

NW Cambridge Area Action Plan – Issues & Options:
Paper 1: Site Footprint Assessments

1. Background

- 1.1 North West Cambridge between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road comprises the Girton ridge, which is visible as the rising land that is seen on the approaches to Cambridge from the west. From the west and southwest, the view of Girton College's tower rising above the screen of pines atop the ridge can be seen. The rising land of the ridge is also prominent in these views. A major issue for the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan (AAP) is how to define the extent of the area for development to meet the University's development needs/aspirations (the site footprint) and the definition of the revised boundaries for the Green Belt having regard to these qualities of the setting of Cambridge.
- 1.2 Five site footprints were included in the Issues and Options consultation:
- Option 10.1 - The preferred option of Cambridge University covering the largest footprint, which extends closest to the M11 and furthest down the slope which runs down to Washpit Brook, which runs roughly parallel to the M11 in this area. This option has a large circular central open space on the strategic gap through the development. It would fully meet the University's development aspirations, as set out in the Issues and Options Report.
 - Option 10.2 – An alternative configuration of site which is contained at the top of the slope broadly on the 20m contour and includes additional land further south. It has a slightly smaller, but broadly comparable, footprint to 10.1. The footprint has a broad strategic gap but no circular central open space.
 - Option 10.3 – An option drawn from the recommendations of a Green Belt Landscape Study for this area prepared by David Brown Associates and Richard Morrish Associates (May 2006), which contains development at the top of the slope broadly on the 20m contour and excludes land further south which is identified as being of historic importance. It includes a strategic gap running broadly north-south towards Madingley Road
 - Option 10.4 – Similar to Option 10.3 but with the strategic gap running northeast-southwest to link out towards open countryside out to and beyond the M11.
 - Option 10.5 – The smallest site footprint with development contained close to the existing built up area of Cambridge.
- 1.3 Maps of all the site footprint options are included in Appendix 1.1.
- 1.4 In order to move towards a preferred site footprint, a structured approach was considered to be needed to compare the relative merits of the site options. Site assessment criteria have therefore been

devised to provide a consistent basis for considering each site option. Following discussions with the Planning Lead Members from Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils as the two local planning authorities jointly preparing the AAP, these criteria were shared with key local stakeholders and the comments received were taken into account before being finalised with the Lead Members and used to assess the different site options.

1.5 The site assessment criteria were compiled from:

1. The vision for the area set out in Option 7.1 of the Issues and Options Report. Appendix 1.2 sets out the various components of the vision and considers the relevance of each to determining the site footprint.
2. The objectives set out in Option 8.1 of the Issues and Options report. Appendix 1.3 sets out these objectives and considers the relevance of each to determining the site footprint.
3. Other relevant criteria drawn from national planning policy guidance, sound planning practice and site specific considerations. Appendix 1.4 sets out these other criteria and how they are relevant to site footprint.

1.6 The assessment criteria drawn from the above were refined to avoid duplication and structured to provide:

1. an overview of the site option and how it relates to the University's aspirations,
2. consideration of the impact of the site option on the Green Belt and setting of Cambridge and other wider considerations particularly affecting the outer boundary of the site,
3. consideration of issues more relevant to the shape and form of the site itself.

1.7 The draft assessment criteria were sent to local key stakeholders including the County Council, the University and local Parish Councils, local interest groups and residents associations. The consultation ran from 23rd April to 4th May 2007.

1.8 The consultation representations and responses are set out in Appendix 1.5 and as a result a number of refinements were made, although the consultation showed a general support for the approach being taken. The changes made are set out in Appendix 1.6 to this paper.

2. Assessment of Site Footprint Options 10.1 to 10.5

2.1 Detailed site assessments of each of the options subjected to public consultation are set out in Appendix 1.7. Also included are the results of the sustainability appraisal and a summary of the representations received during the Issues & Options consultation.

- 2.2 This section summarises and draws together the findings of those assessments against each assessment criteria in turn. It then reaches a conclusion on the relative merits of the site footprint options that were subject to consultation.
- 2.3 The table below identifies the developable land in each option. This is compared with the size of the University’s preferred site, Option 10.1, because the development is intended specifically to meet the University’s needs/aspirations. Each site is also compared with Option 10.2 because the University confirmed in its representations on this option that it “*has a sufficient developable area to meet the University’s needs in terms of housing, academic and commercial research floorspace*”. It also commented that, “*Option 10.2 has a similar developable area to Option 10.1, which enables a form of development of appropriate density*”.
- 2.4 The table also includes an indicative notional capacity of each site footprint for both housing and employment provision. It must be noted that the actual yield of each option will be dependent on masterplanning and this is necessarily an estimate based on size of the site in relation to the University’s preferred option and calculating housing and employment on a pro rata basis. It should also be noted that the housing provision includes market and affordable housing, including key worker housing, but does not include the student housing proposed by the University.

Table 1: Analysis of the Assessments of site options 10.1 – 10.5

Topic	10.1	10.2	10.3	10.4	10.5
Development Option	Development begins in the west where the land starts to rise from Washpit Brook; the green gap widens out into circular open space in the vicinity of the SSSI.	Development extends over fields to the south-west, and is limited on the west facing slope further north.	The rise of land from Washpit Brook is excluded from the development, the strategic gap runs north to south and widens slightly towards Madingley Road.	The rise of land from Washpit Brook is excluded from the development, the strategic gap turns more east to west and widens more than 10.3.	Almost all development is retained within the city boundary.
Developable Land	77ha	68ha	51ha	48ha	26ha
University Aspirations	100% land of 10.1	88% land of 10.1	66% land of 10.1	62% land of 10.1	34% land of 10.1
	113% land of 10.2	100% land of 10.2	75% land of 10.2	71% land of 10.2	38% land of 10.2
Notional Housing provision	2500	2208	1656	1558	844
Notional Employment provision	100,000m ² or 35.5ha	88,312m ² or 31.4ha	66,234m ² or 23.5ha	62,338m ² or 22.1ha	33,766m ² or 12.0ha

