

Appendix 1.3: Issues and Options Report – Objectives (Option 8.1)

Issues and Options Report Objective	Relevance to site footprint
a) To ensure sustainable development;	<p>Yes. Concentration of a scale of development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sufficient to provide for local services and facilities accessible to the new community. • in a location which has, or has potential to have, good access to higher order services and facilities in Cambridge by public transport, cycling and walking.
b) To identify a new Green Belt boundary which allows for the development of the site without fundamentally undermining the purposes of the Green Belt;	<p>Yes. The purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt are set out in Structure Plan Policy P9/2a and are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve the unique character of Cambridge as a compact, dynamic city with a thriving historic centre • Maintain and enhance the quality of its setting • Prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another with the city <p>The Structure Plan also sets out criteria for the review of the Green Belt in Policy P9/2b on the edge of Cambridge which are to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. retain any areas required to maintain the purposes of the Green Belt as set out in Policy P9/2a in the context of delivering sustainable development and planned settlement form; 2. have regard to the compact form of the city; 3. provide green separation between existing settlements and any urban expansion of Cambridge to maintain the identity of the individual settlements; 4. ensure the protection of green corridors running from open countryside into the urban area as

Issues and Options Report Objective	Relevance to site footprint
	<p>generally indicated on the Key Diagram;</p> <p>5. maintain views of the historic core;</p> <p>6. provide, where appropriate, for limited development in identified Rural Centres in accordance with Policy P1/1.</p> <p>Note: only 6 is not relevant to site footprint.</p>
<p>c) To provide an appropriate landscape setting and high quality edge treatment for Cambridge;</p>	<p>Yes. These are separate considerations but both are relevant to site footprint.</p> <p>Landscape setting is about the setting of Cambridge in both near and long distance views.</p> <p>In terms of edge treatment, the choices are either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a high quality built edge • a high quality landscape boundary edge • a combination where high quality built development is enhanced through landscaping but the objective is not for development to be hidden.
<p>d) To ensure appropriate separation between Cambridge and the village of Girton to maintain village character and identity;</p>	<p>Yes. This is a key Green Belt purpose (see b above).</p>
<p>e) To create a new community which respects and links with adjoining communities;</p>	<p>Yes, in part. Site footprint is relevant in terms of links between the new development and existing parts of Cambridge, including the rest of the University and Girton especially if links on foot or by cycle are to be encouraged.</p>
<p>f) To create a satisfactory mix of uses, taking into account:</p> <p>i. Identified University-</p>	<p>Yes, in terms of being of a physical size to accommodate a range of uses, including those identified by the University.</p>

Issues and Options Report Objective	Relevance to site footprint
<p>related uses</p> <p>ii. The need for Key Worker housing with the emphasis on University and College staff;</p>	
<p>g) To maximise walking and cycling and public transport use;</p>	<p>Yes. Site footprint is relevant in terms of the ability to provide high quality public transport and other non-car modes, both within the new development and through links between the new development and existing parts of Cambridge. Especially in relation to a 400m walk distance to public transport stops, and provision of public transport routes within the site to accommodate this requirement.</p>
<p>h) To determine what transport infrastructure is needed to link the development to key destinations in Cambridge and to the wider network and how it is to be delivered;</p>	<p>It is important that any site identified is capable of being properly and appropriately served by economically viable, sustainable public transport and services and infrastructure and has regard to wider transport issues beyond the site.</p>
<p>i) To provide standards for infrastructure provision including renewable energy, open space and car and cycle parking;</p>	<p>In terms of renewable energy provision, site location and size are unlikely to be a determining factor in site footprint.</p> <p>Scale and location of development would be relevant to the need for and location of surface water attenuation features.</p> <p>The Cambridge Local Plan standards for parking and open space will be used. This is consistent with the other urban extensions.</p>
<p>j) To determine the level, type and general location of community uses needed to satisfactorily serve the development;</p>	<p>Yes, in part. Site footprint is relevant in terms of ensuring an appropriate level of community provision for the scale of development and ensuring community cohesion within the new development in terms of accessibility to community uses and through links between the new development and community uses outside</p>

Issues and Options Report Objective	Relevance to site footprint
	the site relied on to serve the development. The accessibility to community uses within the site from residents outside the development may also be relevant.
k) To determine appropriate phasing of development taking into account that development should only proceed when the University can prove the need for it;	Not relevant in this case where site development and phasing will be determined by demonstration of need by the University over time.
l) To ascertain what funding and investment is available to secure the infrastructure needs of the development;	Looking at this in terms of wider development viability, and therefore delivery, there may be implications for site footprint in terms of the overall scale of development and its ability to fund its infrastructure needs. It is likely that a larger scale of development will be better able to provide its infrastructure needs than a smaller scale of development. Although there will be thresholds as the scale of development increases which introduce new requirements for services, facilities or infrastructure which will place a greater proportionate burden on the development. Notwithstanding the above, without information on the development economics, development viability of any particular option cannot be assessed.
m) To protect existing wildlife and secure a net increase in biodiversity.	Yes, having particular regard to impact on protected species and loss of land of particular biodiversity value.