

**Core Strategy / Development Control Polices / Site Specific Policies**  
**Impact of Proposed Changes on Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment**

<b>Change</b>	<b>Summary of implications for SA / SEA</b>	<b>Action for SA / SEA</b>
<b>CORE STRATEGY DPD</b>		
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>		
Amplify text relating to the Community Strategy to highlight the key issues contained in the strategy and key actions relevant to the LDF.	Editorial change	No change required
Advise Cambridgeshire Horizons of the PCT's wish to be involved in developing the Sustainable Communities Checklist and support for it.	Reflects a procedural matter	No change required
Include new section in Core Strategy to follow paragraph 1.16 as follows: "RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER PLANS AND STRATEGIES - 1.16B The Council has consulted all key stakeholders at three stages in the preparation of the DPDs and it is for them to advise the Council how their own strategies affect the South Cambs LDF. Where such information has been received, this has been taken into account in preparing the DPDs. Where organisations did not advise the Council of their delivery plans, it will be for Cambridgeshire Horizons, as the delivery vehicle for the Cambridge Sub Region, to draw together the delivery plans for all aspects of the major developments as part of the negotiations on the planning obligations agreements."	Reflects a procedural matter	No change required
<b>Chapter 2: Strategy</b>		
<i>The Strategic Vision for South Cambridgeshire</i>		
Amend last sentence to read: "The emphasis will be on providing quality homes for all, including affordable housing to meet local needs, to ensure the creation of sustainable and balanced communities."	Change affects supporting text and was not assessed previously as a policy in its own right, though the intention is evident in other policies in the Core Strategy.	No change required

<b>Change</b>	<b>Summary of implications for SA / SEA</b>	<b>Action for SA / SEA</b>
<b>Objectives</b>		
Amend Objective ST/g to read: "To ensure development addresses sustainability issues, including climate change mitigation and adaptation issues, maximising recycling and reuse of resources, and reduce waste and pollution."	Expands definition of this objective. Original assessment scored Core Strategy negative in absolute terms as a result of increased consumption from the required housing growth, but referred to other Core Strategy policies which would mitigate this effect. This change makes clearer the range of policy areas where this is required but does not fundamentally change the assessment.	No change required
Add definition of "climate proofed" to the Glossary.	Editorial change	No change required
<b>Housing Provision</b>		
Include a Housing Trajectory in the Core Strategy DPD that examines delivery of housing numbers in the LDF, and include relevant elements in the Site Specific Policies DPD, and Area Action Plans.	Editorial change that makes clear the level of provision envisaged but which does not affect delivery targets.	No change required
Split the housing completions information into two time periods, 1999-2001 and 2001-2005.	Editorial change.	No change required
Include new chapter 3 Phasing and Delivery, incorporating the existing section Phasing of Housing Land, comprising Policy ST/7 and it's supporting text which should be moved from Chapter 2. Include new chapter 4 Monitoring to incorporate Policy ST/8 and supporting text and amplified to include a range of indicators drawn from the Monitoring Strategy and provide supporting text.	Re-arrangement of existing text and (in the case of Chapter 4) better cross-referencing to show the link between monitoring and policies.	No change required
<b>ST/2 Re-Using Previously Developed Land and Buildings</b>		
Add a new paragraph to Policy NE/6 after paragraph 4: "Previously Developed Land will not be considered to be devoid of biodiversity. The re-use of such sites must be undertaken carefully with regard to existing features of biodiversity interest. Development proposals will be expected to include measures that maintain and enhance important features whilst	Recognises potential biodiversity value of waste land which may have been partially colonised, or other land only recently in disuse which may contain important features. It might be helpful to refer specifically to retention of trees and hedgerows provided this does not divert attention from the wider	Policy scoring against objective 2.2 (protecting characteristics species, etc.) changed from '~' (neutral) to '+'. It is not possible to be more positive without knowing the number of sites to which this would occur.

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
incorporating them within any development of the site."	range of assets that need to be conserved. Requires a more positive score in the detailed assessment, but the change was not considered to be sufficiently important to warrant mention in section 6.2 of the main report, though it is clearly an improvement.	
Amend Figure 1 by taking the mid-point number for those housing figures presented as a range in the original.	Editorial clarification.	No change required
Revise paragraph 2.19 to delete reference to land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road in the sub heading and add the following to the end of the paragraph: "...in accordance with the policy in the Site Specific Policies DPD."	Cross-references a policy assessed separately but does not change policy direction.	No change required

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<p>Insert new subheading above paragraph 2.20 "Cambridge North West - between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road" and revise the paragraph to read: "Land will also be removed from the Green Belt NORTH WEST of the City between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road which crosses the City and South Cambridgeshire district boundary. A revised Green Belt will ensure that the expanded City does not coalesce with Girton village. That part of this land which is removed from the Green Belt will be reserved predominantly for development for Colleges and other University-related uses including housing for University employees [but] AND THE STRUCTURE PLAN MAKES CLEAR IT will [not be available] ONLY BE BROUGHT FORWARD for development [until] WHEN the University can show A CLEAR NEED FOR THE LAND TO BE RELEASED. THE COUNCIL CONSIDERS THAT IN THE INTERESTS OF CAREFUL HUSBANDRY OF THIS AREA WHERE LAND IS BEING RELEASED FROM THE GREEN BELT ON AN EXCEPTIONAL BASIS IN VIEW OF THE PARTICULAR NEEDS OF THE UNIVERSITY, THIS INCLUDES THE TEST that there is no other suitable University or College land or building available elsewhere in the City."</p>	<p>Changes are procedural and clarify the conditions under which this land can be re-developed and does not change the impact of the policy. Moreover the change makes it clearer that the Structure Plan has primacy on this matter.</p>	<p>No change required</p>
<p>Add the following to the end of paragraph 2.21: "... prepared jointly with Cambridge City Council."</p>	<p>Editorial / procedural clarification</p>	<p>No change required</p>
<p>Insert new policy and supporting text into the Site Specific Policies DPD to read: "POLICY SP/x North West Cambridge: Huntingdon Road to Histon Road - Countryside Recreation, Access and Landscape Improvements</p>	<p><i>This change cross-refers to a new policy in a separate DPD and its implications are reviewed later in this summary.</i></p>	

<b>Change</b>	<b>Summary of implications for SA / SEA</b>	<b>Action for SA / SEA</b>
<b>Rural Settlement Policy</b>		
Update Figure 3 to reflect the consequential changes of allocating Bayer Cropscience Hauxton site for mixed use development.	Editorial change reflecting a new site allocation which is assessed separately in the Site Specific Allocations DPD	No change required
<b>ST/5 Group Villages</b>		
Delete the word "redundant" from the last paragraph.	Editorial change which does not affect the policy	No change required
Reclassify Bar Hill as a Minor Rural Centre, under Policy ST5.	Change reflects extensive objection to classifying Bar Hill as a Rural Growth Centre on various grounds including: access limitations and the impact of traffic and congestion on the adjacent A14; recent loss of key services (post office) and poor public transport service; the impact of growth on keeping pedestrian and traffic areas apart, and so on. It is also cited that the village did not meet 2 of the 4 primary criteria to qualify for Rural Centre status. In the light of this information the change appears consistent with the aim of focusing growth on those villages that are best equipped to accommodate it. Our concern is that this could increase housing pressure on the remaining Rural Centres however the Council have advised us this will not be necessary and that the impact on housing supply will be negligible. We have not been able to corroborate the former independently.	Not possible to identify appropriate changes, however the summary text of the assessment of policy ST/3 on Rural Centres has been amended to make the points in the cell to the left.
<b>ST/6 Infill Villages</b>		
Amend proposals map, to show Weston Green as part of the Weston Colville inset number.	Cartographic change only	No change required

<b>Change</b>	<b>Summary of implications for SA / SEA</b>	<b>Action for SA / SEA</b>
<b>ST/7 Phasing of Housing Land</b>		
Amend first sentence to read: "Urban extensions to Cambridge and at the new town of Northstowe will be phased to ensure a continuous supply of housing land throughout the plan period, to minimise the duration of the disruption of the development process and to concentrate resources on a limited number of sites at any point in time to best deliver sustainable developments."	Makes clearer the dual role of phasing in maintaining housing supply and in controlling impacts of development on surroundings. Requires minor adjustment of scoring against certain objectives but is not sufficiently large to warrant major changes.	Scoring against objectives 4.1 (emissions / pollutants) and 5.1 (health) made positive (from neutral).
Include new chapter 3 Phasing and Delivery, to include a housing trajectory.	Editorial change adding supporting information but does not alter policy.	No change required
<b>ST/8 Plan, Monitor, Manage</b>		
Include relevant elements of the Monitoring Strategy, including targets and indicators, in each DPD.	Editorial change to clarify role of monitoring	No change required
Amend first sentence of paragraph 2.46 to read: "In order to assess the effectiveness of the policies in the delivery of development and protection of the environment, it is important that continuous monitoring and review of policies in the LDF is undertaken."	Establishes clearer link to LDF monitoring in managing delivery of housing and infrastructure. The change is not considered sufficient to warrant an adjustment of assessment scores but is useful clarification.	No change required

### **Chapter 3: Development Principles**

<b>Objectives</b>		
Amend Objective DP/e to read: "To ensure that major new developments create distinctive, sustainable and healthy environments that meet the needs of residents and users and contribute towards the creation of vibrant socially inclusive communities."	Minor wording change consistent with one of the seven generic LDF objectives. Does not affect the assessment which assumes this.	No change required
Include new Monitoring Chapters in each DPD to include relevant indicators drawn from the Monitoring Strategy.	Editorial change needed to demonstrate links between the DPD and LDF Monitoring.	No change required

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<b>DP/1 Sustainable Development</b>		
Amend criteria 13 to read: "Contribute to the creation of mixed and socially inclusive communities and provide for the health, education, recreation, community services and facilities, and social needs of all sections of the community."	As for the previous amendment.	No change required
Delete the word "labour" from paragraph 2.	Specific reason for change is not evident but it is so small it does not materially affect the assessment.	No change required
Add to the end of paragraph 3.4: "It also includes references to key sustainability issues of building methods and materials, which will be part of the overall consideration of the development proposal, but are not directly related to the planning system."	A slightly oblique reference which appears to ensure it is clear the planning system will be used to its full scope to encourage adoption of sustainable construction techniques while leaving the specific solutions to developers.	Assessment against the relevant objectives was reviewed – the procedural nature of the change was not considered sufficient to warrant a change to the scores.
Amend criteria 2 to read: "Minimise the need to travel and reduce car dependency, by locating development in areas which are (or are capable of being) highly accessible by public transport, community transport, cycle and on foot, by providing a permeable development that has an appropriate level of public transport in accordance with TR/1, and direct pedestrian and cycling routes to services and facilities.	Minor change to qualitative criteria. It is assumed sites "capable of being" conveniently located are those where there is scope to improve public transport and other links by external funding and/or S.106 contributions, and that other policies (notably TR/3 provide a delivery mechanism.	Assessment of performance against objective 6.1 (access) was considered too weak and increased to '++', and that against 5.1 (health) improved also. These changes were reflected in minor editorial changes to the text in section 6.2 of the main report and in the Appendices.
Amend criteria 6 to read: "Minimise use of energy and resources, both during construction and once implemented, through energy efficient design and materials, siting and orientation of buildings in accordance with Policy NE/1."	We understand the change removes requirements that lie beyond the scope of the planning system to prescribe. As such this does not affect the assessment.	No change required
Amend criteria 8 to read: "Incorporate water conservation measures in accordance with Policy NE/15."	Improves cross-referencing assumed in the assessment.	No change required
Amend criteria 18 to read: "Conserve and enhance cultural heritage, including listed buildings, conservation areas, historic landscapes, ancient monuments and archaeological interest, in accordance with policies CH/3, CH/5, CH/1 and CH/2."	As above, clarifies a dependency between policies that was assumed to exist in the assessment.	No change required
Add a new paragraph after paragraph 3.6: "Guidance on the preparation of a Health Impact Assessment can be found on the	External document reference.	No change required