Green Belt

- 2.5 The strategic context for development in this location is provided by the Structure Plan which identifies land between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road as a location for a strategic scale of development for predominantly University-related uses (Policy P9/2c). The Panel Report recognised that *“this location was not considered by the Buchanan study to have potential for development. The land is prominent, being highly visible from the west and it provides an open setting to the village of Girton, which straddles the A14”* (paragraph 8.92). The Cambridge Sub Region Study by Colin Buchanan and Partners informed the Structure Plan and considered where land could be released from the Green Belt for development without fundamental harm to its purposes. Its conclusions regarding North West Cambridge at paragraph 7.3.1 were that:
“Previous studies have suggested that development could be placed to the west of Cambridge, between the city and the villages of Coton and Madingley. The relatively enclosed, rolling landscape could potentially accommodate development. However, site surveys undertaken for this Study found that there were no opportunities to develop close to the city boundary without affecting the existing interface between the city and the countryside, one of the important aspects of setting. Furthermore, the ecological and historical importance of the area was likely to generate further constraints to sustainable development.”
However, the Panel concluded in the light of evidence of need by the University and lack of suitable alternative locations, that they were *“satisfied that there would be justification for the release of Green Belt land in North West Cambridge to meet that need”* (paragraph 8.101). The Cambridge Green Belt Study by LDA published in 2002 provides and provided further context. At page 64 paragraph 3, it states *“A large area of supportive landscape lies to the west of the city, between the colleges and the visually distracting M11”*, and at page 81 Areas 4 and 5 *“These areas possess the greatest concentration of qualities essential to the fourth purpose of Green Belts as defined by PPG2, i.e. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns....and continues There is little scope for change in this area if these qualities are to be safeguarded. The strategy should be to preserve the countryside, the edge of Cambridge, and the visual and physical relationship between the city and its setting”*. The LDA study however goes on to state in the last paragraph of page 83 that it has not identified opportunities for large scale development between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road but that more detailed assessment might identify some sites in this area that could be developed without causing adverse affects to Green Belt purposes.
- 2.6 The Structure Plan sets the framework for the releases of land from the Green Belt for development that it identifies (Policy P9/2a and P9/2b – see the list of factors in the site assessment criteria at Appendix 1.6). Of particular importance is the objective to *“retain any areas required to*

maintain the purposes of the Green Belt”, the most relevant of which in the context of an urban extension to Cambridge is the need to “maintain and enhance the quality of its setting”.

- 2.7 The Cambridge Local Plan 2006 includes a policy for the development of that part of this sector that lies within its area. The recent City Local Plan Inspector’s Report concluded that all land within Cambridge City’s area should be removed from the Green Belt in the Local Plan and that it would be for the AAP to determine which land should be put back into the Green Belt in the context of considering the whole of the area in both districts and the appropriate footprint for development. In the context of Green Belt setting, it comments that, “*the M11 should have an open space buffer because at present the M11 runs largely through countryside west of Cambridge*” (paragraph 9.22.36).
- 2.8 It is therefore relevant in the context of the NW Cambridge AAP, to determine what land should be retained in order to maintain the purposes of the Green Belt and what land can be excluded from the Green Belt to meet the development needs/aspirations of the University without unacceptable harm to Green Belt purposes, and as a consequence what areas should be put back into the Green Belt in Cambridge City and retained in the Green Belt in South Cambridgeshire.

a. Outer edge of the site:

- 2.9 As part of the preparation of its Local Plan 2006, Cambridge City Council undertook a comprehensive Green Belt assessment for the Inner Green Belt Boundary. For this sector, it looked at four areas defined by field boundaries. It concluded that the area west of Washpit Brook and including the fields west of the Park & Ride, is of very high importance to Green Belt, of very high importance to setting and of low importance to character. For the land east of Washpit Brook including the slope and extending to the district boundary on the plateau, it concluded that it is of high importance to Green Belt, is of high/medium importance to setting and of low importance to character. For the fields to the east of the triangular woodland adjacent to the M11, it concluded that it is of medium importance to Green Belt, of medium importance to setting and of low importance to character. These parcels are not directly comparable with any of the site options, as they do not always follow the contours of the land, but are helpful in confirming the importance of this area generally to the Green Belt setting of Cambridge and particularly the area including the slope rising up to the east from Washpit Brook. .
- 2.10 To assist the Councils further in developing site footprint options for the joint NW Cambridge AAP, David Brown Associates and Richard Morrish Associates were commissioned in 2006 to undertake a Green Belt Landscape Study for the NW quadrant of Cambridge (hereafter termed the David Brown study). The study identifies the slope rising up

from Washpit Brook close to the M11, as a key part of the landscape setting of Cambridge (see map extract at Appendix 1.8 which identifies the “opportunities and constraints” in this location as identified by the authors of that study). Of particular relevance to Green Belt, it identified at paragraph 8.3 a number of features and elements that it considered “*form constraints of very substantial weight on the extent of development possible*” and included “*the visually important rising landform of the Girton ridge between Washpit Brook and the brow of the slope at the 20 metres AOD contour*”. It also referred to “*views of defining local landmarks that give Cambridge its ‘sense of place’, such as Girton College, Girton Church and St John’s College Chapel*”.

- 2.11 In terms of maintaining Green Belt purposes, the main issue which distinguishes the outer boundary of the site footprint options is the potential loss of green foreground to Cambridge that is provided by the slope of land down to the Washpit Brook and M11, which provides a key part of the setting of the City. Development of any scale in this location would have the greatest impact when seen in views towards Cambridge from the M11 and the Madingley area. A key judgement to be made is at what point the extent of the built footprint starts to have an unacceptable impact on the setting of Cambridge and that Green Belt purposes are compromised such that development is unacceptable in Green Belt terms.
- 2.12 The rising landform makes this area very prominent in views from the west of Cambridge. The open and pastoral character of this land presents the quintessential rural setting that is associated with the setting of Cambridge. This openness also allows the visual, historical and cultural connections between the two prominent existing focal points in the landscape; the Chapel of the American Cemetery and the tower of Girton College.
- 2.13 Of the options consulted upon, the University’s preferred site (option 10.1), has the greatest impact on this aspect of the Green Belt setting of the City because it extends development closest to the M11 and down much of the slope to Washpit Brook. The David Brown study considered this footprint and concluded that “*The proximity to the M11 and the falling landform will lead to this area not being perceived as a significant foreground. Views of Girton College would be lost from a number of viewpoints. Areas of historic interest would be permanently lost. Mitigation cannot replace these features and elements. There would be a severe level of harm to the function of the Green Belt as protection for the setting of the historic City of Cambridge and the character of the city on the north west would be fundamentally changed*” (paragraph 8.5).
- 2.14 Options 10.2, 10.3 and 10.4 seek to reduce this impact by generally moving the edge of the development, away from the brook and the M11. They also take the development higher up the slope to its break-line marked by the 20m contour, so that the slope remains an open

foreground to Cambridge as recommended by the David Brown study. Even with a footprint boundary contained at the top of the slope, the study advises that there would be “*moderate harm*”, but concludes that, “*a workable Green Belt setting function is retained*”.

