Circuit) lies approximately 600m to the west – development of the site would bring noise sensitive premises closer to the circuit, which is currently relatively remote. These are unlikely to be considered compatible uses.</li> <li>2. Vehicle repair workshop at New Inn Farm lies adjacent to the site’s southern boundary and commercial units at Glebe Farm lie to the north of the site – sources of commercial noise.</li> <li>3. A428 – noise from road traffic on adjacent roads.</li> </ol> <p><i>Commercial and Motocross Noise – Mitigation:</i>  Current noise has not been quantified. If noise is an issue it is unlikely that mitigation measures on the proposed development site alone can provide an acceptable ambient noise environment. Noise insulation / mitigation abatement measures could be required offsite but there is uncertainty as to whether these would be effective. Such mitigation measures are likely to require the full cooperation of the business operators and section 106 planning / obligation requirements may be required and there are no guarantees that these can be secured. Any detrimental economic impact on existing businesses should also be considered prior to allocation. Environmental Health currently object to this site and before any consideration is given to allocating this site for residential development it is recommended</p> </li> </ul>

	<p>that these noise constraints are thoroughly investigated and duly considered / addressed by undertaking noise impact / risk assessments and consideration is given to possible on or offsite mitigation in accordance with PPG 24 and associated guidance and viability.</p> <p><i>Traffic Noise – Mitigation:</i>  The south of the site is bounded by the busy A428. Traffic noise will need assessment in accordance with PPG 24 and associated guidance. The impact of existing noise on any future residents in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well being and providing a high quality living environment. However, residential use is likely to be acceptable with careful noise mitigation through a combination of appropriate distance separation, commercial shielding, noise berms / barriers, careful orientation / positioning / design / internal layout of buildings, noise insulation scheme and extensive noise attenuation measures to mitigate traffic noise (single aspect, limited height, dual aspect with sealed non-openable windows on façade facing roads, acoustically treated alternative ventilation, no open amenity spaces such as balconies / gardens). Noise likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises.</p>
<p><b>Townscape and landscape impact?</b></p>	<p>The proposed development lies in the Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands Landscape Character Area. The area is fairly open and rolling, noticeably more so than the adjacent proposed development sites and Cambourne to the south.</p> <p>The field pattern of medium to large scale fields are bounded by mature hedgerows and hedgerows and large hedgerow trees, mainly Oak and Ash. The area contains many small areas of mature woodland, often in the valley bottoms of small streams which cut through the site, giving a distinctive layered landscape.</p> <p>Long views are not so frequent as adjacent areas due to the rolling landscape and layers of vegetation.</p> <p>The village of Knapwell to the north of the site is small running along one street south to north in an intimate, shallow valley and surrounded by mature hedgerows and woodland. It has a mature and rural character, and is linked by a public footpath to the across the centre of the site and by Knapwell Road.</p> <p>The site lies north of the A428, west of Knapwell Road. The area is fairly open and rolling, and is cut by the valleys of several small streams. Two noticeable clay ridges run south to north towards the village of Knapwell.</p> <p>Generally the land falls to the north from a height of approximately</p>

	<p>70m AOD to adjacent to the A428 to approximately 45m AOD in the stream valleys. Three public footpaths run south to north from the Old St Neots road towards Knapwell.</p> <p>Towards the north of the site the landscape becomes more detailed and intimate, particularly in the stream valley bottoms. The site contains many mature trees and hedgerows, linking areas of mature woodland. Large mature roadside trees are a feature of Knapwell Road to the east of the site.</p> <p>The area has a very rural and tranquil character.</p> <p>The main settlement of Cambourne lies directly to the south of the site, separated from it by the A428, the old St Neots Road and areas of maturing structure planting and woodland.</p> <p><b><i>The proposed development</i></b> It will be difficult to view this development an extension of Cambourne given the separation by the A428, other roads and structural landscaping to the south. If developed it would be best seen as a new village.</p> <p>Due to its elevation and relativity open character, particularly to the west and south of the site development, this area would form a new built skyline when viewed from the A428 and St Neots Road and particularly from Knapwell Road.</p> <p>The deeply rural approach to Knapwell would be urbanised and the village itself completely dominated by the development.</p> <p>The detailed and layered landscape to the north of the site would become obscured by the development. Given the likely scale of the development and types of buildings proposed, integration of the development into the local landscape would be very difficult.</p> <p><b>a) Landscape effects on existing settlements (Knapwell, Elsworth &amp; Cambourne)</b> Development would be large in relation to the existing village settlements, would dominate the skyline and have a significant adverse effect on existing settlements.</p> <p><b>b) Impact on visual amenity and character of the landscape (Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands)</b> The development is at odds with the local landscape character and would have a very significant adverse effect on the local landscape.</p>
--	---

<b>Can any issues be mitigated?</b>	In part – it should be possible to partly mitigate the noise and air quality issues, and impacts on the listed buildings, SSSI, County Wildlife Site, protected trees and biodiversity. However, it would not be possible to mitigate the landscape impacts. The scale of the development and types of buildings proposed would be very difficult to integrate into the local landscape.
-------------------------------------	--

<b>Infrastructure</b>	
<b>Highways access?</b>	<p>The Highways Agency has advised that the A428 corridor is seriously limited in capacity between the A1 and A1198. At present there is no realistic prospect of resolving this. However, the A428 corridor is within the remit of the A14 strategic study, further adding to the uncertainties.</p> <p>Regarding the sites in the A428 corridor, (estimated capacity of approximately 11,721 dwellings on 21 sites), three quarters of this total is accounted for on just 3 sites along the southern edge of the A428. Development on these sites is likely to be largely Cambridge-centric but St Neots is also likely to attract a significant amount of trips. For instance rail connectivity via St Neots is likely to be an attractive alternative to Cambridge. Even a modest residual demand between these sites and St Neots could be critical.</p> <p>Conversely, there is some scope for these larger sites to enhance to the overall transport sustainability of Cambourne and other local settlements through better integration, with the potential to offset some of the new demand. The capacity to accommodate new development on this corridor is directly related to this scope, which will need to be demonstrated by the promoters.</p> <p>The local highways authority comment that all development proposals of this scale will need to be backed by a Transport Assessment and supporting Travel Plans. Any Transport Assessment will need to be based on analysis undertaken using the Cambridge Sub-Region Model developed and managed by Cambridgeshire County Council. Detailed mitigation measures and the identification of appropriate financial contributions and obligations under Section 106 will be identified based on the appraisal of the Transport Assessment for each site. The comments provide an overview of the headline transport issues for the site, and should not be regarded as a definitive list of transport requirements.</p> <p>This development would have a direct impact on A428 Trunk Road with potential capacity issues at the Cambourne Junction and on corridor between Cambridge and St. Neots / Bedford, particularly junctions at either end of this section of A428 (A1198 roundabout and M11 Junction 14). A1303 Madingley Road corridor into Cambridge has capacity problems (especially at M11 Junction 13). The site has no rail access.</p>