<b>Change</b>	<b>Summary of implications for SA / SEA</b>	<b>Action for SA / SEA</b>
'Health Impact Assessment Gateway' on the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) website."		
Amend first sentence of paragraph 3.5 to read: "All planning applications for major development are required to submit a Sustainability Appraisal and a Health Impact Statement (HIA) to demonstrate that they have addressed sustainability issues, including impact on health, in their development proposals."	Clearly consistent, and original assessment scores the policy positively for including HIA. We suggest that the policy wording should refer to the definition of "major development" in the same way as TR/3. However this does raise the issue of what forms of assessment are appropriate for sites just under the threshold, and may suggest it is disadvantageous to specify one.	Cumulative effect of changes to this policy resulted in scoring against objective 5.1 (health) to be more positive. This was reflected in section 6.2 of the main report and the Appendices.
Engage the South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust in the development of the Sustainable Communities Checklist.	Procedural issue.	No change required
<b>DP/2 Design of New Development</b>		
Amend criteria 1 of Policy DP/2 to read: "Preserve or enhance the character of the local area, having regard to the Landscape Character Area within which it is located in accordance with Policy NE/3, and be acceptable in terms of visual impact."	Minor wording change which does not affect impacts or assessment	No change required
Amend DP2 (5) to include bridleways.	Response to representation. No significant change	No change required
Amend Policy DP/2 (d): Existing accesses for pedestrians, cyclists, EQUESTRIANS, and vehicles.	As above.	No change required
Add a new sentence to the end of paragraph 10.11 as follows: "Cambridgeshire County Council's 'Public Rights of Way - A Guide for Planners & Developers' offers guidance and advice on how adverse impacts of development on Public Rights of Way can be avoided, and how opportunities for enhancing the path network can be pursued.	Documentary reference.	No change required
Change "accessibility" to read "accessible".	Typo. correction.	No change required
<b>DP/3 Development Criteria</b>		
Amend last sentence of paragraph 3.13 to read: "To avoid an overly lengthy and complex policy, many of the criteria cross-refer to other policies in the Plan, which provide the full detail."	Editorial clarification.	No change required

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<b>DP/4 Infrastructure &amp; New Development</b>		
Add additional point to the list in Policy DP/4. 'PRESERVATION OR ENHANCEMENT OF THE HISTORIC LANDSCAPE OR TOWNSCAPE.'	It is assumed the Council's right to seek obligations will continue to be governed by the five standard tests (proximity, etc).	Scoring against objective 3.1 (historic environment) changed to positive ('+').
Amend 3rd paragraph of policy DP/4: 'DEPENDING ON THE NATURE OF THE SERVICES AND FACILITIES, contributions may also be required to meet [running] MAINTENANCE AND / OR OPERATING costs EITHER AS PUMP PRIMING OR IN PERPETUITY, [of services and facilities] provided through an obligation .'	Interpreted as an editorial clarification.	No change required
Amend the second sentence of paragraph 3.15 to read: "In such cases planning obligations will be required, in accordance with Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations, to make the necessary improvements, provide new facilities, or secure compensatory provision for any loss or damage created."	Consistent with the Council's rights under the planning system and with the 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph of the assessed policy.	No change required
Amend 1st paragraph 2nd sentence of Policy DP/4: 'The nature, scale AND PHASING of any planning obligations sought will be related to the form of the development and its potential impact upon the surrounding area.'	Editorial clarification.	No change required
Amend bullet point 4 of Policy DP/4: 'Public open space, SPORT AND recreation FACILITIES (including strategic open space)'	Change is consistent with those made in the Services & Facilities section.	No change required
Add to bullet point 2 of policy DP/4: 'Education (INCLUDING NURSERY AND PRE-SCHOOL CARE)'	Amplifies scope of policy. Does not fundamentally affect the positive nature of the assessment.	No change required
Amend policy DP/5 bullet point 5: 'IMPROVEMENTS (INCLUDING infrastructure) for pedestrians, cyclists, EQUESTRIANS, highways, and public and community transport.'	Consistent with other (previous) changes assessed as having no effect on the scoring.	No change required
Amend bullet point 6 of policy DP/4: 'Other community facilities (e.g. community centres, youth facilities, library services, SOCIAL CARE, AND THE PROVISION OF EMERGENCY SERVICES)'	We assume these additional requirements fall within what it is reasonable to seek through contributions for infrastructure resulting from new development.	Scoring is already strongly positive and these extra items provide little scope for change.

<b>Change</b>	<b>Summary of implications for SA / SEA</b>	<b>Action for SA / SEA</b>
<b>DP/5 Cumulative Development</b>		
Amend criteria 1 read: "Forms part of a larger site where there would be a requirement for infrastructure provision if developed as a whole."	Editorial clarification that does not affect the assessment.	No change required
<b>DP/6 Construction Methods</b>		
Amend the first sentence of paragraph 2: "Any haul roads must be agreed with the Local Planning Authority and developers must employ an agreed methodology for haul roads where they cross public rights of way".	Change results in a less prescriptive policy, however this appears to reflect various representations suggesting that it should be restricted to matters relevant to spatial policy. This being the case, and assuming other policies and mechanisms such as a Considerate Contractors Scheme exist, it was not evident that any of the relevant scores against key objectives should be changed.	No change required
Amend second sentence of second paragraph to read: "They must be located, designed and landscaped (where appropriate) in such a way as to avoid any noise, smell, dust, visual or other adverse impact on residents and businesses." Add new sentence to the end of paragraph 3.21: "In some instances, it will be appropriate for haul roads to further mitigate their impact through landscaping, for example, in locations where the duration and scale of development is extensive, such as at the major development locations."	Repositions existing material. Landscaping assumed to a certain extent within the original assessment and the change is not sufficient to warrant altering the scoring.	No change required
Amend criteria 2 to read: "Prepare a 'Resource Re-use and Recycling Scheme' to cover all waste arising during construction."	Assessment already scores policy strongly for support for recycling.	No change required
Delete the last sentence of policy DP/6 which currently reads: "Adequate provision will need to be made for the storage of fuel and vehicles in a way that minimises risk of pollution to surface water or aquifers."	Appears to be a minor issue although the need to prevent water contamination generally from site activities remains an issue.	No change required
<b>DP/7 Urban Frameworks</b>		
Delete Policy DP/7. Add a new policy after Policy ST/2 as	These changes transpose statements in supporting	No change required

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<p>follows: "POLICY ST/3 Edge of Cambridge The following sites are included within Urban Frameworks: - Land at Cherry Hinton - Cambridge Northern Fringe - Cambridge Airport / North Works - Land west of Trumpington Road Development and redevelopment without any limit on individual scheme size will be permitted within the urban framework provided adequate services, facilities and infrastructure are available or can be made available as a result of the development." Move the text at paragraphs 3.22 - 3.24 to follow the new policy.</p>	<p>text into a new policy (located in the Strategy section), adding the site west of Trumpington Road which forms the core of the mixed use development planned in the western half of the Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP. These changes reposition material but do not fundamentally affect the nature of what the DPD (and the CSF AAP) is seeking. We do not consider this affects the assessments, and that the existing assessment for DP/7 applies in full to the new ST/3 policy.</p>	
<p><b>DP/8 Village Frameworks</b></p>		
<p>Amend heading before Policy DP/8 to read: "DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORKS". Amend Policy DP/8 to read: "POLICY DP/8 Development Frameworks Outside urban and village frameworks, only development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside will be permitted." 1. Retention of the site in its present state does not form an essential part of the local character; and 2. Development would be sensitive to the character of the location, local features of landscape, ecological or historic importance, and the amenities of neighbours; and 3. There is the necessary infrastructure capacity to support the development; and 4. Development would not result in the loss of local employment, service, or facility [where there is no alternative available in the village], protected by Policies ET/7: Loss of Rural Employment to Non-Employment Uses, SF/1: Protection of Village Services and Facilities and SF/11: Protection of Existing Recreation Areas. Amend first sentence of paragraph 3.25 to read: "the development frameworks define where policies for the built-up areas of settlements give way to policies for the countryside." Amend first two sentences of</p>	<p>These changes are minor rewording of the existing text, and the final two points clarify issues already suggested by the text. We do not consider this affects the nature of the assessment.</p>	<p>No change required</p>

<b>Change</b>	<b>Summary of implications for SA / SEA</b>	<b>Action for SA / SEA</b>
paragraph 3.27 to read: "Property boundaries shown on the OS map have been taken into account in defining frameworks. However, since there are many large gardens on the edge of settlements the framework boundaries sometimes cut across such gardens, especially (but not solely) if parts of those gardens relate more to the surrounding countryside than they do the built-up areas."		
Amend the village framework of Melbourn to follow the outside of the building at the northern most end of the Science Park.	Definition of individual frameworks is outside the scope of the SA.	No change required
Amend DP/8 point 4: 'Development would not result in the loss of local employment, service, or facility [where there is no alternative available in the village,] protected by Policies ET/7: Loss of Rural Employment to Non-Employment Uses, SF/1: Protection of Village Services and Facilities and SF/11: Protection of Existing Recreation Areas.'	Clarifies cross-references to policies in this and other DPDs, which were assumed / anticipated by the original assessment.	No change required

#### **Chapter 4: Green Belt**

##### ***GB/1 Green Belt Boundaries***

Amend heading before Policy GB/1 to read as follows: "DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT" Amend Policy GB/1 to read as follows: "There is a presumption against inappropriate development <sup>1</sup> in the Cambridge Green Belt as defined on the Proposals Map. NOTE: 1 Inappropriate development is defined in section 3 of PPG2 Green Belt." Move paragraphs 4.8 and 4.9 to follow paragraph 4.7. Amend first sentence of paragraph 4.8 to read: "The main purpose of the Green Belt is to keep land open by placing a permanent and severe restriction on inappropriate development; therefore most types of development can only be permitted in exceptional circumstances, in accordance with PPG2."	Changes are consistent with national planning guidance in PPG2 and do nothing to alter the intended impact of the policy or the controls it imposes.	No change required
--	--	--------------------

##### ***GB/2 Development in the Green Belt***

Delete Policy GB/2 and remainder of the supporting text -	Impact of change assessed in terms of replacement	No change required
---	---	--------------------

<b>Change</b>	<b>Summary of implications for SA / SEA</b>	<b>Action for SA / SEA</b>
paragraphs 4.10 to 4.15.	text (see below).	
Revisit the Green Belt boundary around Willingham	We understand the change affects newly proposed Green Belt land and will not result in a net loss of such land.	No change required
Create new Policy GB/2 to read: POLICY GB/2 Mitigating the Impact of Development in the Green Belt Any development considered appropriate within the Green Belt must be located and designed so that it does not have an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt. Where development is permitted, landscaping conditions, together with a requirement that any planting is adequately maintained, will be attached to any planning permission in order to ensure that the impact on the Green Belt is mitigated. Move Paragraphs 4.26 and 4.27 to follow paragraph 4.16.	GB/1 provides the principal control using conditions defined in national guidance. This policy provides an additional safety net to mitigate visual / character impacts of appropriate development. It therefore goes a little further than the policy it replaces. Revisions prevent the policy repeating guidance in PPG2. The revised policy also replaces the revised GB/3 which placed controls on development design and layout which was changed for the same reason.	New policy re-assessed in full (original assessment is retained to provide an audit trail). Minor (positive) adjustment of assessment of significant impacts.
<b><i>GB/3 Location &amp; Design of Development</i></b>		
Create new Policy GB/3 to read: POLICY GB/3 Mitigating the Impact of Development adjoining the Green Belt Where development proposals are in the vicinity of the Green Belt, account will be taken of any adverse impact on the Green Belt. Development on the edges of settlements which are surrounded by the Green Belt must include careful landscaping and design measures of a high quality in order to protect the purposes of the Green Belt. Delete Policies GB/3, GB/4 and GB/7. Move paragraph 4.28 to follow paragraph 4.24.	Essentially the equivalent to GB/2 but applying the controls to an area around the Green Belt. The implications are largely the same as for GB/2 although it would be helpful if there was some indication of how far this policy would apply away from the edge of the Green Belt. However GB/3 now subsumes the role of GB/7 in encouraging landscaping and planting not only for visual impact mitigation but for habitat creation. The changes to the supporting text ensure this dual role is retained, however we feel it would be constructive if the policy made clear a positive outcome is intended.	As above, although there was no change in scoring pattern or intensity.
<b><i>GB/5 Major Developed Site</i></b>		
Remove the Green Belt designation from the Spicers site at Sawston and show it as white land on the Proposals Map.	Responds to an objection that the site is long-established and does not fulfil the function of the Green Belt due to its current, continuing use. This	No change required

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
	appears consistent since the other named sites have more of a parkland character. We assume that this change will not result in unsympathetic development following the change in status, and the policy GB/3 and other Development Control principles would be used to limit the effects of development.	
"There being a greater impact than the existing development on the openness of the Green Belt."	Clarificatory change. Implicit in assessment.	No change required
<b><i>GB/6 Recreation in the Green Belt</i></b>		
Amend first sentence of Policy GB/6 to read: "Proposals for the use of the Green Belt for enhanced opportunities for access to the open countryside and which provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation, appropriate to the Green Belt, will be encouraged where it will not harm the objectives of the Green Belt."	Change appears to reflect an objection citing PPG2 which allows for all forms of appropriate recreation. It is not evident the change significantly affects the assessment given that other policies will control its impacts, and given the original assessment strongly supports the relevant objectives.	No change required
Delete the last sentence of Policy GB/6.	Change removes specific reference to country parks and public rights of way as a result of objections that the policy is too prescriptive, does not define how these facilities will be delivered, and because their delivery is addressed by policies in other DPDs and AAPs.	Assessment against objectives 2.3 (wild places) and 5.3 (open space) were reviewed. It was considered that the change does not prevent delivery of country parks, etc. and that the underlying intention of the policy has not changed materially. A reduction in the scoring of 2.3 from '+++' to '++' in this respect was considered but rejected for the reason given above. Moreover the intention of the wording removed from the policy itself is restated in the change below.