- 2.15 Option 10.2 would, however, damage the Green Corridor along Madingley Road, one of the most characteristic entries into the City. It would also have an adverse impact on the areas of historic and ecological importance identified by the David Brown study closer to Madingley Road (see separate criteria).
- 2.16 Option 10.5 has the least impact as it confines development to a small area at the eastern end of the site.
- 2.17 All land within the AAP area and not included in the site footprint would remain in, or be put back into, the Green Belt.

b. Strategic Gap:

- 2.18 Also relevant to Green Belt considerations relating to site footprint is the width and orientation of the strategic gap through the development. The strategic gap will perform two slightly different functions in different locations.
- 2.19 The area fronting Huntingdon Road and between existing development currently has and will continue to have a role in separating Cambridge from the village of Girton. It relates to a similar width of Green Belt separation on the north side of Huntingdon Road performing the same function. The gap in this location should remain at its current full width and no site footprint options propose otherwise.
- 2.20 The part of the strategic gap to the south of Huntingdon Road will form a green corridor running through the development. The development will function as a new urban extension of Cambridge. Whilst the new development will abut the rear boundaries of existing properties fronting Huntingdon Road, there will be no connections between these built areas and the new development will look towards Cambridge and the remainder of the development. The width of the strategic gap as it runs through the new development is therefore not constrained by the width fronting Huntingdon Road. The Cambridge Local Plan policy 9/7 requires the retention of “a green corridor between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road”.
- 2.21 In Option 10.1 the strategic gap opens into a wide circle in the heart of the development and then continues south and runs through to Madingley Road to the east of the Park & Ride. In Options 10.3 and 10.4 the gap is also wide but turns south west towards the open countryside west of the Park and Ride and beyond the M11. These 3 options have the greatest width of corridor linking through to Madingley Road and would be the least sustainable options for planning a

compact urban extension in this locality. Option 10.2 continues the width of the Huntingdon Road frontage through the development and turns towards the open countryside beyond the M11 with development blocking any link through to Madingley Road. Option 10.5 contains development close to Cambridge and east of the strategic gap onto Huntingdon Road and there is therefore no need for a green corridor through the development.

- 2.22 All land within the strategic gap and not included in the site footprint would remain in, or be put back into, the Green Belt.

Historic Landscape

- 2.23 The Green Belt Landscape Study (Brown and Morrish) identifies a number of features of historic interest in the area to the north and east of the Park & Ride site. These include pasture, pre-enclosure hedgerows, a significant pollarded oak, ridge and furrow field patterns and S-shaped field boundaries surviving forms the former open field system that dating back to at least medieval times (see Map extract at Appendix 1.9).
- 2.24 Option 10.1 incurs a high level of impact on historic landscape elements. Historic field patterns, pre-enclosure boundaries, pre-enclosure hedgerows would be lost. Option 10.2 protects features on the slope down to the M11 and Washpit Brook but would have a high impact to the south-west where the majority of the historic field patterns, pre-enclosure boundaries, pre-enclosure hedgerows and ridge and furrow patterns are located.
- 2.25 These heritage landscape elements provide the historic core of Cambridge with a setting and context. The Study advises that 'piecemeal' retention of features from the historic landscape e.g. veteran oak and historic hedgerows, would have their value eroded in terms of context and historical relevance and these features are unlikely to be sustained in the long term. It advises that their loss would be significant and diminish the value of the historic core itself.
- 2.26 Options 10.3 and 10.4 incur less impact of historic landscape by avoiding part of the slope to the M11 and Washpit Brook, and the fields to the north of the Park & Ride site are excluded. Option 10.5 incurs the least loss of historic landscape.

Biodiversity

- 2.27 Option 10.1 has the greatest impact on the Washpit Brook to the northwest edge of the site, which is a known area of ecological interest. The other options limit this impact by confining development to the

higher ground. A main badger sett in the vicinity of the Travellers Rest SSSI is affected by all options to some extent. Other than 10.5, 10.1 scores well on this point with the sett located within a large open area. All options with the exception of 10.5 would probably require the relocation and careful re-establishment of a secondary badger sett, which lies behind the houses fronting Huntingdon Road. The remaining Options 10.3 and 10.4 have very slightly greater impact as the green corridor is less wide. In all Options a 30m wide zone of nil development work would be required by Government guidelines in PPS9. The presence of Great Crested Newts have been recorded in ponds at the Park & Ride site but mitigation measures as part of development could suitably offset any impact and possibly bring habitat gain and an overall increase in the population's distribution across the site. Option 10.2 has the greatest impact. The Travellers Pit SSSI close to Huntingdon Road is entirely geological in its interest and is not designated for any biodiversity/wildlife value. The sides of the Pit with their exposed strata would need to be protected whichever option is chosen.

Surface Water Attenuation

- 2.28 All options will have implications for surface water attenuation although option 10.1 has the most extensive built footprint and therefore could be expected to generate the largest volume of surface water arising from hard surfaces in need of attenuation. However, provided that Suds are incorporated into the built footprint, there is no reason to expect that this option could not satisfactorily accommodate measures to attenuate surface water so that off site flooding and drainage problems are not made worse.

Health and Amenity

- 2.29 Studies have been prepared by consultants for Cambridge University on air quality and noise impacts of development in this location to assess whether there are any fundamental constraints on any particular site footprint and with a view to identifying whether acceptable mitigation measures could be provided that would mitigate any adverse impacts and also not cause unacceptable harm to the setting of Cambridge.
- 2.30 Air quality is an issue at the north west tip of the site. However, this is a matter that could probably be addressed through the masterplanning process and is unlikely to preclude uses such as employment development in this location.
- 2.31 Noise mitigation will be a key requirement of any development even though much of it will be located further away from the motorway. An unknown factor is the impact of potential increases in traffic along the M11/A14 and at the Girton Interchange. The design of the latter is still unknown.

- 2.32 The form of development on its outer edge could possibly be used to mitigate noise or pollution from the M11 if a terraced type of edge development or other alternatives were used and were considered to be acceptable in visual terms. Caution would need to be exercised regarding the scale and height of buildings required to attempt to achieve this.
- 2.33 The study indicates that there may also need to be other measures such as a 3m acoustic barrier along the M11, a 5m bund closer to the development and careful design and orientation of buildings to prevent sound entering residential areas. The principle of a permanent acoustic barrier is unlikely to be acceptable in this location and would significantly harm the setting of Cambridge. A 5m bund would also need careful consideration in this respect. However, at this stage it is not possible to identify any particular site footprint that would require such measures. As such it would be prudent for the AAP to include a policy requiring that the development is undertaken in a way that does not require unacceptable noise and air quality mitigation measures, whichever footprint is chosen. The masterplanning of any site option chosen would therefore be crucial in achieving a satisfactory environment.
- 2.34 There is some suggestion that 10.1 may allow a greater potential to more effectively shield residential areas and internal open spaces from noise than 10.2, 10.3 and 10.4. However this needs to be treated with caution as experience from the Cambridge Northern Fringe suggests that the uses which might provide such a screen may not come forward quickly enough.
- 2.35 Option 10.5 is the least affected by noise and air quality issues.