	<p>Poor access to services by walking, with potential to create walk and cycle routes to Cambourne constrained by severance impact of A428 dual carriageway. Potential for strategic cycle route to Cambridge (East – via Highfields and Coton) with suitable new and improved provision. Opportunity to strengthen bus services on corridor between Cambourne and Cambridge (Service 4) through appropriate enhancement of capacity, although location of site would add time penalty, abortive routing and extra costs to existing services. Madingley Park and Ride capacity may need upgrading.</p> <p>The local planning authority will need to consult with the Highway Agency in respect to the proposed site access onto the A428. Access onto Knapwell Road would not be suitable for the proposed volume of dwellings.</p>
<p><b>Utility services?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity – development of this site is not supportable from existing network, therefore significant reinforcement and new network required.</li> <li>• Mains water – the site falls within the Bourn Reservoir distribution zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 3900 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within the Bourn Reservoir distribution zone to supply the total number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites with the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in the capacity of the Bourn Reservoir distribution zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or a new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</li> <li>• Gas – Cambourne is already served by gas (although it is not provided by National Grid) and significant system reinforcement is likely to be necessary to accommodate the development of this site.</li> <li>• Mains sewerage – Utton's Drove WwTW is operating close to capacity and therefore has limited capacity to accommodate this site. A revised consent will be required for this prior to connection. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre-development assessment will be required to ascertain any required upgrades. The developer will have to fund this assessment and any mitigation required. Swavesey Internal Drainage Board are concerned if it is intended that the foul sewage effluent from this development be directed to the Utton's Drove Sewage Treatment Works and discharged into the Swavesey Drain catchment. The Council will be well aware of the issues that have arisen with such discharges and their effect on the Drain and the standard of protection provided to its catchment. At this stage, therefore, the Board must raise and record its concerns relating to development of this site.</li> </ul>

<b>Drainage measures?</b>	No FRA has been provided.
<b>School capacity?</b>	<p>Early Years education:</p> <p>Approximately 313 places would be required to serve a development of 2,500.</p> <p>The levels of housing development would indicate that additional Early Years settings would be required to meet the demand arising from development. This possibly could be provided along with additional primary school accommodation. However, this may not always be possible and alternative approaches to enable sufficient Childcare and Early Years provision to be commissioned, may therefore need to be considered during the planning of new housing. This additional accommodation would not necessarily need to be specifically for Early Years and Childcare provision, with opportunities for co-locating and/or sharing community facilities being explored wherever possible.</p> <p>Primary education:</p> <p>Jeavons Wood Primary School, Eastgate, Cambourne has a planned admission number of 60 and 420 spaces. The figures are the same for the two other primary schools in the village, namely, Monkfield Park Primary School, School Lane, Cambourne and The Vine Inter-Church Primary School, The Vines, Cambourne. This totals 180 PAN and 1260 spaces. Surplus capacity of places at these schools in Cambourne is currently 21 places.</p> <p>To meet the needs arising from a development of 2,500 homes, 875 primary school places would be required; equivalent to 5FE primary school. These could be incorporated into the development site.</p> <p>Secondary education:</p> <p>The site falls within the catchment of Swavesey Village College. Its PAN is 240 and a capacity of 1200. There is no capacity at this college.</p> <p>2,500 dwellings would equate to approximately 4.37 FE (625 places). A 5 FE school provides 750 places and would be sufficient to serve 2,500 homes but would be a very small secondary school.</p> <p>A recent approval of planning application S/1898/11 for a Secondary School on land west of Cambourne was granted. It is planned that this will open in September 2013, and cater for 750 pupils, aged 11 to 16, with a catchment area covering Cambourne. There is scope to expand the school to provide up to 8FE, subject to the necessary planning permissions and funding.</p>

<b>Health facilities capacity?</b>	Monkfield Medical Practice, Cambourne – an extension to accommodate the additional 950 dwellings agreed at Cambourne has already been agreed. A new facility would need to be provided to accommodate any further growth.
<b>Any other issues?</b>	N/A
<b>Can issues be mitigated?</b>	In part – through improvements and upgrades to schools and major utilities. However the development would have a direct impact on A428 with potential capacity issues.
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	No

<b>Tier 3: Site Specific Factors</b>
--------------------------------------

<b>Capacity</b>	
<b>Developable area</b> (Updated August 2013)	None
<b>Site capacity</b> (Updated August 2013)	2,500 dwellings as proposed by the promoter
<b>Density</b>	40dph

<b>Potential Suitability</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints.

<b>Availability</b>	
<b>Is the land in single ownership?</b>	No.
<b>Site ownership status?</b>	The site is owned by two developers.
<b>Legal constraints?</b>	Not known.
<b>Is there market interest in the site?</b>	The site is owned by two developers.
<b>When would the site be available for development?</b>	The promoter indicates the site is available immediately.

<b>Achievability</b>	
<b>Phasing and delivery of the development</b>	The promoter indicates the first dwellings could be completed on site in 2016-21.
<b>Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	No.
<b>Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	No.
<b>Could issues identified be overcome?</b>	None identified
<b>Economic viability?</b>	For strategic scale sites (new settlements and large urban extensions) much depends upon the extent, cost and phasing of the infrastructure to be funded by the development, the amount of housing that can actually be accommodated on site, and the timing of its provision in relation to that of the accompanying infrastructure. Such variables are currently unknown or unclear and so the viability of such sites cannot be appraised at this time.

<b>Site Assessment Conclusion</b>
Site with no development potential.

<b>Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013</b>
Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework.

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

<b>Proforma Created</b>	July 2012
<b>Proforma Last Updated</b>	July 2012
<b>Location</b>	New Settlement (Longstanton Parish)
<b>Site name / address</b>	Southwell Farm, Station Road, Longstanton (part of Northstowe Reserve)
<b>Category of site:</b>	A new settlement
<b>Description of promoter's proposal</b>	48 - 80 dwellings (note: the site does not adjoin the allocated site for Northstowe, however it lies within another site that does and therefore assessment of this site is conditional on the larger site being found to have potential)
<b>Site area (hectares)</b>	1.84 ha
<b>Site Number</b>	273
<b>Site description &amp; context</b>	The site is located to the north of the village of Longstanton on the B1050, which heads northwards into Willingham. The site is primarily agricultural land with the only vehicular access being onto the B1050. The land is the other side of the road from the core site of the new town of Northstowe and is identified in the Northstowe Area Action Plan 2007 as forming the strategic reserve land under policy NS/3/g.
<b>Current or last use of the site</b>	Residential / Small Holding
<b>Is the site Previously Developed Land?</b>	The majority of the land is undeveloped but there is a dwelling on the land with the associated residential curtilage.
<b>Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan?</b>	None