<b>Change</b>	<b>Summary of implications for SA / SEA</b>	<b>Action for SA / SEA</b>
Amend Paragraph 4.22 to read: "Given the substantial development which is proposed for the edge of Cambridge and in the new town of Northstowe, which will take place at higher densities than in the past, it is essential that the residents of these new developments have direct and easy access by foot, cycle and horseback to open countryside for recreation, which may include land in the Green Belt beyond the boundaries of the Area Action Plans."	Restates the intention to seek provision (or improvement ?) of public rights of way and Strategic Open Space in conjunction with new development around Cambridge. The change essentially balances the text removed from the policy itself.	No change required
<b>GB/7 Improvements to Landscape &amp; Biodiversity</b>		
Delete Policy GB/7.	<i>Relevant comments are indicated above against the new policy GB/3.</i>	
<b>Chapter 5: Housing</b>		
<b>HG/1 Housing Density</b>		
Delete GQPT from Glossary. Amend reference to GQPT to refer to "good local services", and add a definition in Glossary (using the definition in the Local Transport Plan).	Editorial change providing for consistency with other planning documents.	No change required
<b>HG/2 Housing Mix</b>		
Amend the Northstowe Area Action Plan to incorporate a market housing mix of approximately 40% 1 and 2 bedrooms; 30% 3 bedrooms; and 30% 4+bedrooms.	<i>This amendment is reflected in the changes notified to the Northstowe AAP and is assessed there.</i>	
<b>HG/3 Affordable Housing</b>		
Add the following footnote to Policy ET/2: "Employment developments to which this policy will apply are: - B1(a) Offices. - B1(b) High tech and related industries, and services concerned mainly with commercial research and development. - C2 Hospitals, including healthcare teaching and research. - D1 educational uses and associated sui-generis research institutes and academic research institutes."	<i>Change refers to the Economic &amp; Tourism section (below) and its implications are reviewed there.</i>	
Amend any incorrect references to supporting documents in the LDF and ensure a complete list is incorporated into the list of supporting documents.	Editorial changes	No change required

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<b><i>HG/6 Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside</i></b>		
Amend criterion 5 to read: "The dwelling is of permanent design and construction." Amend 2nd paragraph to read: "In exceptional circumstances material considerations may justify an exception to criteria (2) and (3), for example, dwellings with a very small original footprint which do not meet modern living standards.	Adjusts criterion 5 to reflect an objection from GO-East based on case law. It is not possible to assess the exceptions proposed in the second revision.	Scores were briefly reviewed and it was not considered necessary to adjust them.
<b><i>HG/7 Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside</i></b>		
Add the following before the last sentence of paragraph 5.31: "The District Council may control the further expansion of replacement dwellings by the use of planning conditions to remove the rights under the General Permitted Development Order."	Primarily a procedural consideration. Not evident that it changes the effect of the policy in sustainability terms.	No change required
<b><i>HG/8 Conversion of Buildings in the Countryside for Residential Use</i></b>		
Amend the 4th paragraph of Policy HG/8 to read: "Development must be in scale with the rural location. Residential uses must be located close to local services and facilities, and in an accessible location with a choice of means of travel, including non-car modes. The cumulative impact of the conversion of a number of buildings on adjoining sites or the local area will also be considered." Add a new paragraph after paragraph 5.32: "Residential conversion, particularly on a large scale involving several residential units, will only be appropriate in locations close to local service centres such as Cambridge, the market towns and larger villages, including Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres. Development must also be in a location with, or capable of providing, a sufficient standard of accessibility to offer an appropriate choice of travel by non-car modes, in accordance with Policy TR/1."	In principle the changes are clarifications which are clearly consistent with other spatial policies reflecting PPS1, PPG3, PPG13, etc., and the Council's own policies supporting / encouraging sustainable transport. The change appears to have removed the requirement that change only occurs close to larger settlements which would have limited the area where it would be permitted. These changes suggest a little more flexibility which should be beneficial while recognising that other clauses in this policy will continue to control it, and that the pattern of services and facilities in rural areas will still restrict the number of locations where re-development is appropriate.	Assessment was reviewed in full and indicated little scope for amendment. However it was felt that the neutral score against objective 6.1 failed to acknowledge the purpose of the policy and this has been changed to a qualified positive assessment ('+') reflecting the comments at left, which have also been added to the assessment.
<b><i>HG/9 Dwelling to Support a Rural-Based Enterprise</i></b>		
Amend Policy HG/9 as follows: Delete "exceptionally" from 1st paragraph. Amend second to last paragraph to read: "Where a new dwelling is permitted, this will be the subject of a condition	Removal of 'exceptionally' and applicability to a range of forms of rural enterprise appear logically consistent with intention of policy and this and the other change	No change required

<b>Change</b>	<b>Summary of implications for SA / SEA</b>	<b>Action for SA / SEA</b>
ensuring the occupation will be limited to a person solely or mainly working, or last working in the locality in agriculture, forestry or a rural enterprise, or a surviving partner of such a person, and to any resident dependents.	do not appear to affect its assessment (which is difficult to assess without specific examples).	
Amend 1st sentence of the last paragraph to read: "The relaxation of an occupancy condition will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the dwelling is no longer required by the unit or those working, or last working, in the locality in agriculture, forestry or a rural enterprise, or a surviving partner of such a person, and to any resident dependents."	As above.	No change required

## **Chapter 6: Economy & Tourism**

<b>Objectives</b>		
Include in annual monitoring report and Monitoring Strategy indicators measuring job growth and comparison to working population.	Cross reference to link between LDF and monitoring programme	No change required
<b>ET/1 Limitations on the Occupancy of New Premises</b>		
Amend Policy ET/1 point 2 to 'high technology and related industries AND SERVICES...'	Minor clarification of scope. Potentially broadens the number of situations in which policy would apply but it is not evident this would affect the assessment	No change required
<b>ET/2 Meeting Housing Needs from Employment Development</b>		
Add the following footnote to Policy ET/2: "Employment developments to which this policy will apply are: - B1(a) Offices. - B1(b) High tech and related industries, and services concerned mainly with commercial research and development. - C2 Hospitals, including healthcare teaching and research. - D1 educational uses and associated sui-generis research institutes and academic research institutes."	Nature of land usage classes was inferred from existing policy wording (although C2 was not anticipated, though this does not affect the assessment).	No change required
<b>ET/3 Promotion of Clusters</b>		
Amend paragraph 6.8 'a cluster is a group of independent ORGANISATIONS OR companies....	Minor editorial change that appears consistent with the type of body likely to occupy the listed land use classes.	No change required

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<b>ET/4 Development in Established Employment Areas</b>		
<p>Amend 1st and last paragraphs of policy ET/4: “ In defined Established Employment Areas In The Countryside, redevelopment of existing buildings, and appropriate [infill] development for employment use may be permitted. [Infilling is defined as filling small gaps between built development. Cumulative impact of proposals will be considered.] Permission will be refused where there would be a negative impact on surrounding countryside, or landscape character area. Developments will be subject to other policies in the plan, in particular policy ET/6 on the expansion of existing firms. Amend paragraph 6.11: Within these areas, appropriate [infill] DEVELOPMENT and redevelopment will be permitted, subject to consideration of land supply across the District, and other policy concerns. This will enable more efficient use of the sites, and allow them to be adapted for the needs of existing and future users.”</p>	<p>Clarifies conditions under which development would be permitted and improves performance against the conservation objectives. Ideally the amendment could also include biodiversity impacts, which are more likely in such locations. Cross-references to the controlling effect of other plan policies reflect observations in the original assessments.</p>	<p>Scoring against objective 3.2 (character impacts) changed from neutral to positive and comments at left about biodiversity impacts are also noted. Potential (positive) impact on objective 3.3 is also noted</p>
<p>Replace name 'Vantico South of Duxford', with 'Land at Hinxtion Road, South of Duxford'.</p>	<p>Editorial clarification</p>	<p>No change required</p>
<p>Amend boundary of Established Employment Area south of Duxford, to include existing buildings and sidings, but not additional areas of undeveloped land.</p>	<p>Not evident that the change can be addressed meaningfully in the assessment, though it appears to prevent undeveloped land within the existing Green Belt being included in the envelope where further development would be permitted. In that respect it is marginally more sustainable.</p>	<p>No change required</p>

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<b>ET/5 New Employment Development</b>		
<p>Amend policy ET/5 "New Employment Development in Villages" to read: "Planning permission will be granted at an appropriate scale for new small-scale employment in the B1 - B8 Use Classes provided that the development would contribute to a greater range of local employment opportunities, or facilitate cluster development within village frameworks and on previously developed sites adjoining or very close to village frameworks. Small scale employment development in villages is defined as employing no more than 25 people as follows: 1. Offices B1(a): 400 sq.m. 2. High tech/R&amp;D (B1b): 725 sq.m. 3. Light industry (B1c): 800 sq.m. 4. General industry (B2-B7): 850 sq.m. 5. Warehousing (B8): 1250 sq.m."</p>	<p>Change responds to an objection seeking thresholds based on floorspace rather than jobs, as this will vary with usage classes. The thresholds are assumed to be an appropriate clarification although it is not evident how they have been derived. Using jobs as a proxy for impacts on traffic, etc. is understandable, however the thresholds allow for larger areas of warehousing and this could mean a facility which delivers relatively few jobs has a substantial visual impact. It is not evident how this issue would be addressed although we assume there is scope to use other Development Control DPD policies to prevent this outcome.</p>	<p>Original assessment proposed specifying thresholds and this has been addressed, however the concerns at left suggest the '?' score should be retained. Text was added to the assessment and its summary to reflect the comments at the left.</p>
<p>Amend paragraph 6.16 to read: "Small scale is defined as the employment of up to 25 people. The actual scale of new employment which would be appropriate in any village will be determined having regard to the size of each village and the amount of locally available employment. 25 jobs is converted into floorspace using the English Partnerships publication 'Employment densities: a simple guide'."</p>	<p>This change appears to revert to the original job-based threshold and it is not clear what other controls would be used to prevent (for example) visually unsympathetic development. As both statements apply to development in village frameworks it is not clear when the job-based threshold and when the floor space thresholds would apply.</p>	<p>No change to assessment apart from that mentioned above for the first alteration to policy ET/5. Ideally the Council should clarify the point made at left</p>
<b>ET/6 Expansion of Existing Firms</b>		
<p>Add footnote to Policy ET/6. Non-conforming Use - a use which does not conform to the general provisions of the development plan for the area in which it is located, and may have an adverse impact on an area's principal use.</p>	<p>Editorial change / clarification</p>	<p>No change required</p>
<b>ET/7 Loss of Rural Employment to Non-Employment Uses</b>		
<p>Amend Policy ET/7 to read: The conversion, change of use or re-development of existing employment sites to non-employment uses within village frameworks should be resisted unless one of the following criteria is met: 1. It is demonstrated that the site is</p>	<p>Change is a rearrangement of text so conditions under which clause 1 would apply are more evident. Functionally the policy is unchanged</p>	<p>No change required</p>

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<p>inappropriate for any employment use to continue having regard to market demand. Applications [for change of use of premises in, or last occupied by, employment use] will need to be accompanied by documentary evidence that the sites are not suitable or capable of being made suitable for continued employment use. Evidence would be required that the property has been adequately marketed for a period of not less than twelve months on terms that reflect the lawful use and condition of the premises.or 2. The overall benefit to the community of the proposal outweighs any adverse effect on employment opportunities and the range of available employment land and premises; or 3. The existing use is generating environmental problems such as noise, pollution, or unacceptable levels of traffic.</p>		
<b>ET/9 Replacement Buildings in the Countryside</b>		
<p>Amend policy ET/9, including deleting points 1-3: When considering proposals for replacement buildings in the countryside for employment use, any increase in floor area will be strictly controlled, and must be for the benefit of the design, or in order to better integrate the development with its surroundings. [1. The buildings are not makeshift in nature, and are of permanent, substantial construction; 2. It would bring about an environmental improvement in terms of the impact of the development on its surroundings and the landscape; 3. It would result in a more acceptable and sustainable development than might be achieved through conversion.]</p>	<p>Change to order of text which does not alter the intent of the policy.</p>	<p>No change required</p>
<b>ET/10 Farm Diversification</b>		
<p>Amend 1st paragraph of policy ET/10: Well conceived farm diversification schemes [involving uses that need to be located in the countryside], where they are directly related to supporting a working farm will be permitted if...'</p>	<p>Minor editorial / format change</p>	<p>No change required</p>