Sustainable Development

- 2.36 Option 10.1 provides the greatest scale of development and is therefore likely to bring forward the largest range of local facilities and would help ensure that a local centre is viable. For Options 10.2, 10.3 and 10.4, the scale of development would be sufficient to support a local centre. However, for Option 10.5, it is doubtful as to whether it is capable of supporting more than a 1FE primary school.

Site Configuration

- 2.37 The University maintains that Option 10.1 provides ample scope for masterplanning its development needs/aspirations. Option 10.2 would dictate a more constrained site configuration, particularly in view of the shape of development that extends to the west of the Park & Ride and could hamper the creation of a cohesive new community and the provision of accessible services and facilities. For options 10.3 and 10.4 the width of the strategic gap would make it difficult to deliver a

development that works as a whole, and in particular which is cohesive and where all parts of the development have good access to services and facilities. Option 10.5 only provides for a small part of the needs/aspirations of the University and could lead to pressure for higher density development.

Mix of University Related Uses

- 2.38 As Option 10.1 is based on the University's draft masterplan framework, this option would deliver the University's needs/aspirations in full and therefore provide a satisfactory mix of predominately university related uses.
- 2.39 The University's response to 10.2 through the Issues and Option consultation indicated that the required scale of development could be accommodated on this footprint and, on the same basis, is therefore capable in supplying a satisfactory mix of uses.
- 2.40 In contrast, the University have indicated that options 10.3, 10.4 and 10.5 would not bring forward the scale of development required to provide for a satisfactory mix of university related uses.

Transport Infrastructure

- 2.41 In all options it should be possible to provide for different modes of transport, giving priority to walking, cycling and public transport provision. The detail of such provision will be determined through masterplanning and subsequent detailed design and transport assessment. It will thus be essentially an iterative design process rather than one that is fixed at the options stage.
- 2.42 Options with large areas of development are more likely to generate a large number of trips and hence require correspondingly large transport infrastructure. All options could accommodate future strategic transport provision, particularly by linking to a proposed orbital link road. In all cases, however, the ease of doing this will be dependent upon whether the link road is to the east or the west of the strategic gap. The proposed radial link road will need to cross the strategic gap in most options, raising issues of severance. In terms of providing a high level of public transport accessibility, it may be more difficult to meet a 400m walk distance to public transport stops in the more extensive options. However, options with larger areas of development will generate higher transport demands, making specific bus services more viable.

Relationship with Adjoining Communities

- 2.43 All options generally connect well with the existing built up area of the City and the proposed NIAB development, north of Huntingdon Road.

- 2.44 However, for Options 10.1, 10.3 and 10.4, development of the western part of the site would be somewhat removed from the adjoining areas, due to the very wide strategic gap through the development. Whilst the retention of a strategic gap is an important policy requirement of the development, for the part of the gap running through the heart of the new development, a balance should be struck between retaining a meaningful gap and ensuring a connected development where residents and those working in the area can move about the development easily and access community services and facilities and the local centre from all parts of the development. A wider strategic gap may therefore have disadvantages in achieving connectivity.
- 2.45 None of the options present any real opportunities to connect with either Girton Village or with the large properties which front the south side of Huntingdon Road.
- 2.46 Option 10.2 is the only option which could connect directly to the University's west Cambridge site, south of Madingley Road although this does not preclude transport links being created for all the other options.

Accessibility to community uses by walking and cycling

- 2.47 In all options it should be possible to provide for accessibility to community uses by walking and cycling. Options with larger north-south dimensions and greater site areas may result in longer walking and cycling distances to community uses outside the development than options with more compact forms of development. Accessibility to community uses within the site from residents outside the development will also be generally better for options with more compact forms of development, but this will depend on the disposition of the community uses within the development, which is an issue for masterplanning. Similarly, the options with more compact forms of development will have shorter walking and cycling distances to external community uses particularly to the north east of Huntingdon Road. Options with more extensive areas of development will have poorer external accessibility e.g. in Option 10.2 the extension down to Madingley Road will be more remote from facilities to the north.

Development viability and delivery

- 2.48 Whilst this is an important matter, there is no evidence to assess the various options. However, Options 10.1 and 10.2 are considered viable and deliverable by the University.

Comparison of the Sustainability Appraisals

- 2.49 It is a requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) for any Local Development Framework document to undergo a

Sustainability Appraisal in order to determine its impacts on social, economic and environmental objectives. As part of this process, each site footprint has been appraised and reported in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report prepared by Scott Wilson (2006) as part of the preparation of the Issues and Options Report.

- 2.50 The Sustainability Appraisal of Options 10.1 to 10.5 found that the relative sustainability of the options was dependent on the balance between the impacts of development on resource use in the round and the extent that it satisfies the needs of the University.
- 2.51 Although options 10.1 and 10.2 meet the development aspirations of the University, the SA found their impact on the character, setting and landscape of Cambridge and Girton to be substantial. While Option 10.5 performed well in terms of impacts on landscape, ecological and historical interests it underperforms in terms of provision of employment opportunities, services and facilities due to the significantly reduced spatial footprint.
- 2.52 The SA suggests that the greater the resource use the more one could expect adverse environmental impacts, and positive social and economic impacts.
- 2.53 It also indicates that mitigation measures could reduce the impact of options on natural resources, for example through the use of recycled aggregates, water efficiency measures and energy efficiency.

Responses to Issues and Options

Summary of Objections to Option 10.1

- 2.54 Cambridge University supported this option, as it would meet its development needs/aspirations in full. Many of the objections to this option centred around the development paying no attention to the purpose of the Green Belt, the sensitive landscape setting of Cambridge as a compact City and the historical value of the site. Concern was raised about the loss of important views and the loss of biodiversity and substantial areas of habitat. An increase in traffic as a result of the development was also highlighted as a concern, along with questions about the functionality of parts of the site due to their proximity to the M11.

