

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

**Appendix 7ii: Assessment of sites arising from the Issues &
Options 1 Consultation**

Index of Melbourn Site Assessment Proforma

Site Number	Site Address	Site Capacity	Page
Site 320	Melbourn, land to the east of New Road	Around 200 dwellings	2304
Site 331	East Farm, Melbourn	60 dwellings	2310

**South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Review
Site Assessment Proforma**

Factual Background	
Proforma Created	December 2012
Proforma Last Updated	August 2013
Location	Melbourn
Site name / address	Land to the east of New Road, Melbourn
Category of site:	A village extension i.e. a development adjoining the existing village development framework boundary (Sustainable villages focus)
Description of promoter's proposal	Residential development for between 450 and 650 dwellings on the northern part of the site. The remainder of the site will be used to create a buffer and boundary to the edge of the settlement or to potentially provide open space and play space facilities.
Site area (hectares)	26.02ha
Site Number	320
Site description & context	A very large arable field on the south side of the village. Bounded by residential to the north and partly to the west, and arable fields to the south and east. The orchard and farm building complex of East Farm would form the north eastern part of an essentially square site if were part of the site. The East Farm site was submitted as a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Site in 2011 (number 176), and rejected on landscape grounds because of it would have appeared as a promontory of urban development into the open countryside. This reason would cease to apply if the northern part of this site were to be found to have development potential.
Current or last use of the site	Arable fields
Is the site Previously Developed Land?	No
Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan?	No
Planning history	None
Source of site	Issues and Options Consultation 2012

Tier 1: Strategic Considerations	
Green Belt	The site is not within the Green Belt.
Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
Tier 1 conclusion:	0 No impacts / neutral impacts or adverse impacts capable of full mitigation

Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations

Designations and Constraints	
Heritage considerations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-statutory archaeological site - Bronze Age barrows are known to the south and prehistoric activity has been identified by previous archaeological works in the vicinity. We would recommend evaluation prior to the determination of any planning application.
Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biodiversity features - Site is within the Chalklands area. These support species and habitats characterised by scattered chalk grassland, beechwood plantations on dry hill tops, willow and alder in wetter valleys, scrub of hawthorn and blackthorn with ivy or bramble beneath. Spring-fed fens, mires and marshy ground with reed, sedge and hemp agrimony occur along with small chalk rivers supporting watercrowfoots and pondweeds with reed sweet-grass at the margins with bullhead fish and occasional brown trout and water vole. Large open arable fields may support rare arable plants such as grass poly or Venus's looking-glass. Brown hare and typical farmland birds, such as linnet, yellow hammer and corn bunting also occur. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design. Agricultural land of high grade (i.e. Agricultural Land Classification Grade 1, 2, 3a) – Grade 2
Physical considerations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
Townscape and landscape impact?	The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) refers to Melbourn as set on land gently sloping down from the chalk hills of Royston to the south of the village, northwards to the valley of the

	<p>River Cam or Rhee. The River Mel runs north-west of the village, separating it from Meldreth.</p> <p>The wider setting is one of large arable fields with few hedgerows especially to the south and east, with enclosed riverside pasture to the north and parkland to the immediate west. Melbourn provides a well-wooded enclosed edge to all of the separate approaches even from the south where some views are expansive from elevated viewpoints from the ridgelines. Most of the village is located between the 20m to 25m contour with some development extending between the 25-30m contours to the south where the land rises to a south-west to north-east ridge. The high point at around the 40m contour can be found on New Road which runs to the south towards Royston.</p> <p>Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape setting of Melbourn through the development of an open arable field on gently rising land. The impact would be major if the whole site were to be developed with the development likely to be visible from a wide area to the north of the village and possibly from the south seen as rooflines rising above the ridge. If development were to be restricted to the lowest part of the site adjoining the existing village (approximate area 9ha) the impact would be much reduced. This would take in the land north of a line drawn between the southernmost house at Victoria Way on New Road and the south western corner of East Farm; but provided that the southern edge of the development were to form a substantial soft green edge such as could be obtained by a tree belt or similar feature</p> <p>In which case the orchard and farm buildings at East Farm could also be included in the site without any additional harm to the landscape setting of Melbourn.</p>
Can any issues be mitigated?	In Part.