<b>Change</b>	<b>Summary of implications for SA / SEA</b>	<b>Action for SA / SEA</b>
Amend last paragraph of policy ET/10: Applications must include a farm plan, to demonstrate how the proposal will support a working farm.' Replace paragraph 6.25 with: 'It is important that diversification proposals are well founded in terms of effectively contributing to the farm business and the rural economy and integrating new activities into the environment and the rural scene. Farmers are therefore encouraged to submit a farm plan with any planning application for diversification. This should include details of existing farm activities, the need for diversification, details of the proposal and implications of the proposal on, for example, the rural economy and the environment.'	Changes largely concern the procedure for submitting a plan and the justification that the Council expect to see. It is not evident this has improved the policy's impact significantly (though it is a useful clarification).	No change required

## **Chapter 7: Services & Facilities**

<b>SF/1 Protection of Village Services &amp; Facilities</b>		
Replace with 'good local services', as used in Structure Plan 2003 Policy P8/6.	Location of change is not apparent but does not affect the main impact of the policy and therefore the assessment.	No change required
<b>SF/2 Retail Hierarchy</b>		
Add to end of paragraph 7.2: 'Policy E9 of Draft Regional Spatial Strategy sets out the regional structure of retail centres. Although it uses a different terminology, it is not incompatible with policy SF/2.'	The change is a response to an objection raised by GO-East, which advised the Council to make clear the incompatibility but which (given the lack of other instruction) suggests the Office is satisfied that this situation does not mean policy fails to support the RSS. It is not clear how this can be reflected in the assessment or what changes are appropriate.	No change required
Move Policy SF/2, and paragraphs 7.2 to 7.5 to the Core Strategy DPD.	Editorial changes reflecting requests of various respondents, including GO-East. It is the Council's role to determine the appropriate structure for the document.	No change required
<b>SF/3 Applications for New Retail Development</b>		
Add to paragraph 7.4: 'However the District Council does not	Clarification that reflects an assumption made during	No change required

<b>Change</b>	<b>Summary of implications for SA / SEA</b>	<b>Action for SA / SEA</b>
intend that Northstowe should perform a sub-regional shopping role THAT HAS A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE ROLE OF CAMBRIDGE'.	the original assessment and which was stated more explicitly for that at Cambridge East.	
<b>SF/5 Retailing in Villages</b>		
Amend policy SF/5 as follows: '...will only be permitted where the size and attraction of the shopping development is of a scale appropriate to the FUNCTION AND size of the village.'	Change does not materially affect the assessment of the policy, and it is not clear what purpose the change fulfils. There was a single objection to this policy which proposes the issue is the size and function of the retail development, not of the settlement.	No change made although the interpretation of the objection at left suggests further clarification of this text is necessary.
<b>SF/7 Public Art &amp; New Development</b>		
Amend 3rd sentence of paragraph 7.11: 'Plans and budgets will need to be agreed in association with the District Council's officers prior to planning approval, AT A LEVEL APPROPRIATE TO THE TYPE OF APPLICATION.'	A procedural issue which lies outside the scope of comment by the SA.	No change required
<b>SF/8 Telecommunications</b>		
Delete Policy SF/8 delete paragraphs 7.12 and 7.13 and replace with: 'PPG8: Telecommunications sets out national policy on telecommunications installations. It includes requirements to consider the design and siting of apparatus and impact on amenity and appearance. It also makes clear that Local planning authorities may reasonably expect applicants for new masts to show evidence that they have explored the possibility of erecting antennas on an existing building, mast or other structure.'	Changes respond to points raised by GO-East in terms of the relationship between national policy and local authorities' functions on this matter. The rewording does not appear to materially affect the sustainability of the policy, and the removal of the word 'radio' broadens its applicability.	No change required
<b>SF/10 Lord's Bridge Radio Telescope</b>		
Extend the boundary of the Lords Bridge Consultation Area.	No obvious sustainability implications; change is a precautionary move to ensure interference issues are identified and prevented over an appropriate area.	No change required
<b>SF/11 Protection of Existing Recreation Areas</b>		
Delete point 1 of the policy.	Procedural change resulting from changes to PPG17.	No change required
Modify point 3 of the policy to read: 'The proposed development [is for an outdoor or indoor sports facility] INCLUDES	As above.	No change required

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
PROVISION FOR OPEN SPACE, SPORTS AND RECREATION FACILITIES of sufficient benefit to RECREATION PROVISION to outweigh the loss.'		
Amend point 4 of the policy to read: 'An excess of provision IN QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE TERMS is clearly demonstrated.'	Appears to make clearer how applications would be assessed. However the policy is already marked very positively against the key objectives (5.1 – health and 5.3 – open space). At the policy focuses on conserving open space the marking against objective 6.1 (improving facilities) remains unchanged.	No change required
<b>SF/12 Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space &amp; New Developments</b>		
Delete paragraph 7.21 and replace with: 'A Recreation and Community Supplementary Planning Document will detail mechanisms for implementation, including costings, and further details on standards for quantity and quality of provision.'	Minor wording change detailing the Council's intention to develop an SPD subsequently.	No change required
Delete 4th Paragraph of policy SF/12 and replace with: 'DEPENDING ON THE NATURE OF PROVISION, CONTRIBUTIONS MAY ALSO BE REQUIRED TO MEET MAINTENANCE AND / OR OPERATING COSTS EITHER AS PUMP PRIMING OR IN PERPETUITY, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RECREATION AND COMMUNITY SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT.'	Change reflects the need for the Council to negotiate appropriate contributions, rather than to impose them mandatorily. This is in line with national planning policy and does not appear to materially affect the potential impact of the policy either adversely or beneficially.	No change required
Add to first paragraph of Policy SF/12 Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space, STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE, and New Developments: Schemes including one or more new dwellings will be required to contribute towards Outdoor Playing Space (including children's play and formal sports facilities) [and], Informal Open Space, AND STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE to meet the additional need generated by the development.	Extends the scope of contributions sought, although it suggests the policy title should be changed.	No change required

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<p><b>SF/13 Open Space Standards</b></p> <p>Add to policy SF/13: STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE - 5.1HA PER 1000 PEOPLE Add note to Policy SF/13: STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE IS DEFINED AS: PARKS, GARDENS AND AREAS OF NATURAL AND SEMI-NATURAL GREENSPACE THAT PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR INFORMAL RECREATION AND PUBLIC ACCESS, ARE GREATER THAN 25HA IN EXTENT (EXC. WOODLAND* AND OPEN WATER) AND FULFIL FIVE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA: - FULFIL STRUCTURE PLAN AND/OR LOCAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES -CONTRIBUTE TO LARGE-SCALE PUBLIC ACCESS SCHEMES -CONTAIN A NETWORK OF LINEAR ACCESS ROUTES -PROVIDE FREE AND OPEN ACCESS ACROSS THE SITE -ARE SECURED FOR OR HAVE A RIGHT OF PUBLIC USE IN PERPETUITY -HAVE A STATUS OR AN INTENT TO ALLOW PUBLIC ACCESS -THE PROVISION OF FACILITIES THAT ASSIST PUBLIC ACCESS -MEET LOCAL BIODIVERSITY ACTION PLAN TARGETS *GIVEN THE NATURE OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND THE LACK OF WOODLAND IN THE COUNTY, PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE WOODLAND UNDER 25HA THAT MEETS FIVE OF THE ABOVE CRITERIA AND WHICH LIES WITHIN ENHANCEMENT AREAS WHERE THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF WOODLAND EXCEEDS 25HA SHOULD BE INCLUDED AS IT IS STRATEGICALLY AND ENVIRONMENTALLY IMPORTANT.'</p>	<p>Clarification of what is strategic open space (and which is consistent with amendments / additional to other Local Development Documents). Note that the existing assessment is already strongly positive.</p>	<p>Since the changes have more clearly defined the function, provision and location of S.O.S., the scoring against objectives 3.2 (character) and 3.3 (spaces that work well) have been increased from '++' to '+++' making them the same as those for 5.1 (health) and 5.3 (open space). These changes do not materially affect the assessments of significant or cumulative impacts.</p>
<p>Delete paragraph 7.23 and replace with: THE COUNTY AND DISTRICT COUNCILS HAVE DEVELOPED THE CONCEPT OF STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE (SOS). SOS PROVIDES MORE THAN A LOCAL FUNCTION AND SPACES ARE GENERALLY LARGER, MORE VARIED, AND PROVIDE A DIFFERENT VISITOR EXPERIENCE TO VILLAGE OPEN SPACES.</p>	<p>Clarification of the definition of strategic open space.</p>	<p>No change required (see above)</p>

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<p>Delete paragraph 7.24 and replace with: A STANDARD FOR THE PROVISION OF SOS HAS ALSO BEEN DEVELOPED. THIS WILL BE USED TO ENSURE THAT NEW DEVELOPMENTS PROVIDE OR CONTRIBUTE TO APPROPRIATE LEVELS OF STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE. THERE IS CURRENTLY A SHORTFALL IN TERMS OF QUALITY, ACCESSIBILITY AND QUANTITY. THE STANDARD FOR STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE IS 5.1HA OF STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE PER 1000 PEOPLE. THIS SHOULD BE PROVIDED WITHIN 5 MILES OF PEOPLE'S HOMES AND BE ACCESSIBLE BY MEANS OTHER THAN JUST BY CAR. PROVISION MAY INVOLVE THE CREATION OF NEW SITES, OR THE IMPROVEMENT OF EXISTING SITES (INCLUDING ACCESS PROVISION). FURTHER SPECIFIC DETAILS ON STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE WILL BE PROVIDED IN SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS.</p>	<p>As above.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p><b>SF/14 The River Cam</b></p>		
<p>Amend paragraph 7.25: 'Due to the sensitive environment, the need to protect their setting, AND THE ASSOCIATED PUBLIC RIGHTS OF ACCESS, the policy strictly limits further development.'</p>	<p>Makes a subtle but important change to the policy.</p>	<p>Scoring against objectives 3.2 (character) and 5.3 (open space) were upgraded from '+' to '++' and the nature of these changes documented in the summary. They also required changes to Appendices . (As a point of principle it was considered that the banks of the Cam did not count as "wild places" as specified by objective 2.3).</p>

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
Amend policy SF/14 The River Cam to read: "The District Council will only permit extensions to the curtilage of existing marinas or boat yards, or new marinas and boat yards if development would not have an adverse impact on the landscape and character of the River Cam corridor."	The original assessment acknowledged the effect of controls on preserving the attraction of this resource and it was not evident that this might have a potential impact on the recreational/tourism sector, as proposed by one objector. However, this issue appears to be addressed by the changes which mean the policy is less specific in where it applies and the controls it places.	Scoring against objective 7.3 (economic vitality) changed from neutral to '+' in recognition of the points at left.