<b>Planning history</b>	<p>2004, Local Plan – not included as a potential housing site</p> <p>2007, Local Development Framework (Core Strategy) – ST/2 Housing Provision – Northstowe identified as a location for future housing development.</p> <p>2007, Northstowe Area Action Plan – identified as part of the strategic reserve land</p> <p>No previous planning applications for any large scale residential development.</p>
<b>Source of site</b>	Site suggested through call for sites

<b>Tier 1: Strategic Considerations</b>	
<b>Green Belt</b>	The site is not within or adjacent to the Green Belt.
<b>Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site of Geological Importance (unknown)</li> <li>• Part of the site is within a Sand and Gravel Minerals Safeguarding Area</li> </ul> <p>All Allocated for development. See policy NS/3/1/g of the adopted NAAP.</p>
<b>Tier 1 conclusion:</b>	This site has already been identified as part of the strategic reserve land for Northstowe in the NAAP. It falls outside of the greenbelt and is largely agricultural in nature.
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	Yes

### Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations

<b>Designations and Constraints</b>	
<b>Heritage considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cropmarks in the area identify the location of a Roman settlement. Sample excavation of this site has demonstrated continuity into the Saxon period. Archaeological investigations to the south indicate a substantial Bronze Age and Iron Age component to this landscape. Further information would be necessary in advance of any planning application for this site.</li> </ul> <p>With careful design and it should be possible to mitigate the historic environment impacts of development of this site.</p>

<p><b>Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biodiversity features - Greatest impact likely to be as a result of the loss of grassland habitats which in turn provide foraging for the local badger population.</li> <li>• Agricultural land of high grade (i.e. Agricultural Land Classification Grade 1, 2, 3a) – some Grade 2.</li> </ul> <p>It should be possible to mitigate impacts upon any wildlife habitats through well designed buffer zones and the recreation of habitats offsite.</p>
<p><b>Physical considerations?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality issues - Close to the Councils' Air Quality Management Area. Extensive and detailed air quality assessments will be required to assess the cumulative impacts of this and other proposed developments within the locality on air quality along with provision of a Low Emissions Strategy.</li> <li>• Noise issues - Close proximity to the B1050 bypass to the South &amp; East and the CGB to the North with prevailing winds from the South West. Traffic noise will need assessment in accordance with PPG 24 and associated guidance and the impact of existing diffuse traffic noise on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well being and providing a high quality living environment. Residential use is likely to be acceptable with careful noise mitigation and noise likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises. No objection in principle as an adequate level of protection against noise can be secured by condition.</li> <li>• Noise issues – South east of the site is close to Hydro Eu Ltd, Station Road a medium to large sized industrial type unit / uses. Noise from activities / plant and equipment and vehicle movements are material considerations with significant negative impact potential in terms of health and well being and a poor quality living environment and possible noise nuisance. It is unlikely that mitigation measures on the proposed development site alone can provide an acceptable ambient noise environment. It is recommended that these noise, odour and dust constraints are thoroughly investigated and duly considered / addressed including consideration of mitigation by undertaking odour and noise impact / risk assessments in accordance with PPG 24 Planning and Noise and associated guidance.</li> <li>• Noise and malodour - possible noise and malodour from nearby Southwell Farm, Station Rd as proposals would be closer than existing residential. No history of complaints. Minor to moderate adverse noise / odour risk but no objection in principle on this issue.</li> <li>• Noise issues - Some minor to moderate additional off-site road traffic noise generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance. Possible to mitigate but may require s106 agreements.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Townscape and landscape impact? (Of wider reserve site)</b></p>	<p>The proposed development lies in the Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands, but is heavily influenced by the valley of the River Great Ouse to the west and the fenland landscape a short distance to the north and east. The area is generally low lying – from 5-15m AOD, but rising to rolling clay hills south of the A14, which are generally 20-50m AOD. Small changes in level are very noticeable and low hills of 20m AOD give wide panoramic views over the landscape. It should be possible to mitigate the visual impact to a certain extent through well designed built form and appropriate soft landscaping. The field pattern is of large and very large regular fields separated by hedges, drains and ditches and occasional shelter belts. Although the landscape remains generally open, the vegetation combines to produce an almost continuous line of trees and hedges on a low horizon. The landscape becomes more closed and detailed around the edge of the local villages, with a number of small fields and paddocks separated by tall, mature hedges. Wide views are available across the entire site from Gravel Bridge Road to the north west the Longstanton By-Pass to the south, and from the CGB. The eastern B1050 boundary is more closed and includes existing dwellings. Development would be large in relation to the existing village settlements and would adversely affect the landscape setting of Longstanton to the extent that it may be difficult to view Longstanton as separate from Northstowe. The development is at odds with the local landscape character and would have an adverse effect on the local landscape by adding a substantial urban extension into an open and rural landscape. To successfully set the proposed development into the existing landscape, and to preserve a landscape setting to Longstanton, substantial structural landscape will be required to the north, west and south of the development, giving genuine rural separation between the development and the village, and a soft, integrated edge treatment. Structural landscape will also be required within the development with some views to existing horizons and landscape features retained.</p>
<p><b>Can any issues be mitigated?</b></p>	<p>It should be possible to mitigate the visual impact to a certain extent through well designed built form and appropriate soft landscaping. The field pattern is of large and very large regular fields separated by hedges, drains and ditches and occasional shelter belts. Although the landscape remains generally open, the vegetation combines to produce an almost continuous line of trees and hedges on a low horizon. To successfully set the proposed development into the existing landscape, and to preserve a landscape setting to Longstanton, substantial structural landscape will be required to the north, west and south of the development, giving genuine rural separation between the development and the village, and a soft, integrated edge treatment. Structural landscape will also be required within the development with some views to existing horizons and landscape features retained.</p> <p>It should be possible to mitigate noise nuisances.</p>

<b>Infrastructure</b>	
<b>Highways access?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The B1050 runs through the site and there are existing roundabouts where access could be gained. Capacity on the B1050 may become an issue as the core area of Northstowe is developed. Given the volume of traffic that could be using this road there could be the need to divert traffic away from residential areas. The scale of the site and the existing route of the B1050 would allow for this to be achieved if necessary.</li> <li>• The County Council is considering access to this site as part of the Phase I of the Northstowe Site.</li> <li>• This grouping is far closer to Cambridge and is heavily reliant on the A14 for strategic access. It is difficult to see more than a small proportion of these sites being deliverable prior to major improvements to the A14, and even this could require substantial mitigation measures.</li> </ul>
<b>Utility services?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity -The site would not supportable from existing network and that significant reinforcement and new network required.</li> <li>• Mains Water - The site falls within the Cambridge Water Company Madingley Reservoir Distribution Zone and there is insufficient spare capacity to supply the number of proposed properties. Spare capacity will be allocated on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</li> <li>• Gas - There is a medium pressure gas pipeline along route of B1050, which according to the generic advice from National Grid will be suitable for most larger developments, however these will require a Pressure Reduction Station to be built to allow a local low pressure infrastructure to be laid around the developments.</li> <li>• Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the WWTW to accommodate this development site. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre-development assessment will be required to ascertain the specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the developer.</li> </ul>
<b>Drainage measures?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No FRA been carried out</li> <li>• The development site is near the boundary of the Old West Internal Drainage District, which does not have any capacity to accept any direct discharge into its system above the green field run off rate. All surface water from the site would have to be balanced before it is released into the Boards system.</li> <li>• There are concerns about the foul sewage effluent from any development areas be intended to be directed to the Uttons Drove STW and discharged into the Swavesey Drain catchment.</li> </ul>