Infrastructure	
Highways access?	The site can be accessed with some mitigation measures. If the site were to be found acceptable on other grounds, it would be sensible to also include the SHLAA site at East Farm which would also allow a junction located on to Hinkins Close which would be acceptable to the Highway Authority. The proposed site is acceptable in principle subject to detailed design.
Utility services?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electricity - No significant impact on existing network • Mains water - The site falls within the CWC Heydon Reservoir distribution zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 5,450 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within the Heydon Reservoir distribution zone to supply the total number of proposed

	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gas - Melbourn has a mains gas supply • Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the 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.
Drainage measures?	No FRA provided.
School capacity? (update August 2013)	<p>Melbourn has one primary school with a PAN of 45 and school capacity 315, and lies within the catchment of Melbourn Village College with a PAN of 148 and school capacity of 740 children. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there were 26 surplus primary places in Melbourn taking account of planned development in Melbourn, and a surplus of 97 secondary school places taking account of planned development across the village college catchment area.</p> <p>After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site would only require an increase in school capacity in combination with other development sites. This may require the expansion of existing schools and/or the provision of new schools.</p> <p>Update from County Education Officers May 2013 - The primary school currently has in-catchment demand for places and would not be able to accommodate the additional pupils likely to be generated by this development (in combination with the adjoining site). To accommodate this scale of development a significant expansion of the school to 2FE would be required. There is likely to be scope to achieve this as part any redevelopment of the school should this site be accommodated. The Village Collage currently has capacity to meet the demand arising from a development of this size. It is likely that no additional provision would be required. However, it is also likely that there would be sufficient site capacity available to support small scale expansion.</p>
Health facilities capacity?	Medical Practice at New Road, Melbourn with limited physical capacity to expand.
Any other issues?	None.
Can issues be mitigated?	In Part

Tier 2 Conclusion:	- Adverse impacts capable of partial mitigation
---------------------------	---

Tier 3: Site Specific Factors

Capacity	
Developable area (Updated August 2013)	6.75 ha (Note: Significant adverse townscape and landscape impacts were identified with the larger site, but a reduced site of 9.02 ha. gross (ha. net) could help mitigate these impacts (site option H7 issues and options 2013))
Site capacity	Around 200 dwellings
Density	30 dph

Potential Suitability	
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints.

Availability	
Is the land in single ownership?	Yes
Site ownership status?	Yes
Legal constraints?	None known
Is there market interest in the site?	The site has received interest from house builders.
When would the site be available for development?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is not available immediately.

Achievability	
Phasing and delivery of the development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first dwellings could be completed on site in 2011-16
Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability?	None known

Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?	None known
Could issues identified be overcome?	No issues identified
Economic viability?	<p><u>Viability Category 1 Most viable sites</u></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 do not have any major concerns as to why the landowner would be unable to deliver a development that complies with current planning policy in respect of density, mix and the provision of onsite facilities whilst still delivering the necessary level of affordable housing, planning obligations and potential community infrastructure levy payments.</p> <p>In summary this site is not considered to have any barriers, in terms of development viability alone, to restrict it coming forward within the next 5 years (new settlements and other very large developments may take longer than 5 years to come forward).</p>

Tier 3 Conclusion:	+ Potentially suitable, available and achievable during the plan period
---------------------------	---

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

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

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Review
Site Assessment Proforma

Factual Background	
Proforma Created	December 2012
Proforma Last Updated	August 2013
Location	Melbourn
Site name / address	Orchard and land at East Farm, Melbourn
Category of site:	A village extension i.e. a development adjoining the existing village development framework boundary (Sustainable villages focus)
Description of promoter's proposal	Residential development, 60 dwellings
Site area (hectares)	2.83ha
Site Number	331 (SHLAA site 176)
Site description & context	A derelict orchard bounded by hedgerows on the south side of the village accessed from Hinkins Close. Bounded by residential to the north, and arable fields to the west, south and east. Adjoins site 320 to the west and south.
Current or last use of the site	Derelict orchard
Is the site Previously Developed Land?	No
Allocated for a non-residential use in the current development plan?	No
Planning history	DC – No relevant history. Policy – 2002. Part of site proposed for residential development in the first review of the Local Plan. The Inspector rejected the proposal on the grounds that Melbourn has a clearly defined urban edge in this location and development would represent random extension of the built up area into the rural surroundings.
Source of site	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment call for sites 2011

Tier 1: Strategic Considerations	
Green Belt	The site is not within the Green Belt.
Is the site subject to any other considerations that have the potential to make the site unsuitable for development?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
Tier 1 conclusion:	0 No impacts / neutral impacts or adverse impacts capable of full mitigation

Tier 2: Significant Local Considerations

Designations and Constraints	
Heritage considerations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-statutory archaeological site - Cropmarks to the east indicate that the site is located in a landscape of extensive prehistoric activity. Further information would be necessary in advance of any planning application for this site.
Environmental and wildlife designations and considerations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biodiversity features - Site is within the Chalklands area. These support species and habitats characterised by scattered chalk grassland, beechwood plantations on dry hill tops, willow and alder in wetter valleys, scrub of hawthorn and blackthorn with ivy or bramble beneath. Spring-fed fens, mires and marshy ground with reed, sedge and hemp agrimony occur along with small chalk rivers supporting watercrowfoots and pondweeds with reed sweet-grass at the margins with bullhead fish and occasional brown trout and water vole. Large open arable fields may support rare arable plants such as grass poly or Venus's looking-glass. Brown hare and typical farmland birds, such as linnet, yellow hammer and corn bunting also occur. Any development proposals should show how features of biodiversity value have been protected or adequately integrated into the design. Agricultural land of high grade – Grade 2
Physical considerations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land contamination - Agricultural building on east side of site, requires assessment, can be conditioned.
Townscape and landscape impact?	The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) refers to Melbourn as set on land gently sloping down from the chalk hills of Royston northwards to the valley of the River Cam or Rhee. The River Mel runs north-west of the village, separating it from Meldreth. The wider setting is one of large arable fields with few hedgerows especially to the south and east, with enclosed riverside pasture to the north and parkland to the immediate west. Melbourn provides a