## Chapter 8: Natural Environment

<i>NE/2 Renewable Energy</i>		
Add the following to the end of criterion 1 of Policy NE/2: "...unless it can be demonstrated that energy generation would be used on-site to meet the needs of a specific end user."	Provides more flexibility in using the energy without the need for additional infrastructure. This can be beneficial since reselling to national providers means that generation sources need to be situated close to a grid connection point, whereas local re-use might make it possible to exploit more sites. It is not possible to assess the impact and the original assessment implicitly considered the possibility of CHP projects even though this was not explicit in the policy or its supporting text.	Original assessment is moderately positive, qualifying it because technology deployment may be focused on new development rather than existing properties. We see no clear case for altering the assessment, although the increased flexibility mentioned at left is acknowledged in a minor change to the assessment summary.
Delete second sentence of paragraph 8.8.	Removes a comment in the original policy which appeared to restrict the size of wind farms on the basis of a presumption rather than a real situation. It is not evident that the change weakens or strengthens the policy, merely that it provides the need for case by case assessment. However the apparent size restriction is reflected in comments against several objectives.	The assessment was reviewed and it was considered that the existing markings and comments adequately reflected the potential impacts. A change to scores or comments could not be justified without evidence suggesting the wording change would have a substantial effect on the deployment of wind farms in the District, and these points are noted in changes to the assessment summary.
Amend the first sentence of paragraph 8.12 to read: "Electricity generation from renewable sources will be directed into the National Grid where it could help smooth out fluctuations in	Largely a procedural / management issue which appears outside the scope of the SA, and which is supported by the first amendment shown above.	No change required

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
supply and demand; it would also not require the developments receiving the electricity to be limited to a single energy supply company."		
<b>NE/5 Countryside Enhancement Areas</b>		
Amend Policy NE/5 to read: "Development within, or closely associated with, Countryside Enhancement Areas will contribute towards schemes for quiet recreation, biodiversity and landscape enhancement." Amend last sentence of paragraph 8.18 to read: "The Biodiversity Strategy, which will be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document, identifies a number of Countryside Enhancement Areas. Areas have been identified because of their existing, or potential, biodiversity value for a wide range of species and habitats, or because of their proximity to significant habitat and/or access creation projects."	Wording of the first amendment is still unclear and the word "contribute" suggests the Council may seek financial or other provisions in such cases. The second amendment updates the policy to reflect recent progress on this matter and is a procedural change only.	No change required although the policy wording requires clarification.
<b>NOTE: as a result of the re-assessment comments shown below for policies NE/6 to NE/8, the Council agreed to remove the word "unacceptable". The changes shown in the right-hand column have not been made as a result of this further change, however the original review and proposed changes to the document are retained to record the process.</b>		
<b>NE/6 Biodiversity</b>		
Amend second paragraph of Policy NE/6 to read: "The District Council will refuse development that would have an unacceptable adverse significant impact on the population or conservation status of protected species or priority species or habitat unless the impact can be adequately mitigated or compensated for by measures secured by planning conditions or obligations."	Change introduces the word "unacceptable" impact following an objection that this approach is also used in assessing noise impacts, where they are different in nature. We consider this weakens the effectiveness of the policy even though it retains a requirement for effective mitigation. This is a particular issue for NE/6 as it refers specifically to species covered by the strictest conservation designations. It is also applicable to NE/7 and NE/8.	Previously strong support for objectives 2.1 (protected species) and 2.2 (characteristic habitats) have been changed from strongly positive to qualified positive ('+++') to reflect this issue. The sections in the main report dealing with these objectives have not been changed pending discussion of this issue with SCDC.
<b>NE/7 Sites of Biodiversity Importance</b>		
Amend paragraph of Policy NE/7 to read: "Planning permission will not be given for proposals that may have an unacceptable adverse impact, either directly or indirectly, on a Site of Biodiversity Importance."	As above, although the lower level of conservation importance means this is less of an issue. Nevertheless the third change (to para. 8.34 – see below) illustrates the conservation value of these assets and appears inconsistent with the weakening	Assessment against objectives 2.1 and 2.2 again adjusted to reflect apparent weakening of the policy in spite of positive comments from several sources.

<b>Change</b>	<b>Summary of implications for SA / SEA</b>	<b>Action for SA / SEA</b>
	of this policy by the wording change.	
Amend the Proposals Map to include the latest County Wildlife Sites.	Cartographic improvement	No change required

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<p>Amend paragraph 8.34 to read: "PPS9 recognises that Regional or Local Sites have a fundamental role to play in meeting overall national biodiversity targets; contributing to the quality of life and the well-being of the community; and in supporting research and education. In South Cambridgeshire these "County Wildlife Sites" (CWS) are identified by the Wildlife Trust in accordance with published criteria and are marked on the Proposals Map. As the SSSI network is only a representative sample, many CWSs are equivalent ecological value to SSSIs and a majority of CWSs support priority BAP habitats and species. They will be treated as material to the consideration of development proposals. The knowledge of such sites and their condition is always changing and sites may be added and removed from the list. PPS9 also recognises the value provided by networks of natural habitats. They may link sites of biodiversity importance and provide routes or stepping stones for the migration, dispersal and genetic exchange of species in the wider environment. In South Cambridgeshire such networks may include public rights of way, important roadside verges which need to be protected from road improvements or new access points, ponds, moats, marshes and ditches that can be adversely affected by changes in local hydrology, woodlands, copses, pollarded willow and hedgerows, semi-natural grasslands and disused gravel, chalk or clunch pits. The management of such features is crucial to maintaining the existing biodiversity interest and to assisting further colonisation of habitats by various species."</p>	<p>Clearly supportive but expands the rationale without affecting the nature of the positive assessment to date.</p>	<p>No change required</p>
<p>Add new paragraph after 8.34: "Public rights of way can often be green corridors in their own right, especially when in open arable</p>	<p>As above.</p>	<p>No change required</p>

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<p>countryside. which can be up to ten metres wide 60 feet wide strips through the countryside, and should consequently be protected for the biodiversity opportunities that they provide. These corridors often co-exist with SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites, and Scheduled Ancient Monuments, and need to be very carefully managed to balance the complex rights and various statutory protections."</p>		
<b>NE/8 Natural Areas</b>		
<p>Amend Policy NE/8 to read: "Planning permission will not be granted for development which would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the biodiversity of the Natural Areas shown on Figure 1."</p>	<p>Comments are largely as for NE/6 and NE/7. A particular concern is that the wording change is not offset by any statement about the need for mitigation measures where impacts are considered to be "acceptable".</p>	<p>Similar amendment of scores and assessment comments to those made for NE/6 and NE/7.</p>
<p>Add the text of Policy NE/8 to the end of Policy NE/6. Move paragraphs 8.35 and 8.36 to follow paragraph 8.26.</p>	<p>Editorial change</p>	<p>No change required</p>
<p>Amend the reasoned justification to refer to, and take account of changes resulting from, PPS9 and Circular 06/2005.</p>	<p><i>Change duplicates that made for NE/6 and need not be reviewed separately.</i></p>	
<b>NE/9 Regionally Important Geological / Geomorphological Sites</b>		
<p>Delete Policy NE/9 and paragraph 8.37.</p>	<p>These changes reflect an observation from GO-East that the lack of such sites in the District obviates the need for a policy. As such its removal should not have any sustainability implications. However the final change below appears prudent to enable local geology to be treated in the same manner as archaeological assets, provided there is reasonable evidence to suggest something valuable is located beneath the development site. We must assume that the Council's inclusion of references to geological sites in a revised policy NE/7</p> <p>No change required. The original assessment and corresponding elements in Appendices 4, 5 and 6 have been retained to provide an audit trail.</p>	
<p>Amend title of Policy NE/7 to read: "Policy NE/7 Sites of Biodiversity or Geological Importance"</p>		
<p>Amend first sentence of first paragraph to read: "Planning permission will not be given for proposals that may have an adverse impact, either directly or indirectly, on a Site of Biodiversity or Geological Importance."</p>		
<p>Amend first sentence of paragraph 8.27 to read: "Sites of Biodiversity or Geological Importance are identified on the Proposals Map."</p>		
<p>Move paragraph 8.38 to follow paragraph 8.31.</p>		

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<p>Add new paragraph to follow 8.31A: "In considering any development proposal, the District Council will have regard to the need to allow suitable opportunities to study and record exposures and features, and the opportunity to incorporate within the development the preservation of geological features of interest."</p>	<p>will be acceptable to GO-East.</p>	
<p><b>NE/12 Foul Drainage – Alternative Drainage Systems</b></p>		
<p>Amend first paragraph of policy NE/12 as follows:[Drainage to a public sewer should be provided wherever possible] The development of sites where drainage to a public sewer is not feasible will only be permitted if proposed alternative facilities are considered [in]adequate and would NOT pose an unacceptable risk to the quality or quantity of ground or surface water, pollution of local ditches, watercourses or sites of biodiversity importance. DRAINAGE TO A PUBLIC SEWER SHOULD BE PROVIDED WHEREVER POSSIBLE. A package treatment plant [will therefore need to] should be provided WHERE THIS IS NOT POSSIBLE. Only where it is clearly demonstrated that neither of these options is feasible will a system incorporating septic tank(s) be acceptable.'</p>	<p>Changes appear straightforward and clarify the priorities, correct an error in the original policy, and define appropriate mitigation consistent with what was proposed in the original policy.</p>	<p>No change required</p>
<p><b>NE/13 Flood Risk</b></p>		
<p>Amend proposals map key to refer to EA website, and the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, for further information.</p>	<p>Cartographic improvement</p>	<p>No change required</p>
<p><b>NE/15 Water Conservation</b></p>		
<p>Amend 1st sentence of policy NE/15:Development must incorporate water conservation measures [such as water saving devices, rainwater harvesting, and greywater recycling]. Amend paragraph 8.51: 'There are a number of ways water conservation can be achieved, SUCH AS WATER SAVING DEVICES, RAINWATER HARVESTING, AND GREYWATER RECYCLING,</p>	<p>Changes are necessitated by an objection from GO-East that mandating water conservation lies outside the scope of the DPD. Given the nature of their response we assume this issue concerns mandating specific measures, as opposed to imposing a general principle. The changes appear to reflect this</p>	<p>No change required</p>

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
and the policy offers a degree of flexibility on the exact methods used.'	procedural issue rather than a change in position by the Council. It is not evident that giving greater flexibility in choosing measures will have an marked effect on our assessment which remains strongly positive.	
Amend policy NE15: Development must incorporate water conservation measures, such as water saving devices, rainwater harvesting, and greywater recycling. Any measures must avoid adverse impact on the water environment and biodiversity. [Major Developments] ALL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS GREATER THAN 1,000 M2 OR 10 DWELLINGS will be required to submit a Water Conservation Strategy, to demonstrate how this is to be achieved.	The change is clearly beneficial in terms of delivering the desired improvements, although we would assume that developments of this size could be required to provide these details through the masterplan or development brief, and a separate document should not add time and cost.	The assessment is strongly positive and the changes do not do enough to weaken the assessment. No change required, although the comments at left are reflected in the assessment summary.
<b>NE/18 Noise Pollution</b>		
Revise Policy NE/18 criterion 3 to read: "3. Would be subject to unacceptable noise levels from existing noise sources, both ambient levels and having regard to noise impulses whether irregular or tone."	Clarification of nature of unacceptable noise. Does not affect basis of the assessment.	No change required
<b>NE/21 Protecting High Quality Agricultural Land</b>		
Amend 1st paragraph of policy NE/21:'The District Council will not grant planning permission which would lead to the irreversible loss of grades 1,2, or 3a agricultural land UNLESS:- LAND IS ALLOCATED FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK;- SUSTAINABILITY CONSIDERATIONS AND THE NEED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT ARE SUFFICIENT TO OVERRIDE THE NEED TO PROTECT THE AGRICULTURAL VALUE OF THE LAND.	Several objectors complained that the original policy was too inflexible. The revisions appear to provide scope for development in certain circumstances though these are not well-defined. The first condition offers the greater cause for concern although the LDF should provide scope to restrict its effect using policies on landscape character impact, new or converted buildings in the countryside, proximity to services, etc. The circumstances in which the current LDF is being prepared illustrates an example of the second clause, in which decisions taken higher up the land use planning system dictate that	Assessment reviewed and scoring against objective 1.1 (land resources) was revised from significantly positive to "significantly positive but qualified", reflecting the pragmatic position which the policy now takes. The text has been adjusted to reflect this position and a comment added to the assessment of objective 1.1 in the main report. Notwithstanding these changes we do not consider them sufficient to change the assessment of cumulative or significant impacts.