Summary of Objections to Option 10.2

- 2.55 Cambridge University commented that this option would meet most of its development needs/aspirations. A major concern in relation to this option was that the fragmentation of the development would dissipate the potential for a thriving local centre as well as making public transport provision through the site less sustainable. The strategic gap

was criticised for being contrived and of limited value, failing to maintain sufficient separation between Cambridge and Girton. Concerns were again raised about the loss of Green Belt land as well as the effect on areas of both ecological and historical value, with a loss of biodiversity and habitat. Objections were also raised in relation to the prominence of development on the plateau, poor landscape setting and the nature of transport links.

Summary of Objections to Option 10.3

- 2.56 Concerns have been raised that this option would far too severely restrict the use of an urgently needed site in Cambridge and provide less growth capacity for the University. Development under this option would either lead to a substantial reduction in the development capacity of the site or lead to an increase in development densities and heights in order to deliver the University's aspirations. Concerns have been raised that this would lead to unsustainably dense development and an intensification of development that would lead to the coalescence between Cambridge and Girton. Other concerns are that the density of development would lead to a dominance of apartment blocks rather than houses and would also rule out the possibility of plots being made available to self-builders. Concerns remain over the loss of the Green Belt, the affect of the development on important views of key features of the landscape, loss of land deemed important to the setting of Cambridge and the detrimental impact on the SSSI, while others feel that the benefits in terms of setting of the city are not significant. An added concern is that the development would provide no noise buffer for Girton.

Summary of Objections to Option 10.4

- 2.57 Concerns have been raised that this option would far too severely restrict the use of an urgently needed site in Cambridge and provide less growth capacity for the University. Development under this option would either lead to a substantial reduction in the development capacity of the site or lead to an increase in development densities and heights in order to deliver the University's aspirations. Concerns have been raised that this would lead to unsustainably dense development and an intensification of development that would lead to the coalescence between Cambridge and Girton. Other concerns are that the density of development would lead to a dominance of apartment blocks rather than houses and would also rule out the possibility of plots being made available to self-builders. In terms of public transport, concerns are raised that under this option it would be difficult to create a legible public transport route from the main part of the development towards the Madingley Road Park & Ride site. Concerns remain over the loss of the Green Belt, the affect of the development on important

views of key features of the landscape, loss of land deemed important to the setting of Cambridge, the detrimental impact on the SSSI and the awkward layout of the strategic gap, while others feel that the benefits in terms of setting of the city are not significant.

Summary of Objections to Option 10.5

- 2.58 Concerns have been raised that this option would lead to an overly dense and unsustainable development on a small portion of the site and lose an opportunity to open the site to the public and create an attractive built fringe and that this would not make good use of land released from the Green Belt. Concerns raised in relation to Options 10.3 and 10.4 are mirrored for this option, i.e. that the density of development would lead to a dominance of apartment blocks rather than houses and would also rule out the possibility of plots being made available to self-builders. Concerns are also raised that this option would be contrary to the requirements of the Structure Plan in that it does not maximise the use of land close to the urban edge, that it would cause difficulties in delivering elements of the draft East of England Plan as it restricts development from taking place in South Cambridgeshire and, that by preventing development in South Cambridgeshire, it would not be able to help deliver some of the 1,000 dwelling shortfall identified by the Inspector examining the South Cambridgeshire Core Strategy DPD. In not meeting the University's needs it is also felt by some objectors that this option would fall entirely short of serving the urgent need for key worker housing for University staff and that as adequate provision of services and facilities would not be met in the vicinity it could further increase the need to travel. There is a continuing concern from some objectors that this option still represents loss of Green Belt, while others feel that the benefits in terms of setting of the city are not significant.

3. *Conclusions on sites subject to consultation*

- 3.1 The assessments demonstrate that all options are capable of being developed but none are able to completely satisfy all the criteria each having a different mix of advantages and disadvantages.
- 3.2 Various studies, including those informing the Structure Plan, confirm that the area between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road is important to the Green Belt setting of Cambridge. Notwithstanding, the Structure Plan proposes the release of land from the Green Belt in this location specifically to meet the long-term needs of the University.
- 3.3 Given this, the two key criteria (in no particular order) can be considered to be:
1. Satisfying the needs of the University
 2. Maintaining the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt.

- 3.4 The site footprint assessments have tested those 2 criteria alongside a variety of other criteria, drawn from the vision and objectives for this development. Those assessments have indicated that there are no absolute constraints on any particular site footprint for matters such as air quality, noise, drainage, ecology. There are other factors that are relevant to take into account alongside meeting the University's needs and impact on the Green Belt, such as historic landscape and connectivity within the development, however, they do not have the same weight in terms of strategic policy.
- 3.5 None of the site options consulted upon perform sufficiently well against the 2 key tests of meeting the University's needs and protecting the Green Belt setting of Cambridge that they could be recommended as the preferred site.

4. *Development of further Variant Options*

- 4.1 In order to try and identify a site footprint that could better meet the 2 key tests of meeting the University's needs and protecting the Green Belt setting of Cambridge, the Joint Officer Team has developed two additional Options derived from those consulted upon, Sites A and B. The aim of these new options was to try to protect the Green Belt setting by keeping development generally to the 20m contour on the Washpit Brook valley slope (as recommended in the David Brown Landscape Study) but to compensate elsewhere to increase the site footprint to more closely match the University's needs/aspirations. This was achieved by including more land in the south west part of the site and narrowing the green gap through the development between the two sections of the development. Two alternative approaches to the width of the strategic gap are identified, but otherwise the sites are very similar. The implications of these changes is considered in site assessments using the same assessment criteria as site options 10.1 to 10.5.
- 4.2 The University put forward an additional option submitted as part of the University's response to the Issues and Options consultation; Option C. It pulls development to a limited extent up the slopes of the Washpit Brook valley but still well below the 20m contour. This Option has been endorsed by the University's North West Cambridge Committee.
- 4.3 Through partnership working with the University on the issue of the site, the University raised concerns about the Councils' emerging site options A and B in terms of the scale of the development footprint, the importance of the slope in protecting the setting of Cambridge and whether these options provided an appropriate site configuration to ensure a sustainable form of development, particularly at the north western part of the site.