<b>School capacity?</b>	As an extension of Northstowe children within the development would attend one of the seven proposed primary schools and the proposed secondary school that are identified in the Development Framework Document to serve the new town. As the reserve land would be one of the last phases of Northstowe to be developed the capacity of these schools, and their ability to extend would need to be assessed nearer to the time. As the DFD is considering this site the location of schools, and their site size will be taken into account.
<b>Health facilities capacity?</b>	Any major new settlements outside of Cambridge will almost certainly require significant Health infrastructure and these facilities would be planned as part of Northstowe. The surgeries in Longstanton and Willingham could be extended but by the time this land comes to be developed Northstowe should have its own facilities, the location and site areas needed for these facilities will be considered as part of the DFD.
<b>Any other issues?</b>	None
<b>Can issues be mitigated?</b>	Yes – the majority of the constraints relate to capacity within the relevant network and the consultees identify that in all cases capacity could be increased. This increase in capacity would have implications for the viability of any development.
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	Yes

**Tier 3: Site Specific Factors**

<b>Capacity</b>	
<b>Developable area</b>	1.66 ha.
<b>Site capacity</b>	66 dwellings
<b>Density</b>	40 dph

<b>Potential Suitability</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The site is potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints.

<b>Availability</b>	
<b>Is the land in single ownership?</b>	Yes
<b>Site ownership status?</b>	Landowner

<b>Legal constraints?</b>	None known
<b>Is there market interest in the site?</b>	Yes
<b>When would the site be available for development?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is available immediately.</li> <li>• The assessment is based on the Call for Sites Questionnaire.</li> </ul>

<b>Achievability</b>	
<b>Phasing and delivery of the development</b>	The promoter indicates the first dwellings could be completed on site 2011-16.
<b>Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	Given the proximity of the site to the facilities that will be developed at Northstowe and the Cambridgeshire Guided Bus demand for housing may be higher than at other sites.
<b>Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	The main cost factors relate to increasing capacity in the necessary infrastructure. However significant investment in the surrounding infrastructure will happen as a result of Northstowe itself.
<b>Could issues identified be overcome?</b>	Yes - through S106 payments or CIL.
<b>Economic viability?</b>	For strategic scale sites (new settlements and large urban extensions) much depends upon the extent, cost and phasing of the infrastructure to be funded by the development, the amount of housing that can actually be accommodated on site, and the timing of its provision in relation to that of the accompanying infrastructure. Such variables are currently unknown or unclear and so the viability of such sites cannot be appraised at this time.

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

<b>Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013</b>
Allocated for development (policy SS7 Northstowe Strategic Reserve).

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

<b>Proforma Created</b>	July 2012
<b>Proforma Last Updated</b>	August 2013
<b>Location</b>	New Settlement (Longstanton, Rampton & Willingham Parish)
<b>Site name / address</b>	Land generally to the north and north east of Northstowe adjoining the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway
<b>Category of site:</b>	A new settlement
<b>Description of promoter's proposal</b> (Updated June 2013)	An extension to the new town of Northstowe, an employment-led development which would provide around 11,800 homes and around 12,000 jobs on the two sites combined (Northstowe allocation and this extension).
<b>Site area</b> (hectares) (Updated June 2013)	202 ha
<b>Site Number</b>	274
<b>Site description &amp; context</b>	The site abuts the route of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway to the south east, the other side of which is the site for the new town of Northstowe. To the north there is the village of Rampton. The land is flat and primarily agricultural in nature with some buildings in the northwest. There are several public rights of way across the site and to the west it abuts the B1050.
<b>Current or last use of the site</b>	Agricultural land mainly in arable use.
<b>Is the site Previously Developed Land?</b>	The majority of the land in agricultural use. There is some built development with curtilages adjacent to the B1050 and to the northwest.
<b>Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan?</b>	No

<b>Planning history</b>	<p>2004, Local Plan – not included as a potential housing site.</p> <p>2007, Local Development Framework (Core Strategy) – ST/2 Housing Provision – Northstowe identified as a location for future housing development. Other land in vicinity that was put forward for consideration for development was not included in the site allocation.</p> <p>No previous planning applications for any large scale residential development.</p>
<b>Source of site</b>	Site suggested through call for sites

<b>Tier 1: Strategic Considerations</b>	
<b>Green Belt</b>	The site is not within or adjacent to the Green Belt.
<b>Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minerals and Waste LDF designations (Core Strategy designations only) – approximately 1/3 of the site is within a Sand and Gravel Minerals Safeguarding Area.</li> <li>Flood Zone – most of the southern part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3. In relation to flood risk the majority of the site is in Flood Zone 1 (87%) and is therefore not affected by flood risk. Only about 10% of the site is in Flood Zone 3a and a previous Masterplan identified these areas for uses such as open space, which are compatible with the flood risk potential. No part of the site is within the functional flood plain (Flood Zone 3b).</li> </ul>
<b>Tier 1 conclusion:</b>	The site falls outside of the greenbelt and is largely agricultural in nature. It is located adjacent to the core area of Northstowe identified in the Northstowe Area Action Plan (adopted 2007). Only a small part of the site is within flood zones.
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	Yes

### Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations

<b>Designations and Constraints</b>	
<b>Heritage considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-statutory archaeological site - Cropmarks and surface finds suggest the presence of significant late prehistoric and Roman archaeological remains in the area. Further information would be necessary in advance of any planning application for this site. There are a number of listed pillboxes along the perimeter of the former RAF Oakington site, which is almost adjacent to this site. These pillboxes are located near to the southwest boundary of the site.</li> </ul> <p>With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the historic environment.</p>