<b>Change</b>	<b>Summary of implications for SA / SEA</b>	<b>Action for SA / SEA</b>
	development on agricultural land can be justified.	
Add to end of paragraph 8.62:'DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE VILLAGE FRAMEWORKS IS RESISTED TO THAT REQUIRED FOR AGRICULTURE, HORSECULTURE, FORESTRY, OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OTHER USES WHICH NEED TO BE LOCATED IN THE COUNTRYSIDE, BY POLICY DP/8.	Change appears to clarify nature of sympathetic uses. The nature of these changes does not appear to lead to the possibility of large scale permanent loss of agricultural land and therefore the effect of the changes appears to be limited.	No change required
<b>Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage</b>		
Amend objective CH/a:'To protect historic landscapes and PUBLIC rights of way'	Reflects the legal scope of the DPD.	No change required
Delete 2nd half of 1st sentence of paragraph 9.1.The landscape is the product of human action on the natural landscape over many thousands of years[, particularly relevant in South Cambridgeshire which has been significantly settled for a long period].	Minor editorial change to the supporting text which does not affect the policy.	No change required
<b>CH/2 Archaeological Sites</b>		
Replace 4th sentence of paragraph 9.4 with:[Government policy favours the retention of important remains in situ.] PARAGRAPH 13 OF PPG16 MAKES CLEAR THAT PRESERVATION IN SITU OF IMPORTANT ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS IS NEARLY ALWAYS THE PREFERRED APPROACH.	Merely clarifies priorities and the specific relevant legislation. The policy is already marked as strongly positive against objective 2.1.	No change required
<b>CH/3 Listed Buildings</b>		
Amend Policy CH/3 to read: "Applications for planning permission and listed building consent (including applications for alterations, extensions, change of use or demolition of Listed Buildings) will be determined in accordance with legislative provisions and national policy (currently in PPG15), together with the local policies set out in Supplementary Planning Documents. In assessing such applications the District Council will adopt a presumption in favour of the retention and preservation of local materials and details on Listed Buildings in the district."	Change responds to objection by GO-East that the original text repeated national policy. It is assumed that the shortening still adequately conveys the intention to use national guidance and criteria in determining the suitability of applications, and that the change therefore does not materially affect the way the policy would operate.	No change required
Add the following text to the end of paragraph 9.11: "In particular	Also a response to GO-East objection which, we	No change required

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<p>the District Council will resist applications that result in the loss of traditional longstraw roofs and their ridge, barge and dormer details, or the loss of traditional gault clay pegtiles and pantile roofs, their ridge, valley, verge and abutment details."</p>	<p>presume, provides specific examples of features which must be preserved. We assume these items are consistent with other local guidance (eg. the District Design Guide mentioned below). The only issue it raises is whether a fuller list is needed, though we assume this could be delivered through a revised Guide in due course (again, see below).</p>	
<p><b>CH/5 Conservation Areas</b></p>		
<p>Amend Policy CH/5 to read: "Planning applications for development proposals (including applications for Conservation Area Consent for demolitions) in or affecting Conservation Areas will be determined in accordance with legislative provisions and national policy (currently in PPG15), together with the local policies set out in Supplementary Planning Documents and guidance contained in specific Conservation Area Appraisals (where they exist) and the District Design Guide." Add the following text to the end of paragraph 9.18: "Where appropriate they will be adopted as Supplementary Planning Documents."</p>	<p>As above.</p>	<p>No change required</p>
<p><b>CH/7 Important Countryside Frontages</b></p>		
<p>Designate Important Countryside Frontages east of Hill Road, Over and on Park Lane, Histon.</p>	<p>It is not possible for this assessment to review the merits of individual designations, although we do not consider it will affect the assessment.</p>	<p>No change required</p>

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<b>Chapter 10: Travel</b>		
<i>Objectives</i>		
Amend the wording of Objective TR/c to read: "To increase travel by sustainable modes through the encouragement of modal shift away from the private motorcar."	Objectives were assessed at Regulation 25 stage consultation. Through both stages of the assessment the objective of modal shift to sustainable transport has been amply clear in the wording of options, policies and supporting text (see item below, for example), and taken account of explicitly in the assessment of all relevant policies. This change merely clarifies the issue.	No change required
<i>TR/1 Planning for More Sustainable Travel</i>		
Amend bullet 4 to read: "Ensuring that new developments are located and designed at the outset with permeable layouts to facilitate and encourage short distance trips by cycle and walking, including to public transport interchanges, in accordance with Policy TR/4."	Amplifies intention that paved infrastructure should encourage walking to public transport services. This issue was discussed with Council staff during the Regulation 25 stage assessments and it was made clear that this was the intention (specifically in terms of development at Northstowe and Cambridge East, which prompted the initial discussion). Assessment is already strongly positive, qualified only by the comment that addressing health objectives requires provision of infrastructure and the willingness of residents to use it. In the circumstances the overall assessment is not changed by this clarification.	No change required
Add a new paragraph before paragraph 10.5: "All development should strive to offer travel choice by non-car modes appropriate in scale and kind to the development. An indicative list of measures which may assist in achieving suitable modal choice are listed. The measures applicable to each development proposal will vary on case by case basis, according the type and scale of development proposed, its location, and the level of existing transport infrastructure and services in the immediate	The original assessment commented that the policy lacked a clear statement of whether contributions might be sought. This change clearly resolves this matter, defining a process consistent with current practice on negotiating such agreements, and ensuring flexibility in seeking proportionate financial contributions from smaller developments where appropriate. Moreover it seems likely such sources	Assessment of objective 7.2 (infrastructure investment) changed to a more strongly positive score ('++') and corresponding changes made to the review of achievement of this objective in section 6.2 of the main report, and to Appendix 4. Assessment against objective 6.1 (access to services, etc.) was already strongly positive even in the short-term and it was not considered necessary to change this.

<b>Change</b>	<b>Summary of implications for SA / SEA</b>	<b>Action for SA / SEA</b>
area. This could also include a financial contribution into a "pot" for the implementation of schemes beyond the scope of an individual development to deliver."	will be essential for providing transport services early on so that sustainable commuting is encouraged as soon as the development is rolled out.	
Add a new paragraph after paragraph 10.4: "In assessing whether the development proposal is likely to give rise to a material increase in travel demand, the Council will consider the existing use of the building(s) / site, existing transport conditions in the immediate and wider area, and likely transport generation resulting from the development proposal(s)."	Clarification of policy which does not appear to affect its sustainability but which ensures 'baseline' conditions are taken into account.	No change required
<b>TR/2 Car Parking &amp; Cycle Standards</b>		
Amend Appendix 1, Use Class C3: Dwelling Homes, to read: "Average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling across the district..."	Aligns the policy with national guidance which specifies an average achievement (policy had previously specified 1.5 places per dwelling as a standard rate.	No change required
Amend 2nd sentence of 2nd paragraph to read: "Where opportunities arise, for example, on mixed-use sites, shared use parking and car pooling will be encouraged to minimise provision."	Suggests alternative solution. Not considered to affect the scoring which is already positive.	No change required
<b>TR/3 Mitigating Travel Impacts</b>		
Add the following caveat to the end of Policy TR/3: "In relation to outline planning applications, a Framework for the preparation of Travel Plans will be submitted with the application proposals."	Appears to reflect a procedural requirement noted by an objector, and does not affect the impact of the policy.	No change required
Amend 3rd paragraph to read: "Proposals for 'major development'* or where a proposal is likely to have 'significant transport implications' the Council will require developers to submit the following alongside planning applications:..." Add footnote to read: "'Major development' will be interpreted as set out in paragraph 3.5 on page 32."	Appears to broaden the circumstances in which a travel plan must be submitted. Changes are clearly consistent and linked to other policies. The definition of "major development" sets a relatively low threshold of 10 or more dwellings which could be quite compact on a high-density site. It might therefore be appropriate to seek a level of detail proportionate to the size of the development, though we recognise the difficulty of specifying what is expected in a way that	Assessment scores were reviewed against several objective but were considered to be appropriate to the amended policy.

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
	helps developers. However this issue is addressed by the change preceding para. 10.9 (next but one point below).	
Add the following text after bullet 2: "All other planning applications should be accompanied by a Transport Statement to demonstrate that the development will achieve adequate mitigation of its transport impacts."	Clarifies what is required for other development falling outside the 'significant' and 'large' definition, although this requirement was anticipated in the original assessment. The change also addresses our comment on appropriate mitigation measures (policy rewording in the original assessment).	No change required
Add new paragraph before 10.9, as follows: "It is important that all development mitigates its transport impact. 'Major development' proposals or development proposals with a 'significant transport implications' will be required to produce a Transport Assessment and a Travel Plan (for non-residential proposals). A Transport Statement should be submitted alongside all other development proposals to enable the applicant to demonstrate to the Council that they have properly considered the transport impact of the proposal and taken into account how to mitigate them. The level of detail of the Transport Statement will vary according to the scale and complexity of the application."	Clarifies the point made above about the level of detail that would be expected. Given the nature of preceding comments we do not consider this affects our assessment although it is helpful in making clearer what the policy will require of developers across a wider range of sites.	No change required
<b>TR/4 Cycling &amp; Walking Provision</b>		
Amend policy title to: "Non-car modes". Amend 1st paragraph to read: "The District Council will use its planning powers to support increased use of non-car modes by all sectors of society, including cycle use and walking by ensuring that..."	Intention was abundantly clear throughout the earlier versions of the policies and does not affect the assessments.	No change required
Amend 2nd paragraph to read: "In assessing such future provision for non-car modes, the District Council will use the following priorities:..."	Minor clarification indicating it applies to more than just cycling provision, which was implicitly assumed in the original assessment.	No change required
Amend bullet 3 of Policy TR/4 to read: "That detailed designs and layouts are permeable and encourage cycle use and	Amplifies intention that paved infrastructure should encourage walking to public transport services. This	No change required

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
walking for all or part of a journey, e.g. by including safe, direct links to schools, nearby centres of attraction and public transport interchanges, contributing..."	issue was discussed with Council staff during the Regulation 25 stage assessments and it was made clear that this was the intention.	
Amend 1st sentence of the last paragraph to read: "...or improve the attractiveness of the network, including through improved maintenance, crossings, signposting and waymarking of cycleways, footpaths and other rights of way."	Adds crossings to the list of requirements. Too small to affect assessment.	No change required
Add new paragraph, before paragraph 10.11, as follows: "The hierarchy sets out the priority for the delivery of infrastructure provision for non-car modes through the planning process, for example through Section 46 contributions. Although listed in priority order, no one priority should be promoted to the exclusion of others. The first priority is to connect to larger centres of attraction, both within or adjacent to the district, including Cambridge and the market towns. These centres have a range of services and facilities, including schools and employment areas. This offers greater value for money in terms of the range of the population who could potentially use the routes. In addition, Safer Routes to School, whilst contributing to the overall aims of improving infrastructure, is already delivered from a separate pot of money. Leisure and recreation routes are also an important resource, particularly to improve access to the surrounding countryside as part of a healthy lifestyle."	Text supports and clarifies the priorities laid out in the policy text and makes it evident there is a need to address all of them to some degree. This does not affect the assessment.	Assessment comments were re-checked but it was not evident that the scorings reflected an assumption that only priority 1 would be pursued in all cases. Therefore there is no case for changing the assessment.
<b>TR/6 Eastern Rapid Transit</b>		
Delete Policy TR/6.	Change has occurred at the suggestion of GO-East who considered it was more appropriate to address it in the Cambridge East AAP. The original assessment was generally positive and therefore there is no effect <u>provided</u> it is taken forward through other planning documents.	Reason for change noted in the assessment which has been retained for audit trail purposes.

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<b>Chapter 11: Site Specific Allocations</b>		
<i>SP/1 Housing Allocations in Rural Areas</i>		
Include in the Site Specific Policies DPD, details of monitoring arrangements, including a housing trajectory.	<i>Duplicates changes notified previously and is an editorial change.</i>	
Revise the Rural Housing allocations table, and consequential changes to the proposals map and Core Strategy (refer to Special Council Report 15th November 2005). Delete all allocations which have planning permission. Update Table in SP/1 to reflect situation at end of March 2005.	Addressed below.	
In response to other objections, the Core Strategy is already proposed to be amended to include a commentary on when the sites are expected to come forward for development, the anticipated delivery timescales, as well as some of the main dependencies, risks to delivery and any contingencies.	Editorial clarification	No change required

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
Delete allocations: 2 [Sawston]; 3 [Melbourn]; 5 & 6 [both Willingham]; 7 [Bassingbourn]; 8 [Highfields Caldecote]; 9 [Comberton]; 10 Fowlmere; 11 [Girton]; 12 [Gilden Morden]; 13 [Longstanton]; 14 [Meldreth]; 15 & 16 [both Oakington]; 17 [Over]; 18 & 19 [both Papworth Everard]; & 21[ Steeple Morden] and delete the corresponding text	We have been advised by the Council (see above) that certain sites have now received planning permission based on the adopted District Local Plan, while others have been withdrawn following a review of the housing trajectory. The assessments focus on sustainability issues of the sites and not of housing provision.	Changes render most of the previous assessments superfluous, however these are retained in the relevant Appendix as an audit trail.
Amend: Papworth Everard: West of Ermine Street South: Outline planning permission was granted in September 2005 based on the Local Plan 2004. It is included in the LDF due to gaining permission after March 2005, to ensure the housing land supply it creates is acknowledged. The site includes a net developable area of 10.36 hectares, and was allocated to provide 259 dwellings. It forms the last of four quadrants of development, envisaged to provide a better balance to the population structure, reducing the proportion of elderly and people with disabilities. The level of development was also envisaged to provide a bypass for the A1198. This is due to commence construction in 2006.	Change clarifies the changed status of this allocation and that it will fund construction of the bypass.	No change to scoring however the role of the development in meeting special needs housing is acknowledged in a small revision to the summary. However the impact on the health objective is a more positive score and corresponding changes to section 6.2 of the main report and Appendices.
Amend: Heathfield, West of Kingsway and Woburn Place: Development will include contributions to improve community sustainability. Community improvements will take priority over securing affordable housing. PLANNING PERMISSION WAS GRANTED IN SEPTEMBER 2005 FOR 58 DWELLINGS.	Clarifies progress on taking forward the site.	No change required
Amend para. 11. 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence removing reference to sites coming forward in 2006. Remove reference to planning permissions in 4 <sup>th</sup> sentence. Amend a final sentence: "Although two of the sites are in group villages, they have the benefit of planning permission, gained after the end of March 2005 monitoring date. In order that their contribution towards housing numbers is acknowledged, they are retained as allocations."	As above.	No change required

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
Amend policy SP/1 to refer to a mixed use development including residential development of the former Bayer CropScience Plc site at Hauxton.	<i>Addition of a new site is considered below.</i>	
<p>Add a new policy SP/2 (and renumber all existing policies accordingly) to read: "Bayer Cropscience, Hauxton. Land at BayerCropScience Plc, Hauxton, is allocated for a sustainable mixed use development. Development of the 8.7 hectare site will comprise an even balance between jobs in B1 employment development, and numbers of dwellings, as well as open space and community facilities. The development will include: 1. The creation of riverside informal openspace linking between the proposed Trumpington Meadows Country Park and Hauxton village, retaining appropriate existing features of ecological interest, and creation of new features that will enhance the site. 2. Establishing pedestrian and cycle links to the Trumpington West Development, and to the Trumpington Park &amp; Ride. 3. Establishing pedestrian and cycle links to the village of Hauxton. 4. Contributions to improved public transport provision along the A10 corridor. 5. Finding uses for the Listed Buildings on the site at the Hauxton Mill complex. 6. The remediation of all land contaminated by the former industrial processes. 7. Redevelopment will secure a reduced visual impact of the site on the openness of the Cambridge Green Belt. A masterplan will be required for the site. (policy) The Bayer Cropscience site near Hauxton offers a specific opportunity where a brownfield site is to come available for redevelopment, located near to the edge of Cambridge. The site comprises an intensively developed industrial site, including manufacturing and warehousing. Appropriate redevelopment will comprise a mix of uses, to maximise sustainability. It will enable visual improvement of this prominent site, improving a major approach into Cambridge. It</p>	New allocation.	New assessment provided and added to the Appendix. Principal significant impacts noted in Appendix 4, and text in the main report (6.2) adjusted accordingly as appropriate.