- 4.4 Through this process, the University has also informally submitted a further variant, Option D, which is similar to Option C but, like Option A maintains the green gap to a constant and narrow width instead of opening out as in the previous University preferred Options 10.1 and C. In comparison to C, option D also presents a more indented outer boundary towards the west.
- 4.5 It was also agreed that further work on some key issues would be helpful in informing the decision on the preferred site, and to assess whether a site could be identified that met the University’s development needs/aspirations and also protected the Green Belt setting of Cambridge. To this end, the University helpfully commissioned work on 3-D modelling of the site to assist an understanding of the visual impact of the outer limits of development on the Green Belt setting and the views into the strategic gap from Huntingdon Road, a study of potential air quality and noise impacts (used for the assessment of all site options), ecological issues (also used for the assessment of all site options), and transport implications. All parties entered into this work in the interests of partnership working and with the hope of reaching agreement on the site footprint, but in the understanding that there was could be no commitment on the part of the local planning authorities that a consensus agreement could necessarily be reached.

5. Assessment of Site Footprint Options A to D

- 5.1 Detailed site assessments of each of the further options A to D are set out in Appendix 1.10. Also included are the results of the sustainability appraisal. Maps of these options are set out in Appendix 1.11
- 5.2 This section summarises and draws together the findings of those assessments against each assessment criteria in turn. It then reaches a conclusion on the relative merits of the further site footprint options that were developed to address the shortcomings of sites Options 10.1 to 10.5.

Table 2: Analysis of the Assessments of site options A - D

Topic	A	B	C	D
Development Option	Development is contained broadly by the 20m contour line before following the established hedge towards the M11, the strategic gap narrows to 100m south of the SSSI towards Madingley Road.	Development is contained broadly by the 20m contour line before following the established hedge towards the M11, the strategic gap continues at 200m south of the SSSI towards Madingley Road.	Based on 10.1, development is drawn slightly further up the slope, the strategic gap widens out into a circular open space in the vicinity of the SSSI.	Based on option C, with additional green indentations into the outer edge of the development, the 200m strategic gap runs south towards Madingley Road.
Developable Land	71ha	67ha	72ha	75ha

University Aspirations	92% land of 10.1	87% land of 10.1	94% land of 10.1	97% land of 10.1
	104% land of 10.2	99% land of 10.2	106% land of 10.2	110% land of 10.2
Housing	2305	2175	2338	2435
Employment provision	92,208m ² or 32.7ha	87,013m ² or 30.9ha	93,506m ² or 33.2ha	97,403m ² or 34.6ha

Green Belt

5.3 The context for the Green Belt assessment of options A to D remains as given above for options 10.1 to 10.5.

a. Outer edge of the site:

5.4 Options A to D all provide a more extensive green setting and foreground to views of Cambridge than Option 10.1 by moving the outer edge of the site further up the slope away from the M11. For the central section of the site, the width of the setting separating built development from the M11 is broadly 200 metres in options C and D rising to between 300 and 400 metres in options A and B. The intention of the drawing back of the footprint further up the slope being to maintain the quality of the setting of the City, particularly as appreciated by people moving through the Green Belt either to and from Cambridge along Madingley Road and Cambridge Road or past it along the M11 and the A428 – the setting of Cambridge can only be appreciated by people moving through or living in the Green Belt. Setting quality is not dependent upon any difference in the quality of the built form between options on this outer edge, as a high quality edge would be an expectation for every option, but rather upon the extent of its green setting and foreground. As an extreme, if development were to be brought forward to the foot of the slope, which is close to the M11 there would be no meaningful green setting or foreground for the City in this location. Such a proposal would be contrary to Green Belt purposes and the Green Belt policies of the Structure Plan.

5.5 Views of the site reveal that it is visible as a relatively narrow horizontal sliver of land when viewed from a distance but as an expansive open foreground to Cambridge when viewed from the middle distance or nearby. Options A and B therefore set out to provide an acceptable Green Belt setting when viewed from the middle distance (Madingley Road), and when travelling either north or south on the M11 for nearby views and also from the existing footpath under the M11 which leads to Madingley village and which will be more heavily used once the development has taken place. The 20-metre contour is followed along the middle part of the site, but in these options the proposed development edge would encroach down the slope to follow an existing hedge line in the southern part of the site. The rationale being that this portion of the development would not be visible from the south due to

the motorway cutting and the wood, and from the middle distance and the north the built edge of Cambridge would still be framed by an attractive and expansive green setting and foreground, particularly with enhancement of the existing hedge line.

- 5.6 The success of these assumptions remained to be tested through three-dimensional modelling of each option, which the University's consultants were capable of providing. The outcome of this modelling work is examined below, can be seen in Appendix 1.12, and can be used as an aid to understanding potential impacts upon Green Belt purposes when on site.

b. Strategic Gap:

- 5.7 The context for the strategic gap in respect of options A to D remains as given above for options 10.1 to 10.5. All of these options maintain a 200 metre wide gap towards Huntingdon Road to maintain an effective gap between Cambridge and Girton to conform to Structure Plan policy. Options B, C, and D broadly retain this width further to the south whilst option A narrows it to 100 metres width in the middle of the site about 500 metres south of Huntingdon Road. The rationale being to improve community cohesiveness between the western and eastern parts of the University development, that a wider gap is not needed in this location to provide effective separation between Girton and Cambridge and to enable the development needs of the University to be more closely met.

Historic Landscape

- 5.8 The inclusion of land north and west of the Park & Ride in all options has disadvantages in terms of impact on features of historic interest as identified by the David Brown study. However, it allows for development further north to be contained at the top of the slope in Options A and B and the Green Belt setting of Cambridge is better protected. Under normal considerations, these areas of historic importance would be protected from development. The David Brown study advises that "*piecemeal retention of landscape features within new development is unlikely to sustain these features in the long term*".
- 5.9 However, in the context of the 2 key criteria, it is considered on balance that the overall harm would be less than that created to the setting of Cambridge by development on the slope down to Washpit Brook. There will also be opportunities through careful masterplanning to retain some of the key factors of historic interest within the development, e.g. the significant pollarded oak and the S-shaped field boundary.
- 5.10 The loss of historic landscape features would not be acceptable in the context of Options C and D where there remains a significant degree of harm to the Green Belt setting of Cambridge.

Biodiversity

- 5.11 These Options limit the impact on the Washpit Brook to the northwest edge of the site, which is a known area of ecological interest by confining development to the higher ground. As with all the consultation options, other than 10.5, they would probably require the relocation and careful re-establishment of a secondary badger sett which lies behind the houses fronting Huntingdon Road. A main badger sett in the vicinity of the Travellers Rest SSSI is protected by a green corridor of just 200m width narrowing to only 100m in Option A which could have a significant impact on foraging and social routes to a greater extent than any of the consultation options. Ponds known to have or that have potential to have Great Crested Newt populations are largely unaffected as in the consultation Options with the exception of 10.2. The Travellers Pit SSSI is entirely geological in its interest and is not designated for any biodiversity/wildlife value. The sides of the Pit with their exposed strata would need to be protected whichever option is chosen.