<p><b>Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations?</b> (Updated June 2013)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Rights of Way - There is a byway and footpath across the southern part of the site that links the villages of Longstanton and Rampton. Further byways to the north and south east.</li> <li>• Biodiversity features - Greatest impact likely to be as a result of the loss of grassland habitats, which in turn provide foraging for the local badger population. Water voles are known to be present on some watercourses across the site.</li> <li>• Agricultural land of high grade (i.e. Agricultural Land Classification Grade 1, 2, 3a) – a small amount of the site, to the north west is Grade 1 and the majority of the rest of the site is Grade 2. Note – the promoter’s own assessment concluded that none of the site is Grade 1 and only 6% is Grade 2 quality. 50% of the site is Grade 3a, and the remaining 44% is Grade 3b.</li> </ul> <p>It should be possible to mitigate impacts upon any wildlife habitats through well designed buffer zones and the recreation of habitats offsite.</p>
<p><b>Physical considerations?</b> (Updated June 2013)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land contamination - Site is adjacent to guided busway (old railway line) and would require investigation. This can be dealt with by condition.</li> <li>• Air Quality issues - This proposal is located close to the Councils’ Air Quality Management Area and is of a significant size. Extensive and detailed air quality assessments will be required to assess the cumulative impacts of this and other proposed developments within the locality on air quality along with provision of a Low Emissions Strategy. This information will be required prior to further comment.</li> <li>• Noise issues - The site is in close proximity to the B1050 to the West and the CGB to the South &amp; Longstanton P&amp; R. Traffic / Transport noise will need assessment in accordance with PPG 24 and associated guidance and the impact of existing diffuse traffic noise on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well being and providing a high quality living environment. However residential use is likely to be acceptable with careful noise mitigation. Noise likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises. No objection in principle as an adequate level of protection against noise can be secured by condition.</li> <li>• Noise and malodour - Possible noise and malodour from nearby farms that may coexist as proposals would be closer than existing residential. No history of complaints. Minor to moderate adverse noise / odour risk but no objection in principle on this issue.</li> <li>• Noise issues - Some minor to moderate additional off-site road traffic noise generation on existing residential due to development related car movements but dependent on location of site entrance. Possible to mitigate but may require s106 agreements.</li> <li>• Other environmental conditions (e.g. fumes, vibration, dust) –</li> </ul>

	<p>There is a sewage treatment works with open trickle beds in close proximity to the west, offsite near BrookField associated with old barracks and existing housing etc. However, this is no longer operational.</p>
<p><b>Townscape and landscape impact?</b> (Updated June 2013)</p>	<p>Given the relatively flat nature of the site and surrounding landscape any development is likely to have a significant visual impact, especially when viewed from the B1050 and the PROWs that pass through the site. The landscape becomes more closed and detailed around the edge of the local villages, with a number of small fields and paddocks separated by tall, mature hedges.</p> <p>The site lies to the north of the proposed new-town development at Northstowe, with the Cambridge Guided Bus (CGB) running east-west between the two developments. The field pattern is of large and very large regular, open agricultural fields separated by drainage ditches with occasional hedges, small copses and shelterbelts. The horizon is largely formed by low lines of vegetation beyond the site. From the north huge views are available across the entire site and the adjoining proposed Northstowe development and Longstanton to the clay hills south of the A14. Apart from the dwellings and screen planting adjoining Station Road and New Farm to the west of the site there are no notable landscape features.</p> <p>The proposed development will form a very large and highly visible extension to the existing proposals for Northstowe. Given its likely form and scale the development will form an extensive urban edge clearly visible from Willingham and Rampton to the north. Stretches of Station Road and Rampton Road between the villages will become urbanised by large scale development and the requirements for new road infrastructure, access junctions etc. The much increased scale of the combined development may benefit Longstanton and Oakington if, as the promoter contends, a greater degree of separation with these villages can be achieved, but this may be countered by a greater impact on the landscape setting of Willingham and Rampton.</p> <p>The proposed layout of Northstowe and the existing transport infrastructure will make satisfactory visual connections between the two sites very difficult. The current structural landscape proposals for a green 'waterpark' to the north and east of Northstowe, and the connections to the wider landscape will become absorbed within a far larger development than is currently proposed.</p> <p>Development would be very large in relation to the existing and proposed settlements and would adversely affect the landscape setting of Longstanton Oakington, Willingham and Rampton.</p> <p>The development is at odds with the local landscape character. It would have an adverse effect on the local landscape by adding a very</p>

	<p>substantial urban extension into an open and rural landscape. The proposed development would also have a very significant adverse effect on the carefully considered structural landscape proposals for existing and currently proposed developments in the area.</p> <p>Landscape Mitigation - It would be extremely difficult to integrate an extended development of this scale with existing proposals and the local landscape. If this site is to form an extension to Northstowe then the form of the combined developments, their structural landscape, connections to the wider landscape and their transport infrastructure and connections will have to be re-addressed. A far more limited development than proposed may be possible as a new 'village' separate to Northstowe. Any development must respect the scale and rural separation of local settlements and should feature its own links to existing roads and a robust green infrastructure to set it comfortably in the local landscape.</p> <p>The promoter has undertaken its own Landscape Character and Visual Impact Assessment by Allen Pyke Associates which concluded that the proposed development can be accommodated into the local landscape without causing any unacceptable harm.</p> <p>They contend that the current proposals for Northstowe do not allow for any significant separation from the existing communities in Longstanton and Oakington. They argue there is potential to secure a greater degree of separation from Longstanton and Oakington by making more land available to accommodate the housing and other development, reducing the need to use land in sensitive areas such as this. Whilst development will bring the town closer to existing communities in Willingham and Rampton, they propose a substantial area of green separation from these villages.</p> <p>The promoter disputes that the Guided Busway is a barrier to connectivity. The Travel Demand; Northstowe Review report by Cannon Consulting Engineers is clear that the Busway does not prevent vehicular, pedestrian and cycle connections between the allocated site and the land to the north.</p>
<p><b>Can any issues be mitigated?</b></p>	<p>No. Significant historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts. Only limited mitigation would be possible of key townscape and landscape considerations. Further investigation and possible mitigation will be required to address the physical considerations, including potential for land contamination, noise and malodour.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Infrastructure</b></p>	
<p><b>Highways access?</b> (Updated June 2013)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The B1050 runs through the site and there are existing roundabouts where access could be gained. Capacity on the B1050 may become an issue as the core area of Northstowe is developed. Given the volume of traffic that could be using this</li> </ul>