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<p>will need to be sensitively designed to take account of its position surrounded by the Green Belt. It is capable of being developed with good links to the Trumpington West development, and Trumpington Park &amp; Ride, as well as the village of Hauxton itself. The site also offers opportunities for improved access to the River Cam. Part of the site lies within the medium risk flood zone, and appropriate mitigation measures will be required. Proposals for redevelopment of the recreation buildings and waste water treatment facility on the western side of the A10 will be considered in the context of proposals for appropriate development within the green belt. (written justification)</p>		
<p>Policy SP/1 has been amended to refer to a net developable area of 10.36 ha.</p>	<p>Consistent with change to policy SP/1t which has been reviewed above.</p>	<p>No change required</p>
<p><b>SP/3 Chesterton Sidings</b></p>		
<p>Amend first paragraph of POLICY SP/3 Chesterton Sidings: 'Land at Chesterton Sidings is allocated for a sustainable mixed-use development, as part of a distinctive new urban neighbourhood for Cambridge covering the whole of the cross-boundary area. A Masterplan will required, which must demonstrate how the Sidings can be developed as both a standalone development and one which can be integrated into the development of this wider area.'</p>	<p>Amplifies the general intention of the policy. The change to the final sentence is considered to have a slight beneficial impact on objective 3.3 (good spaces) and this is reflected in an improved mark, though this cannot be assessed effectively without a masterplan.</p>	<p>Minor improvement to scoring of objective 3.3.</p>
<p><b>SP/4 Allocations for Class B1 Employment Uses</b></p>		
<p>Amend policy SP/4 by adding a third entry to the table as follows: "3. The former Bayer CropScience site at Hauxton as part of a mixed used redevelopment, Total Site Size to be specified following the preparation of a master plan or development brief.</p>	<p>Procedural matter and cross reference to addition of a new site which is reviewed above.</p>	<p>No change required</p>
<p>Amend the proposed site area in table to read 3.0 ha instead of 4.8ha.</p>	<p>Reason for reduction of the site and given the lack of other detail we assume it will have a pro rata impact</p>	<p>No change required</p>

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<p>Amend policy SP/4 (1) to read: "Longstanton, Hattons Road: The site is allocated for 12,500 sq.m of gross internal floor area of Research and Development use. Development of the site will be dependent upon the provision of a development related bypass secured through a legal agreement. The agreement will ensure that no floor area will be occupied before the bypass, including all necessary junctions and road links to the existing network are complete.</p>	<p>on other parameters.</p> <p>It is not evident why the reference to landscaping has been removed, though we assume the position of the site close to the repositioned Green Belt around Longstanton will mean that revised policy GB/3 will address this matter. A key issue is timing of the development relative to delivery of the bypass and this is clarified by the change.</p>	<p>Delivery issues are clarified but only appear to address the issue of impacts on Longstanton. The original assessment refers to traffic generation impacts on the surrounding road system and these appear to remain, hence the assessment is unchanged. However the text acknowledges this may not occur to a significant extent if the development provides jobs for residents of Longstanton and Northstowe.</p>
<p><b>SP/5 Allocations for Class B1 and B2 Employment Uses</b></p>		
<p>Amend 1st paragraph of policy SP/5: The following sites are allocated for employment development for uses within the classes B1, B2, B8 of the Town &amp; Country (use classes amendment) order 2005 (offices, Research and Development, light industry, general industry, AND STORAGE USES).</p>	<p>Consistent with the specified range of usage classes although this is not consistent with the title of the policy which excludes B8 apparently.</p>	<p>No change to assessment; propose revision of policy title</p>
<p><b>SP/6 West of St Mary's Church, Gamlingay</b></p>		
<p>Amend policy SP/6 to read: "A site of 1 hectare west of St Mary's church, Gamlingay is allocated for use as a graveyard. Planning permission will be subject to landscaping conditions ensuring use of the land does not have an adverse impact on nearby listed buildings."</p>	<p>Adds a planning condition.</p>	<p>Scoring not affected as existing comments in the policy acknowledged the need to respect local character, but the addition of a condition has been acknowledged in the comments.</p>
<p><b>SP/7 Allocations for Open Space</b></p>		
<p>Add to Policy SP/7: West of Recreation Ground, New Road, Impington 5.7ha. (development must provide appropriate protection for the Memorial Stone)</p> <p>Allocate the following areas of land for recreation use: (1) East of Mill Lane. (2) "Chivers Barrell Field" (Manor Park) (3) Land at Barrowfrott (Gunns Lane)</p>	<p>Add new sites.</p>	<p>New assessments added for these sites. For ease of incorporating these changes into the Appendices, the sites are grouped together as a New Rec. Sites policy (without ref. number).</p>
<p><b>SP/8 Character of Village Centres</b></p>		
<p>Delete Policy SP/8, and paragraph 11.12.</p>	<p>Policy removed at suggestion of GO-East since the traffic congestion problems it refers to suggest it is</p>	<p>No change required. Policy assessment retained as a record.</p>

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
	<p>inappropriate to designate these locations as Rural Centres, and since it may be more appropriate to address these issues with other development control policies. It is assumed the latter route will be taken.</p>	
<p><b>SP/10 Former Land Settlement Association Estates</b></p>		
<p>Change policy SP/10 and the written justification to read: "Within the former Land Settlement Association site at Fen Drayton, where it can be demonstrated that buildings are no longer needed for agricultural purposes, planning permission for change of use or redevelopment of existing buildings will be permitted for on site experimental or other ground-breaking forms of sustainable living provided that development would not occupy a larger footprint than existing buildings. (policy) The Land Settlement Association's activities at Fen Drayton are an earlier example of an attempt to achieve a more sustainable form of living but with the passage of time this has not proved to be an enduring model. The current legacy of the experiment is a network of small land holdings, a wide variety of land uses including some disuse, and a patchwork of buildings of variable quality. It is difficult to see how this area can be returned to a pattern of land use or a landscape character in any way akin to the surrounding fenland countryside. In view of the area's history and its current appearance, form and character this policy will allow it to evolve as a positive experimental test-bed for new forms of sustainable living. A requirement of sustainable living at Fen Drayton will be a development which is carbon neutral. Prospective developers will be required to submit a 'carbon neutral energy statement' with their planning applications which will demonstrate how the construction and use of the development will ensure that its occupants will not cause any net increase in carbon emissions when compared to a greenfield</p>	<p>The change amplifies the nature of changes that will be permitted and makes clearer the intention to only permit current or improved levels of sustainable use and construction. Moreover we note that this is a sizeable site near to a village which is not defined as a Rural Centre. A major change of use therefore appears inconsistent with its status in spatial planning terms, and with other development control policies.</p>	<p>Scores for objectives 1.2 (energy), 1.3 (water) and 4.2 (recycling) are positive in the longer term. However the small scale of the site (in District terms) suggests the assessment of its significance does not need to be changed</p>

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<p>site. Required measures will include: ensuring the development is highly energy efficiency in terms of design, construction and subsequent use; utilises locally generated renewable energy; has high levels of recycling and has a long-term goal of ensuring no waste is sent to landfill by providing facilities to recycle, compost and convert waste to energy; introduces measures to restrict car use and promote sustainable forms of travel and commuting."</p>		
<b>SP/11 Papworth Everard Village Development</b>		
<p>Amend First Paragraph of SP/11 Site 2 - Papworth Everard West Central: Redevelopment will provide a mixed-use development, [primarily based on housing, but incorporating some employment] OF HOUSING, EMPLOYMENT and community uses.</p>	<p>Appears to clarify acknowledged definition of mixed use.</p>	<p>No change required</p>
<p>Amend paragraph 11.17 to read: "Further redevelopment at what has become known as Papworth West Central Area which may also provide opportunities for redevelopment of previously developed land. The area comprises two churches which are approaching the end of their structural life, office and commercial accommodation, and residential property that includes sheltered housing for the disabled and two nurses homes. Located at the heart of the expanded village any redevelopment will be based on a mixed use development aimed at the continued invigoration of the village centre with community uses, employment and housing development."</p>	<p>Initial amendment is largely a clarification although it ends with a shift in land use away from the mainly residential use planned originally to mixed use. Given redevelopment will follow relocation of the hospital, this change appears entirely consistent with the need to regenerate local facilities and employment to compensate for the loss of the major local employer.</p>	<p>Scoring against objectives 7.1 (access to jobs) and 7.3 (economic vitality) have been improved. That for 7.1 is a pragmatic change since it is not clear how much the development can compensate for the relocation of the hospital (though it is assumed some people will commute to the new site). That for 7.3 is more positive though it should be recognised it refers to the Papworth economy only. Appropriate changes as a result of the re-scoring have been made to sections 6.2 of the main report and the Appendices.</p>
<p>Amend the paragraph under the policy SP/11 "Site 2 - Papworth Everard West Central" heading to read: "Redevelopment will be based on a mixed use development aimed at the continued invigoration of the village centre with community uses, employment and housing development."</p>	<p>As above.</p>	<p>No change required</p>

<b>Change</b>	<b>Summary of implications for SA / SEA</b>	<b>Action for SA / SEA</b>
<b>SP/13 New Road Development</b>		
Delete bullet point 2.	Original assessment reviewed the sustainability of replacing the level crossing at Foxton with a flyover but does not address the issue of whether a flyover is necessary. The policy does not present the evidence for new infrastructure and therefore we cannot assess the impact of not providing it.	No change. The original assessment is retained as a record.
Add to paragraph 11.27, after the 4th sentence: IT IS HOWEVER NOT THE ROLE OF THE DPD TO DETERMINE PRECISELY THE NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL DWELLINGS. RATHER THE MASTER PLAN EXERCISE TO BE UNDERTAKEN IN RESPONSE TO POLICY SP/18 AND POLICY HG1 WILL DETERMINE THE OPPORTUNITY TO INCREASE HOUSING PROVISION.	Procedural clarification which does not affect the original assessment.	No change required
<b>SP/18 Cambourne</b>		
Revise 1st sentence of Policy SP/18 to read: "Development of the remainder of Cambourne will be at residential densities SUCH THAT THE OVERALL NET DENSITY OF CAMBOURNE AS A WHOLE IS APPROXIMATELY 30DPH....."	Makes explicit the level of density to be applied. This appears to be a clarification of the original text.	Positive assessment ('++') increased to ('+++') in the longer term but this does not affect comments in the main report or the Appendices
Revise paragraph 11.29 by deleting the 2nd and 3rd sentences and replacing to read: "...At Cambourne the remaining areas within the village frameworks, should be developed at higher densities than the earlier parts of the development to reflect changes in national policy towards higher residential densities, such that the average net density of Cambourne as a whole is raised to 30dph...."	As above.	As above
<b>SP/21 Green Separation at Longstanton</b>		
Amend policy heading and policy SP/21 to read "Policy SP/21: Conservation Areas and Green Separation at Longstanton", "Countryside within the 2 Conservation Areas at Longstanton St	The change appears to have removed a specified minimum distance for the green separation although the original value (200m) is retained in the supporting	No change required