	<p>well-wooded enclosed edge to all of the separate approaches even from the south where some views are expansive from elevated viewpoints from the ridgelines. Most of the village is located between the 20m to 25m contour with some development extending between the 25-30m contours to the south where the land rises to a south-west to north-east ridge. The high point at around the 40m contour can be found on New Road which runs to the south towards Royston.</p> <p>Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape setting of Melbourn through the development of an enclosed orchard which adds to the rural setting of the village. In appearance it would have the form of a promontory of development extending out into open countryside. The impact would be major if the site were to be developed by itself.</p> <p>If however the site were to be developed with site 320 the impact on the landscape setting would be much reduced as there would be no promontory of development, provided the southern boundary were to form a substantial soft green edge such as could be obtained by a tree belt.</p>
Can any issues be mitigated?	In Part

Infrastructure	
Highways access?	A junction located on to Hinkins Close would be acceptable to the Highway Authority. The proposed site is acceptable in principle subject to detailed design.
Utility services?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electricity - No significant impact on existing network • Mains water - The site falls within the CWC Heydon Reservoir distribution zone, within which there is a minimum spare capacity of 5,450 properties based on the peak day for the distribution zone, less any commitments already made to developers. There is insufficient spare capacity within the Heydon 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. • Gas - Melbourn has a mains gas supply • Mains sewerage - There is sufficient capacity at the 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.
Drainage measures?	No FRA provided.

<p>School capacity? (update August 2013)</p>	<p>Melbourn has one primary school with a PAN of 45 and school capacity 315, and lies within the catchment of Melbourn Village College with a PAN of 148 and school capacity of 740 children. In their 2011 submission to the South Cambridgeshire and City Infrastructure Study, the County Council stated there were 26 surplus primary places in Melbourn taking account of planned development in Melbourn, and a surplus of 97 secondary school places taking account of planned development across the village college catchment area.</p> <p>The development of this site for 60 dwellings could generate a need for early years places and a maximum of 21 primary school places and 15 secondary places.</p> <p>After allowing for surplus school places, development of this site would only require an increase in school capacity in combination with other development sites. This may require the expansion of existing schools and/or the provision of new schools.</p> <p>Update from County Education Officers May 2013 - The primary school currently has in-catchment demand for places and would not be able to accommodate the additional pupils likely to be generated by this development (in combination with the adjoining site). To accommodate this scale of development a significant expansion of the school to 2FE would be required. There is likely to be scope to achieve this as part any redevelopment of the school should this site be accommodated. The Village Collage currently has capacity to meet the demand arising from a development of this size. It is likely that no additional provision would be required. However, it is also likely that there would be sufficient site capacity available to support small scale expansion.</p>
<p>Health facilities capacity?</p>	<p>Medical Practice at New Road, Melbourn with limited physical capacity to expand.</p>
<p>Any other issues?</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Can issues be mitigated?</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>Tier 2 Conclusion:</p>	<p>- Adverse impacts capable of partial mitigation</p>
----------------------------------	--

<p>Tier 3: Site Specific Factors</p>

Capacity	
<p>Developable area</p>	<p>2.0 ha</p>
<p>Site capacity</p>	<p>60 dwellings</p>
<p>Density</p>	<p>30 dph net</p>

Potential Suitability	
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints.

Availability	
Is the land in single ownership?	No
Site ownership status?	Two family landowners, no known ownership constraints
Legal constraints?	None known
Is there market interest in the site?	The site has not been marketed, option agreement exists with a developer.
When would the site be available for development?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is available immediately. The assessment is based on the call for sites questionnaire.

Achievability	
Phasing and delivery of the development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first dwellings could be completed on site 2011-16
Are there any market factors that would significantly affect deliverability?	None known
Are there any cost factors that would significantly affect deliverability?	None known
Could issues identified be overcome?	No issues identified
Economic viability?	<p><u>Viability Category 1 Most viable sites</u></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 do not have any major concerns as to why the landowner would be unable to deliver a development that complies with current planning policy in respect of density, mix and the provision of onsite facilities whilst still delivering the necessary level of affordable housing, planning obligations and potential community infrastructure levy payments.</p> <p>In summary this site is not considered to have any barriers, in terms of development viability alone, to restrict it coming forward within the next 5 years (new settlements and other very large developments may take longer than 5 years to come forward).</p>
--	--

Tier 3 Conclusion:	+ Potentially suitable, available and achievable during the plan period
---------------------------	---

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

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