Surface Water Attenuation

- 5.12 All options will have implications for surface water attenuation of surface water arising from hard surfaces in need of attenuation. However, provided that Suds are incorporated into the built footprint, there is no reason to expect that these options could not satisfactorily accommodate measures to attenuate surface water so that off site flooding and drainage problems are not made worse.

Health and Amenity

- 5.13 All of these options are likely to have similar health and amenity implications. The context in terms of noise and pollution remains as given in respect of the consultation Options 10.1 to 10.5.

Sustainable Development

- 5.14 All of these options are likely to have similar sustainable development implications being large enough to bring forward a local centre and local facilities.

Site Configuration

- 5.15 All of these options provide ample scope for masterplanning. Appendix 1.13 illustrates one example of how Option A could be configured. During consideration of the emerging alternative options, the University raised concerns over the deliverability of a successful and sustainable form of development in Options A and B, particularly in respect of the north west part of the site where development is contained at the top of the slope at the 20m contour. The Councils' masterplanning officers

have given consideration to this concern and have prepared an indicative layout to demonstrate that these options can be successfully developed at Appendix 1.13. One of the advantages of these options is that they provide publicly accessible views out across the Green Belt towards Madingley.

Mix of University Related Uses

- 5.16 Table 2 shows that none of these options are able to deliver enough land to meet the full extent of the University's aspirations as set by Option 10.1, although options A, C and D are very close to doing so. The University's response to option 10.2 through the issues and Options consultation indicated that the required scale of development could be accommodated on that footprint and, on the same basis, is therefore capable of supplying a satisfactory mix of uses. Measured against this test, options A, C and D would be capable of meeting the aspirations of the University.

Transport Infrastructure

- 5.17 The context in terms of transport infrastructure remains as given in respect of the consultation Options 10.1 to 10.5.

Relationship with Adjoining Communities

- 5.18 The gap between Girton and Cambridge at Huntingdon Road is about 200m in width. The gap is crucial north of Huntingdon Road in order to maintain the separate identity of Girton village. However, south of Huntingdon Road the only existing development consists of the ribbon of detached houses in large gardens. Any University development which takes place behind these properties presents no real opportunity to connect with them. Therefore the issue of separation is less acute in this sector, and becomes increasingly less important with distance from Huntingdon Road. One factor to consider is the significance of views out from the Huntingdon Road area towards the open countryside, but this has to be set against the severance which open space could result in for the community of the new University development. The assessment suggests that if this is very wide it could prevent cohesion within the development and discourage walking and cycling to the local centre.
- 5.19 Therefore Option B maintains the green gap at 200m instead of widening out as in Options 10.1, 10.2, 10.3 and 10.4. Option A goes further and narrows the gap to 100m to maximise the built footprint and community cohesion and minimise walking/cycling distances.

Accessibility to community uses by walking and cycling

- 5.20 The context in terms of accessibility to community uses by walking and cycling remains as given in respect of the consultation Options 10.1 to

10.5. The narrow strategic gap in Option A would minimise any separation issues between the western and eastern parts of the development and so facilitate access to community uses throughout the development.

Development viability and delivery

- 5.21 Whilst this is an important matter, there is no evidence to assess the various options. However, Options C & D must be considered viable and deliverable by the University, having been put forward by them.

Comparison of Sustainability Appraisals

- 5.22 The Sustainability Appraisal of Options A – D found that, in common with options 10.1 and 10.2, they have the potential to meet the aspirations of the University and are likely to increase housing provision, including key worker housing, and employment opportunities as well as stimulating the local economy. However the options were also found to have negative impacts on the character, setting and landscape of Cambridge and Girton, as well as potential negative impacts on the ecology of the area. Options A – D all represent relatively large land-take resulting in the loss of open space and Green Belt, comparable to Options 10.1 and 10.2. The larger development footprints are likely to have greater impacts on resource use, although mitigation measures could reduce this impact, for example the use of recycled aggregates, water efficiency measures and energy efficiency.
- 5.23 The SA concluded that development proposed in Options A and B would lead to a significant loss of historic landscape features in this area as well as causing harm to some views. While options C and D, will impact on some views, development in the south west of the site does not extend as far as that proposed in Options A and B, thus reducing the risk to the sensitive historic features of the area.
- 5.24 In both Options A and D, the risk of merger between the new development and Girton is elevated due to the reduction of the strategic gap. The risk of harm to the SSSI is also increased in these options due to the narrowness of the buffer zones proposed. While the buffer in Option B was found to provide good protection for the SSSI against development, the SA highlights Option C as the best performing option in terms of the protection offered by the buffer zone around the SSSI and the width of the strategic gap, preventing merger between the development and Girton. All options were found to have a negative impact on public access to open space due to an absence of enhanced public access, which had previously been included for Options 10.1 – 10.5.
- 5.25 The Sustainability Appraisal recommends that mitigation measures similar to those suggested for 10.1 and 10.2 could be used for all

options. Provision of open space could help mitigate the overall loss of open space across the site.

6. Modelling

- 6.1 In order to assist the assessment of the site footprint options, the University agreed to undertake three dimensional modelling of a shortlist of sites through their consultants EDAW. This included the University's preferred option 10.1 and the variant site options A, B and D. This modelling is set out in Appendix 1.12 along with an accompanying letter. Note that Option D is called the "2007 Discussion Plan" in the modelling, i.e. the plan put forward by the University for discussion during this process.
- 6.2 The modelling compares the 4 site options in turn from 7 agreed viewpoints. The building form is shown as a solid "wall" of development along the outer boundary of each option. The purpose of this simple "ribbon" modelling is to represent the variations between the options principally to show how the views change from option to option in terms the setting for development and in particular the foreground in front. The modelling assumes a building height of 4 storeys.
- 6.3 The University has also modelled Options A/B with 5 storeys on the basis that they say this would be required to fully meet their development needs/aspirations on a smaller footprint. It is however noted that in its representations on Option 10.2 the University has stated that this "*has a sufficient developable area to meet the University's needs in terms of housing, academic and commercial research floorspace*". Compared with the footprint of Option 10.2, Options A and B would provide 104% and 99% of 10.2 respectively. It is therefore not accepted that the increased building height would be needed in order to meet the University's needs. Notwithstanding, even if this were the case, the aim is to meet the University's needs/aspirations as far as possible and consistent with other planning objectives. If the University's full development aspirations were not able to be fully met on this site in an acceptable form, that is an acceptable outcome. However, it must be stressed that one of the key objectives of this process has been to identify a site that does meet the University's aspirations, and Options A and B themselves represent a compromise on what would be proposed if it were not the strategic requirement to address the University's needs/aspirations.
- 6.4 The actual impact of development would vary depending on the actual form of development following masterplanning. The modelling is not intended to suggest that the development edge would actually look like a solid, continuous wall of buildings as it does in all these images. Some mitigation of impact will be able to achieved through masterplanning and treatments could include, for example, breaks in

the building frontage, variation in the building line, planting and other factors. If the built form is used as a tool to mitigate against noise impact, there may be less scope for mitigating its visual impact by breaking the building line, although some measures may be possibly whilst still effectively acting as a noise barrier.