Change	Summary of implications for SA / SEA	Action for SA / SEA
<p>Michaels will be included in its entirety within the Green Separation between Longstanton and Northstowe. Public access to these areas of countryside will be controlled to protect the setting of the village. Urban uses, including open space uses such as playing fields, allotments or cemeteries will not be permitted. The open aspect of the fields affording views of All Saints Church will be maintained, elsewhere the landscape character of a series of hedged paddocks, small copses and tree belts will be maintained and enhanced." Amend the Longstanton Inset Map to show the extent of the revised Longstanton St Michaels Conservation Area.</p>	<p>text. The Council has advised that the level of separation has not been reduced and therefore the change is considered to have no effect on the assessment (proscribed land uses are the same as before).</p>	

## Policies Requiring Complete Re-Appraisal

### GB/2 – Mitigating the Impact of New Development in the Green Belt – NEW POLICY REPLACING GB/2

Establishes the requirement that any new development considered appropriate within the Green Belt should have no adverse impact on visual aspect, and that forecast impacts should be addressed by planting and screening.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	(++)	(++)	(++)	Implicitly supportive though it is assumed other policies (eg NE/21) address this issue more directly.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	+	+	+	Supportive in principle as such sites will lie beyond urban edge.
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	+	+	+	Supports maintenance.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	++	++	++	Ensures that open countryside surrounds settlements (proximity), although accessibility depends on rights of way.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	+	+	+	
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	+++	+++	+++	Within 1.1 the other principal objective of this policy.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	++	++	++	Supports 3.2.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	(+)	(+)	(+)	As vegetation helps to fix carbon it can be argued that the policy supports this objective indirectly.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	?	?	?	Depends whether land is available for recreational use.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	++?	++?	++?	Supportive in principal though designation does not imply public access.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	~	~	
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	~	~	

6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	~	~
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~

**Summary of assessment:** Principal control is provided by GB/1 and use of PPG2 definition of what is acceptable development and this policy provides an additional safety net to mitigate visual and similar impacts that could result. The only issue is that this policy replaces GB/3 which addressed the design of the development itself not just its visual impact. It is assumed such controls will be imposed by other Development Control Principles.

**Summary of mitigation proposals:** Condition 2 of the policy permits appropriate development for recreational and leisure use. Should the policy or the supporting text indicate that ‘appropriate’ should be determined not only by maintaining the open character of the land but also that it should not result in excessive traffic since this indirectly affects the character and tranquillity of the area. This issue is partly addressed in GB/6 by encouraging non-car access, but traffic impacts are not mentioned specifically.

**Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects:** None identified.

**SP(x) – Bayer Cropscience, Hauxton**

**Proposes redevelopment of an 8.7ha. site comprising industrial (B2 / B8) and office premises lying at the northeast edge of the village, alongside the A10 route into Cambridge via Trumpington. and close to Junction 10 on the M11. Proposes mixed use (residential / B1) redevelopment with adjacent green space along the Cam.**

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings	+++	+++	+++	Clearly positive – no greenfield land take envisaged. Moreover the site is not currently part of the Green Belt any extension would contravene other policies in the LDF.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	?	?	?	In principle there is an absolute negative impact due to the more varied and possibly intensive use of the land compared to the current use which may include some processes that require substantial energy. This is an opportunity to reduce this impact with more energy efficient structures.
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	?	?	?	As for 1.2.
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	

2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species	?	?	?	It is not evident that redevelopment would strictly affect this objective although it does not appear to have an adverse impact.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	+(+)	+(+)	+(+)	We understand the initial proposal provides for some improvement of the existing rights of way along the adjacent Cam (although an initial desk survey suggests none exist on the west bank which the site will occupy). We assume the Council would seek their delivery through planning obligations.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	There is a listed building (water mill) on the northern edge of the site, and we assume that redevelopment will respect its setting.
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	(+)	(+)	(+)	Impact depends on specific design which is not yet determined. Clearly there is potential to replace a highly visible industrial / office premises with development that has a lower elevation and part of which blends with the nearby residential areas. See also below.
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	(+)	(+)	(+)	Again this depends on the eventual design of the site. One issue identified in the initial assessment is the relationship between the site and the adjacent housing around St Edmund's church. A balance needs to be struck between mitigating the edge effects of the site on the existing village with the need to integrate it into its fabric, and this part of the site has a key role to play.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	-	?	As most of the site is no longer operational road traffic to / from it should have fallen, and redevelopment would therefore lead to adverse impacts following redevelopment and re-occupation in the medium-term. The initial brief recognises the possible synergies with development of the Trumpington West site as part of the Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP, and there is a clear opportunity to extend public transport services (shown in a 2000 survey to be fairly poor) past that site and across the M11 to Hauxton. See also comments against objective 6.1.
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	(-)	-	-	Negative in short term – assuming on-site processes may affect ability to re-use materials that are demolished. Later on growth will increase waste arisings on the site. (Any reduction in industrial / commercial and hazardous wastes is assumed to have occurred already.) This is a negative impact in absolute terms which could be offset to some degree by other LDF policies.
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	(-)	-	---	Around 20% of the site appears to lie in the functional (100-year event) floodplain of the Cam and therefore a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment would be required to identify any measures needed in addition to those which already protect the industrial site in order to comply with PPG25.

5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	~	~	~	There are various potential, incidental effects that are positive (activity from access to the Cam, using public transport to commute) and negative (noise and other impacts from re-development). None appears particularly significant and the adverse ones can be mitigated. There is a specific issue relating to road accidents on the A10 (a busy strategic route) and how best to provide access to the site, recognising the number of movements will increase compared to when it was in industrial use.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime	~	~	~	
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	(+)	(+)	(+)	The current proposal is a little ambivalent about the disused recreational facilities on the west side of the A10 opposite the site, and this clearly provides an opportunity to assist in meeting open / recreational space targets through renovation rather than reallocation.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities	~	+	++	The site appears to offer synergies with Trumpington West in providing a 'market' for a public transport link from the Trumpington Park & Ride to Hauxton. The collective growth might provide opportunity to seek financial contributions from the outset to sponsor an extended service which would provide access to the centre of Cambridge, shops and amenities in Trumpington, and employment on the enlarged Addenbrookes site. The latter two areas are also within easy cycling distance.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	~	?	?	Details of housing tenancy proposals are not known though it is assumed the development would make a contribution to affordable housing. The relatively distant location from amenities suggests it may be less suitable for special needs and similar housing unless there is a specific requirement in the village.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	?	?	As above.
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	~	?	?	As indicated in the comments against 3.3, one concern is that the development sits at the northeast edge of the village and separated from the rest of the housing, the bulk of which lies approx. 0.5km south and contains the limited range of local amenities. Ideally the development should deliver communal facilities to encourage interaction, and this could include the sports field mentioned above.
7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	+	++	Assessment assumes that most of the site is no longer operating, so any development that delivers employment units is potentially supportive. We assume other Core Strategy and Development Control policies on the type of employment uses favoured, clustering, etc. will apply.
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and	~	~	~	(Marked as neutral though we assume planning obligations will be implemented to secure

infrastructure				the necessary infrastructure).
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	+	+	It is not known what effect closure of the site will have on the local employment market, however redevelopment for mixed use suggests a substantial degree of compensating growth which will replace need for sector-specific skills with a broader range of requirements.
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Generally a sustainable proposal with strengths in its re-use of brownfield land, proposal for mixed use development which can provide new jobs locally, and the opportunity it offers to seek contributions to benefit the wider village, It is interesting in terms of the scope it offers to integrate new public transport connections for the development with those at Trumpington West, and then also to the southern end of the Rapid Transit link at Addenbrookes.				
<b>Summary of mitigation proposals:</b> Specific issues will need to be investigated once the development proposal is more comprehensive. However the extent of flood risk will require attention, as will the need for appropriate traffic management to coordinate increased access to the site with through traffic on the A10. Furthermore there is a need to develop a strategy for integrating the development into the existing settlement as its industrial use means that it has been isolated at one end of the village. Fortunately this is the end closest to Cambridge,				
<b>Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects:</b> The main impact concerns transport, and the potential synergy of a transport link also serving Trumpington West. Conversely there is a potential cumulative impact on road traffic from development at both these sites if public transport links are not provided and used.				

**SP/x –Additional allocations for open space – THIS POLICY ADDED FOLLOWING PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

Proposes 4 additional recreation sites in Histon / Impington.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives [abridged in some cases]	Assessment			Comments / Proposed Mitigation
	Short	Med.	Long	
<b>In the assessments below, where appropriate, the first symbol refers to the Recreation Ground, the second to East of Mill Lane, the third to Chivers Barrell Field, and the last to Gunns Lane.</b>				
1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings		(+) / ? / (+) / (-)		Nature of current land use cannot be determined from map evidence. All plots appear to be open land at the moment and those next to the Rec. Ground and in Manor Park appear to provide extensions of existing recreational space. The Gunns Lane site lies outside the village framework and occupies or adjoins agricultural land.
1.2 Reduce the use of non-renewable resources including energy	~	~	~	
1.3 Limit water consumption to sustainable levels	~	~	~	
2.1 Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species	~	~	~	
2.2 Maintain / enhance range and viability of characteristic habitats and species		(+) / ? / (+) / ?		Logically this appears linked to current use although it is not clear that converting agricultural land to recreational space would be a problem. The main requirement will be to retain any trees and hedgerows on or around the site.
2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access the countryside and wild places	(+)	(+)	(+)	Essentially supportive as all sites are at the edge of the village.
3.1 Avoid damage to designated historic sites and their settings	~	~	~	(However the policy makes specific reference to preserving a feature within the area east

				of the Recreation Ground.)
3.2 Maintain diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape	~	~	~	
3.3. Create places and spaces that look good and work well	+	+	+	Intrinsically supportive in providing for an appropriate level of local amenity. The nature of the land use change is generally sympathetic. The changes at the Rec. Ground and Manor Park extend existing facilities which appears to offer more flexibility for use compared to fragmented space. Nevertheless we recognise the other allocations help to achieve targets of providing recreational space within easy reach of various parts of this large residential area.
4.1 Reduce emission of greenhouse gases and other pollutants	~	~	~	
4.2 Minimise waste production and support recycling	~	~	~	
4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to flooding and other climate change impacts	~	~	~	Not evident any site lies within the floodplain.
5.1 Maintain and enhance human health	++(+)	++(+)	++(+)	Representations by the parish council identify a need for more recreational space, and we assume these allocations (specifically those off Mill Lane and at Gunns Lane) provide capacity in those parts of the community which are currently poorly-served (ie. they are furthest from the other spaces. Development of the area at the Recreational Ground appears to be on such an extent (when combined with the existing facility, football ground, etc.) that it is not clear whether this is part of the Strategic Open Space.
5.2 Reduce and prevent crime and the fear of crime		- / ? / + / -		The scorings reflect the extent to which the sites are overlooked since their peripheral location limits the opportunity for external lighting at night. The negative scores for two may be harsh especially in the case of the Recreation Ground if this is well used.
5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space	+++	+++	+++	Clearly the primary objective of this policy.
6.1 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities		++ / + / ++ / +		As indicated above it is assumed that the sites at Mill Lane and Gunns Lane 'infill' gaps in recreational space provision around the settlement. The other two are marked slightly more positive because combination with existing facilities may provide synergies for providing infrastructure (eg. new or enlarged changing rooms) which may be more costly to provide at the new sites.
6.2 Redress inequalities in age, gender, race, location, faith, disability, etc.	+	+	+	Implicitly positive as the policy deals with current under provision, which is an issue of each of these settlements.
6.3 Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	~	~	~	
6.4 Encourage and enable active involvement of local people in the community	?	?	?	Impact unclear but at worst neutral and may encourage more local recreation.

7.1 Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and location	~	~	~
7.2 Support appropriate investment in people, places, communications and infrastructure	~	~	~
7.3. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	~	~
<b><i>Summary of assessment:</i></b> Little to add to the assessments for those sites included in the consultation draft. The sites at the Recreation Ground and Manor Park appear marginally more sustainable insofar as they extend existing sites and may offer synergies if there is existing infrastructure (eg. changing rooms, showers, etc.) on site. However the additions appear to respond to representations from the parish council seeking to address shortages of space, and we assume the other two sites also offer sustainability benefits if they provide new space within easy reach of parts of the community that are poorly served at present. All sites will take open land and some of this may be agricultural at present, however the nature of change is not irreversible.			
<b><i>Summary of mitigation proposals:</i></b> None.			
<b><i>Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects:</i></b> Sharing infrastructure as mentioned above. Also, the expansion of the area around the Recreation Ground appears to bring this closer in scale to the sort of site envisaged as Strategic Open Space, though it is not clear what are the implications.			