	<p>road there could be the need to divert traffic away from residential areas. The scale of the site and the existing route of the B1050 would allow for this to be achieved if necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The County Council is considering access to this site as part of the Phase I of the Northstowe Site.</li> <li>• This grouping is far closer to Cambridge and is heavily reliant on the A14 for strategic access. It is difficult to see more than a small proportion of these sites being deliverable prior to major improvements to the A14, and even this could require substantial mitigation measures. The Northstowe new town proposal is constrained by the capacity of the A14, as is the case for other major development sites on the edge of Cambridge. The Highways Agency have agreed to an initial phase of 1,500 dwellings to be constructed at Northstowe, at the current time. We also understand that the Highways Agency and its partners are currently investigating options to release additional capacity on the A14 for further housing in this and other locations.</li> </ul> <p>The promoter's own Transport report notes that there may be scope for additional development prior to the upgrade of the A14, while the remainder of the development would be phased to follow this upgrade, currently planned for completion around 10 years before the end of the Plan period.</p> <p>The promoter contends that with the extension to Northstowe it has the potential to be self-contained, in terms of meeting the needs of its population locally, and minimising out-commuting and car journeys. By providing a large number of new jobs close to new housing, and alongside the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway, Northstowe can create a truly sustainable form of development. It can be expected that in the long-term, people will move to live where they can conveniently travel to work, providing that there is a sufficient amount and choice of housing available in the local area.</p>
<b>Utility services?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity - The site would not supportable from existing network and that significant reinforcement and new network required</li> <li>• Mains water - The site falls within the Cambridge Water Company Madingley Reservoir Distribution Zone and there is insufficient spare capacity to supply the number of proposed properties. Spare capacity will be allocated on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</li> <li>• Gas - There is a medium pressure gas pipeline along route of B1050, which according to the generic advice from National Grid will be suitable for most larger developments, however these will require a Pressure Reduction Station to be built to allow a local low pressure infrastructure to be laid around the developments.</li> <li>• Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the WWTW to</li> </ul>

	<p>accommodate this development site. The sewerage network is approaching capacity and a pre-development assessment will be required to ascertain the specific capacity of the system with regards to this site. If any mitigation is deemed necessary this will be funded by the developer.</p>
<p><b>Drainage measures?</b> (Updated June 2013)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No FRA been carried out</li> <li>• The development site is near the boundary of the Old West Internal Drainage District, which does not have any capacity to accept any direct discharge into its system above the green field run off rate. All surface water from the site would have to be balanced before it is released into the Boards system.</li> <li>• There are concerns about the foul sewage effluent from any development areas be intended to be directed to the Uttons Drove STW and discharged into the Swavesey Drain catchment.</li> </ul> <p>The promoter's Initial Flood Risk and Wastewater Assessment by Cannon Consulting Engineers demonstrates that foul water from the proposed development could be accommodated at Over Waste Water Treatment Works, which discharges to a separate water course. There is therefore no need for the development to discharge to Uttons Drove STW.</p>
<p><b>School capacity?</b> (Updated June 2013)</p>	<p>As an extension of Northstowe new schools would be needed to meet the increased population of the town. Alternatively children within the development would attend one of the proposed primary schools and the proposed secondary school that are identified in the Development Framework Document to serve the new town. The capacity of these schools, and their ability to extend would need to be assessed nearer to the time.</p> <p>The promoter states new school facilities would be provided within the development to support new housing. The nature of this provision would be discussed further with the Local Education Authority (LEA), but we have provisionally allowed for the provision of new primary schools in our Masterplan options below. Allowance would also be made towards secondary school provision, with the nature of the provision to be determined in discussion with the LEA. The provision of additional land for Northstowe on this site will allow flexibility in meeting these requirements.</p>
<p><b>Health facilities capacity?</b></p>	<p>Any major new settlements outside of Cambridge will almost certainly require significant Health infrastructure and these facilities would be planned as part of Northstowe. Whether these facilities could be extended to take in the population of this additional site would need to be assessed. The surgeries in Longstanton and Willingham could be extended but by the time this land comes to be developed Northstowe should have it own facilities. Given the scale of this site it is likely to need its own health facilities.</p>

<b>Any other issues?</b> (Updated June 2013)	The site is entirely within the control of The Fairfield Partnership.  The promoter's revised proposals suggest an employment-based development at Northstowe, with major new employment development designed to meet the needs of the local economy.
<b>Can issues be mitigated?</b>	Yes. The majority of the constraints relate to capacity within the relevant network and the consultees identify that in all cases capacity could be increased. This increase in capacity would have implication for the viability of any development.
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	No

<b>Tier 3: Site Specific Factors</b>
--------------------------------------

<b>Capacity</b>	
<b>Developable area</b> (Updated August 2013)	None
<b>Site capacity</b> (Updated June 2013)	1,800 dwellings
<b>Density</b> (Updated August 2013)	40 dph

<b>Potential Suitability</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints.

<b>Availability</b>	
<b>Is the land in single ownership?</b>	Yes
<b>Site ownership status?</b>	Owned by developer
<b>Legal constraints?</b>	None
<b>Is there market interest in the site?</b>	Yes – a developer has bought the site

<b>When would the site be available for development?</b>	The promoter has indicated the site is available immediately.
--	---

<b>Achievability</b>	
<b>Phasing and delivery of the development</b> (Updated June 2013)	<p>The Call for Sites Questionnaire states that the first dwellings be completed on site could be in 2011-16.</p> <p>There must be serious doubts about the deliverability of this site at the same time as the original Northstowe site and the reserve site already allocated. The delivery of those sites alone may extend beyond the plan period to 2031 and delivery rates would not necessarily increase through the allocation of additional land. The risk is that delivery rates would remain broadly similar but extending well beyond the end of the plan period and so requiring additional site allocations elsewhere able to deliver housing over the period to 2031.</p> <p>The promoter states that the development proposals have changed significantly from those previously proposed, and they have now been designed specifically with the intention of aiding the delivery of the town as a whole, and increasing the level of development which could be completed by the end of the Plan period.</p>
<b>Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	Given the proximity of the site to the facilities that will be developed at Northstowe and the Cambridgeshire Guided Bus demand for housing may be higher than at other sites.
<b>Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	The main cost factors relate to increasing capacity in the necessary infrastructure. However significant investment in the surrounding infrastructure will happen as a result of Northstowe itself.
<b>Could issues identified be overcome?</b>	Yes - through S106 payments or CIL.
<b>Economic viability?</b>	For strategic scale sites (new settlements and large urban extensions) much depends upon the extent, cost and phasing of the infrastructure to be funded by the development, the amount of housing that can actually be accommodated on site, and the timing of its provision in relation to that of the accompanying infrastructure. Such variables are currently unknown or unclear and so the viability of such sites cannot be appraised at this time.

<b>Site Assessment Conclusion</b>
Site with no development potential.

<b>Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013</b>
Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework.