- 6.5 The modelling demonstrates that any site option that meets or is close to meeting the University's aspirations will change the character of this area and development will be highly visible. However, it is of strategic importance to maintain the setting of Cambridge and the modelling helps to understand which site footprint options enable a "workable Green Belt setting function" as it was described by David Brown to be achieved, and some options better provide for this than others.
- 6.6 A summary of the impact of development in each view is as follows:

View 1 – Long distant view from Cambridge Road

Option 10.1 presents a slightly greater impact in terms the amount of development visible and the green foreground provided to the development. The variation between Option 10.1 and Options A/B elsewhere is minimal.

View 2 – Mid distant view from Madingley Road

There is minimal difference in impact between Option 10.1 and Option D and there is little green foreground in this view. A minor rise in topography appears to be preserved in the foreground with Options A/B and the development is more distant, particularly in the central part of the view. The benefit of the foreground is reduced when the building height is increased to 5 storeys, however, it nonetheless retains a green setting to Cambridge.

View 3 – Closer view from the M11 heading south

More significant differences are revealed with this and views 4 and 5 due to their closer proximity to the development site. Views from the M11 are important to the impression gained by large numbers of people as they pass Cambridge and the gentle curve in the M11 accentuates the views into the site as they travel south. The M11 runs largely through countryside west of Cambridge and development should not have such an impact that it effectively brings Cambridge out to the M11. The key difference here is the preservation of the foreground and slope beyond Washpit Brook in Options A/B, particularly in the central and right hand parts of this view. This is not an insignificant difference in the Green Belt setting of Cambridge. 5 storeys would again have a greater impact than Options A/B but the green foreground to development is retained.

View 4 – Closer view from the M11 heading north

There is again a significant difference between Options 10.1 and A/B in this view. In terms of the built form edge, option 10.1 will very much dominate this view. In particular, the foreground is significantly reduced in 10.1 and so buildings, if built at 4 stories as shown, will very much dominate the view. The landscape in the foreground will become little more than a buffer to the motorway rather than a landscape setting for this development and the city. There is also no impression of the topography and the rising land that is currently an important part of the setting in this area. Views from the M11 are important to the impression gained by large numbers of people as they pass Cambridge and the gentle curve in the M11 again accentuates the views into the site as they travel north. Slightly more foreground is provided in Option D. However, Options A/B show a greater foreground with buildings retreating in the view.

View 5 – Closer view from public footpath to north west

While the slope in this view appears very gentle, the actual slope is very much apparent when viewed on site, and views are gained along the slope which emphasises its impact. Option 10.1 removes any notion of the gentle slope below the 20m contour and pushes any buildings into the foreground towards the M11. It also provides a more "forced" or "contrived" edge which does not "work with" the natural contour of the land. Option D has a similar impact. Options A/B respect the 20m contour and the slope remains a feature in the landscape and provides a green foreground to Cambridge.

View 6 – Closer view from Huntingdon Road into strategic gap

In this view Option A and to a slightly lesser extent Option B become more dominant whereas Option 10.1 and to a lesser extent Option D, provide for a much greater "gap" between the two parts of development. Option A/B is far more prominent in terms of the impact of the built form. However, the development visible on the left side of this view is actually some way in the distance as shown on the map, which will mitigate its impact. The frontage of the strategic gap onto Huntingdon Road is not apparent in this view which is focused on the difference in impact of different widths of corridor through the heart of the new development. As recognised earlier, the gap on the road frontage is the crucial issue in Green Belt terms and a reduced gap through the new development can help ensure connectivity between the two parts of the new development.

View 7 – Closer view from SSSI into strategic gap

This view looks from the SSSI into the strategic gap and it addresses the impact of the options on the SSSI, which is the field at a lower level between the hedges in the left side of the view. There are major differences between the options in this view. First and foremost option 10.1 is completely screened by buildings in the foreground and development west of the strategic gap is so far away across the wide circular gap that it cannot be seen. Option A/B shows development closer to and on the far side of the SSSI. However the SSSI feature is properly preserved. Option D shows a more significant impact of built form on the SSSI.

- 6.7 While all the views in the modelling exercise are important, the immediate views shown in views 3,4 and 5 are particularly important. These views provide the most obvious impression of the change in topography on this side of the City and will be viewed on an extremely frequent basis by motorists on the M11. Given the high level of traffic on the M11 and the fact that it represents a major north-south motorway in the Country, any impact on these views must be given priority consideration. The modelling reveals options A/B preserve the important Green Belt characteristics offered in views 3,4 and 5 namely the gentle slope in topography and the benefit this provides to the development and this edge of the City.

7. Overall Conclusion

- 7.1 This site footprint analysis has looked in detail at nine alternative options. Each has a different balance of advantages and disadvantages. The analysis has identified two key criteria in assessing the site footprint notwithstanding the importance of the assessment undertaken of all of the criteria. The two key criteria being the degree to which each option can satisfy the needs of the University and maintain the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt in this location.
- 7.2 From the above analysis it is clear that options 10.1, 10.2 and A, C and D can satisfy the needs of the University. The analysis tends to show that Option 10.2 is unsatisfactory on a number of counts and it can be disregarded from further consideration.
- 7.3 The final choice between options 10.1, and options A, C and D will necessarily depend upon how the decision maker balances the importance of how each option performs in respect of the two key criteria, and taking into account the other criteria where these may assist in reaching a decision. If it is accepted that all of these options can satisfy the needs of the University then it follows that the impact of each option on Green Belt purposes will be decisive in allowing a choice to be made (it must be noted that the University retain a strong

preference for the full extent of development as allowed by option 10.1).

- 7.4 From the detailed assessments of the site options, the supporting landscape studies, an examination of viewpoints of the site and from the modelling work undertaken by EDAW, officers consider that option A should be preferred over options 10.1, C and D as it would better maintain the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt and provide an acceptable setting to Cambridge.