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

<b>Proforma Created</b>	July 2012
<b>Proforma Last Updated</b>	March 2013
<b>Location</b>	Oakington
<b>Site name / address</b>	Old East Goods Yard, Station Road, Oakington
<b>Category of site:</b>	A village extension i.e. a development adjoining the existing village development framework boundary
<b>Description of promoter's proposal</b>	Up to 25 dwellings possibly with employment (A2 use or B1 use) and community facilities (D1 use) and potential for allotments or recreation ground.
<b>Site area (hectares)</b>	0.59 ha.
<b>Site Number</b>	275
<b>Site description &amp; context</b> (Updated March 2013)	<p>The site is a long thin strip of land located adjacent to the eastern edge of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway to the north of Station Road on the western edge of Westwick. The site is approximately 342 metres long and varies in width from 26 metres to 17 metres in width with the majority being at around 17 metres wide. The site is located to the rear of residential properties and businesses fronting onto Station Road. The site access is around 50 metres long and varies in width from around 2metres wide to 3.7 metres wide. It is surrounded on all other sides by agricultural and pastoral land. The site was formerly in business use and unoccupied buildings and hard standing remain in situ, but the built development only occupies a small part of the site. The site is well screened by hedgerows on all sides, and a tree belt runs along the western side of the Guided Busway alongside much of the length of the site.</p> <p>Note: this site does not adjoin a village framework.</p>
<b>Current or last use of the site</b>	Unoccupied B8 premises used for storage and repair of contractors plant. Ceased 2003.
<b>Is the site Previously Developed Land?</b>	Yes
<b>Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan?</b>	The site is adjacent to the area covered by the Northstowe AAP.

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

<p><b>Planning history</b></p>	<p>Attempts to gain planning permission for 1 - 4 dwellings on this site have been unsuccessful (S/2089/87/O, S/2088/87/O and S/2292/05/O). The larger proposal (S/2292/05/O) being refused as it would introduce a series of four detached properties in a backland position. The units would run parallel to the railway line. This pattern of development would be totally alien and out of keeping with the existing linear pattern of development. The units would be set in open countryside and would be highly visible from the main Cambridge Road with views obtained from up the former railway line. In this location the development would introduce dwellings on the edge of the Conservation Area, altering the relationship of the existing settlement pattern to the open countryside.</p> <p>The earlier proposals were considered unsuitable as they would intensify the use of this access located near a level crossing and closely related to adjacent commercial uses, namely a public house, a civil engineering plant depot and pipe store. The site is poorly related, in terms of probable noise and disturbance, to the adjacent commercial uses and the railway line.</p>
<p><b>Source of site</b></p>	<p>Site suggested through call for sites</p>

<p><b>Tier 1: Strategic Considerations</b></p>	
<p><b>Green Belt</b></p>	<p>The site is not within the Green Belt.</p>
<p><b>Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development?</b> (Updated March 2013)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone – the whole site is within Flood Zone 2 and the site entrance and the adjoining road is within Flood Zones 3a and 3b. The FRA submitted by the landowners consultants broadly accepts that the site is within FZ2 and that the site entrance is likely to be subject to flood risk up to a depth of up to 450mm. The majority of the site is not thought to be at risk of flooding due to the broad areas of lower lying land to the north and east. It notes that Fire Engines can operate at slow speeds in water up to 500mm depth and that dry access on foot should be possible via the guided busway and that it is therefore unlikely that the site would ever be completely cut off.</li> <li>• The NPPF states that:  <i>“101. The aim of the Sequential Test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. A sequential approach should be used in areas known to be at risk from any form of flooding.</i>  <i>102. If, following application of the Sequential Test, it is not possible, consistent with wider sustainability objectives, for the development to be located in zones with a lower probability of</i> </li> </ul>

	<p><i>flooding, the Exception Test can be applied if appropriate. For the Exception Test to be passed:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>it must be demonstrated that the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk, informed by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment where one has been prepared; and</i></li> <li>• <i>a site-specific flood risk assessment must demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Both elements of the test will have to be passed for development to be allocated or permitted.”</i></p> <p>The FRA states that they cannot conceive that climate change will increase the risk of flooding to the site. It does not however identify the likely increase in flood water depths affecting the site access and impacts on accessibility by emergency vehicles.</p>
<b>Tier 1 conclusion:</b> (Updated March 2013)	This is a long thin former commercial site located adjacent to the eastern edge of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway to the north of Station Road on the western edge of Westwick which is within Flood Zones 2 and 3 with the site access is within FZ3. The site does not adjoin the village framework and is on the opposite side of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway to the new settlement of Northstowe.
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	No

**Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations**

<b>Designations and Constraints</b>	
<b>Heritage considerations?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation Area – the southern part of the site lies within the Westwick Conservation Area.</li> <li>• Listed Buildings – Grade II Listed Westwick Hall lies approximately 215m to the south east and Westwick Hall Farmhouse lies 320m to the east.</li> <li>• Non-statutory archaeological site - Earthworks associated with the shrunken medieval settlement of Westwick are located to the east of the site. Further information would be necessary in advance of any planning application for this site.</li> </ul> <p>The site forms an important part of the setting of several Grade II Listed Buildings and the Westwick Conservation Area. However, with careful design it may be possible to mitigate any impact on the historic environment with a much smaller scale of development which does not extend so far back from the road frontage.</p>

<p><b>Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Rights of Way – a bridleway lies approximately 60m to the south east of the site.</li> <li>• Biodiversity features - Greatest impact could be upon boundary trees/scrub if site poorly developed. Common lizard may be associated with habitat near to former railway line.</li> </ul> <p>With careful design it should be possible to mitigate any impact on the natural environment.</p>
<p><b>Physical considerations?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land Contamination - Site is adjacent to the guided busway (old railway) &amp; previous military land and was commercial use. A Contaminated Land Assessment will be required as a condition of any planning application.</li> <li>• Noise issues - The site is immediately adjacent to and runs parallel to CGB. Due to the close proximity to the CGB and the physical constraints of the site dimensions 305m long and 16m wide, noise and vibration impacts are paramount considerations that are likely to influence the design / layout and number / density of residential premises allowed. The impact of existing CBG noise on any future residential in this area is a material consideration in terms of health and well being and providing a high quality living environment. Before this site is allocated for residential development it is recommended that these noise threats / constraints are thoroughly investigated in accordance with PPG 24: Planning and Noise and associated noise guidance for any new housing. This site requires a full noise assessment including consideration of any noise attenuation measures such as noise barriers / berms and practical / technical feasibility / financial viability of actually erecting residential premises on site.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Townscape and landscape impact?</b></p>	<p>The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes Westwick as a Fen Edge village, in generally flat, open landscape. Strong tree and hedgerow boundaries tend to screen the edges of the village. Views of the approaches are narrow and restricted by trees, mature gardens and field boundaries. Between Oakington and Westwick an area of parkland provides an attractive setting to the villages. The site is in an area characterised as enclosed farmland.</p> <p>The Westwick Conservation Area Appraisal (2005) describes how the village is effectively within open countryside and has no defined village framework. Westwick is separated from Oakington by a narrow belt of land that contains some significant Medieval remains. Most of the settlement lies along the road through the hamlet, with open farmland to the north and parkland and further farmland to the south. From the road within the village, in several places, there are fine views out into the surrounding parkland and open countryside. The village is also characterised by belts of trees lining the roadway and individual mature trees within the parkland.</p> <p>Westwick is a very linear settlement with the majority of houses directly facing the road often with no front gardens. Only the hall and</p>

	<p>model farm are set back from the road. The western boundary of the village is formed by the old railway line and its flanking vegetation. Just like the main road with its mature trees and hedges, this is very important in defining the village edge and contributing to its green character.</p> <p>On the north side of the road, east of the old railway track, is the former Oakington railway station / station master's house. The picket fence and gates of the old station survive. East of the station access is a house formerly the New Inn which opened in 1858. The station master's house and former New Inn are identified as significant buildings. Further to the east are some houses built for, and occupied by, railway workers in the C19.</p> <p>Beck Brook runs beside the railway line before dog-legging to flow on the south side of the road. It dog-legs again and flows due north on the east side of the railway cottages. Looking north along the brook, its western bank has a dense hedgerow with trees, whilst the eastern bank is more open with views out into the farmland and across to Westwick Hall Farm.</p> <p>On the southern side of the road is the very attractive Westwick Hall parkland with large mature trees including some magnificent oaks. Fine vistas out into the open countryside and of the front of the hall can be gained. Behind the brook, which runs alongside of the road, is a mature hedgerow with occasional trees. In places, views through this dense belt to the parkland beyond can be gained.</p> <p>The Northstowe development area lies to the west of the site on the opposite side of the Guided Busway. It is proposed to create a landscape buffer (Policy NS13/1) approximately 15m to the north west of the site.</p> <p>Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Westwick. Despite the opportunity for the development proposal to improve an unoccupied commercial site, the planning history section demonstrates the unsuitability of this site for backland development given the historically sensitive nature of the area. This pattern of development would be totally alien and out of keeping with the existing linear pattern of development, which would introduce dwellings on the edge of the Conservation Area, altering the relationship of the existing settlement pattern to the open countryside.</p>
<p><b>Can any issues be mitigated?</b></p>	<p>No. Historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts, together with noise and vibration impacts from the Guided Busway, which may not be mitigate-able. This is a long thin site and mitigating these impacts will leave an unsuitable site area to create a good design of development compatible with its surroundings.</p>

<b>Infrastructure</b>	
<b>Highways access?</b>	<p>Regarding sites in the Dry Drayton / Longstanton / Oakington / Willingham area (estimated capacity of 5,300 dwellings on 22 sites) the Highways Agency comment that this grouping is far closer to Cambridge and is heavily reliant on the A14 for strategic access. It is difficult to see more than a small proportion of these sites being deliverable prior to major improvements to the A14, and even this could require substantial mitigation measures.</p> <p>A junction located on Station Road would be acceptable to the Highway Authority. The proposed site is acceptable in principle subject to detailed design.</p>
<b>Utility services?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity - No significant impact on existing network.</li> <li>• Mains water - The site falls within the CWC Madingley reservoir distribution zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 500 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within the Madingley Reservoir Distribution Zone to supply the total number of proposed properties which could arise if all the SHLAA sites within the zone were to be developed. CWC will allocate spare capacity on a first come first served basis. Development requiring an increase in capacity of the zone will require either an upgrade to existing boosters and / or a new storage reservoir, tower or booster plus associated mains.</li> <li>• Gas - Westwick has a mains gas supply and the site is likely to be able to be accommodated with minimal disruption or system reinforcement.</li> <li>• Mains sewerage – The promoter states that there is no mains sewerage to the site or nearby, and suggests a sewage treatment plant and seasonal soakaway would be installed to handle all foul sewerage and surface drainage.</li> </ul>
<b>Drainage measures?</b>	<p>The development site is near the boundary of the Old West Internal Drainage District. The District does not have any capacity to accept any direct discharge into its system above the green field run off rate. All surface water from the site would have to be balanced before it is released into the Boards system. We also have main drains adjacent to the site, therefore any works involving these drains would require the consent of the Board.</p> <p>The promoter states that the proposed use should reduce surface run off and increase efficiency by replacing hard surfaced areas with soft landscaping and installation of a seasonal soakaway to accommodate roof and surface run-off.</p>
<b>School capacity?</b>	<p>The nearest Primary School is in Oakington. Oakington has one Primary School with a PAN of 17 and school capacity of 119, and lies within the catchment of Impington Village College with a PAN of 210 and school capacity of 1,050. In their 2011 submission to the South</p>

	<p>Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there was a surplus of 7 primary places in Oakington taking account of planned development, and a deficit of 13 secondary places at Impington VC taking account of planned development across the village college catchment area.</p> <p>After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site would be likely to require an increase in school planned admission numbers, which may require the expansion of existing schools and/or provision of new schools.</p>
<b>Health facilities capacity?</b>	The nearest medical practices are in Bar Hill, Histon, Cottenham, Swavesey and there is no spare capacity except at Histon where there is limited capacity.
<b>Any other issues?</b>	
<b>Can issues be mitigated?</b>	Yes, with upgrades to local infrastructure, including utilities, drainage, school capacity and health.
<b>Does the site warrant further assessment?</b>	No

<b>Tier 3: Site Specific Factors</b>
--------------------------------------

<b>Capacity</b>	
<b>Developable area</b>	None (area if unconstrained 0.40 ha.)
<b>Site capacity</b>	16 dwellings
<b>Density</b>	40 dph

<b>Potential Suitability</b>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	The site is not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints.

<b>Availability</b>	
<b>Is the land in single ownership?</b>	No
<b>Site ownership status?</b>	The site is promoted by two landowners.
<b>Legal constraints?</b>	No known constraints.
<b>Is there market interest in the site?</b>	The site has not been marketed but there is interest in the site from a developer.

<b>When would the site be available for development?</b>	The promoter indicates the site is available immediately.
--	---

<b>Achievability</b>	
<b>Phasing and delivery of the development</b>	The promoter indicates the first dwellings could be completed on site 2011-16.
<b>Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	None known.
<b>Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?</b>	Mains sewerage upgrade? Potentially high site preparation costs. Possible archaeological interest and large undeveloped area, currently hard surfaced to be stripped and landscaped.
<b>Could issues identified be overcome?</b>	
<b>Economic viability?</b>	<p>Viability Category 4 Least viable sites</p> <p>This viability assessment is provided independent of any policy or other assessment as to whether the site should be allocated for development. The references to planning policy only relate to those existing policies governing how a site would be developed, not whether it should be allocated in the new Local Plan.</p> <p>Having undertaken an assessment of this site the local planning authority have concerns about the landowners ability to deliver a development that fully complies with current planning policy in respect of density, mix and the provision of onsite facilities whilst still delivering the necessary level of affordable housing, planning obligations and potential community infrastructure levy payments.</p> <p>This site may not be sufficiently attractive for developers to be interested in acquiring it in the current market. The necessary changes to planning policy requirements to help ensure site viability would be more significant but could allow development during the plan period.</p>

<b>Site Assessment Conclusion</b>
Site with no development potential.

<b>Status of Site in Proposed Submission Local Plan 2013</b>
Not allocated for development; outside Development Framework.