

Local Development Framework

**North West Cambridge
Area Action Plan**

**Preferred Options
Volume 2**

Development of Preferred Options

2007

CONTENTS

	PAGE NUMBER
Preface	5
2. Vision, Objectives & Development Principles	
NW1: Vision	9
Objectives	11
NW2: Development Principles	15
NW3: Implementing the Area Action Plan	19
3. Site and Setting	
NW4: Site and Setting	21
4. Housing	
NW5: Housing Supply	33
NW6: Affordable Housing	37
NW7: Balanced and Sustainable Communities	39
5. Employment & University Uses	
NW8: Employment Uses	43
NW9: Employment Uses in the Local Centre	45
NW10: Mix of Uses	47
6. Travel	
NW11: Sustainable Travel	49
NW12: Highway Infrastructure	51
NW13: Vehicular Access	55
NW14: Madingley Road to Huntingdon Road Link	57
NW15: Highway Provision	61
NW16: Public Transport Provision	63
NW17: Cycling Provision	67
NW18: Walking Provision	71
NW19: Parking Standards	73
7. Community Services and Facilities	
NW20: Provision of Community Services and Facilities and Arts and Culture	75
NW21: A Local Centre	77
NW22: Public Art	81
8. Recreation	
NW23: Open Space and Recreation Provision	83
9. Natural Resources	
NW24: Climate Change and Sustainable Design & Construction	87
NW25: Renewable Energy	91
NW26: Surface Water Drainage	95
NW27: Foul Drainage and Sewage Disposal	99
NW28: Management and Maintenance of Surface Water Drainage Systems	101
NW29: Water Conservation	105
10. Delivery	
NW30: Construction Process	109
NW31: Strategic Landscaping	113
NW32: Phasing and Need	115
NW33: Infrastructure Provision	119
Options Not Carried Through to the Draft Area Action Plan	121
Currently Adopted Policies that will be Superseded by the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan	123

PREFACE

Background

The Area Action Plan (AAP) for North West Cambridge, as a joint plan, will form part of the Development Plan for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District. It identifies land to be taken out of the Green Belt to allow for development which will help to meet the long-term needs of Cambridge University.

The location is identified in Policy P9/2c of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 as one where land should be released from the Green Belt for housing and mixed-use development and reserved for predominantly University-related uses and only brought forward when the University can show a clear need for the land to be released. This policy is consistent with RPG6 as well as the emerging Regional Spatial strategy, the East of England Plan, and is to be “saved” within that plan which is due to be adopted towards the end of 2007.

The Councils consulted both stakeholders and the wider public on Issues & Options (Regulation 25) during September and October 2006. An Initial Sustainability appraisal was undertaken by consultants and was also subject to consultation.

Further consultation as part of this process took place during April and May 2007 with key local stakeholders on the assessment criteria for determining the site footprint and the revised Green Belt boundary.

The current stage in the AAP process is the selection of Preferred Options (Regulation 26), which will be the subject of Pre-Submission public participation for a six-week period in October-December 2007.

Preferred Options

The Preferred Options have been set out in two volumes.

Volume 1 (Preferred Options Draft AAP) takes the form of a draft plan which includes policies and their reasoned justification. It covers the main elements of the plan which will guide development, with sections on:

- Vision, Objectives and Development Principles
- Site and Setting
- Housing
- Employment
- Travel
- Community Services and facilities
- Recreation
- Natural Resources
- Delivery
- Monitoring.

It also includes sections on standards for car and cycle parking and open space and recreation.

Volume 1, as the draft AAP, includes plans comprising:

- The Proposals Map
- A Concept Plan
- A Preferred Highways Option Concept Diagram.

The draft policies have been subject to a Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal by consultants.

Volume 2 (the Development of Preferred Options), records how each Preferred Option was chosen. The Preferred Options form the basis of the draft policies in Volume 1 and is an important element of the Councils' evidence base and audit trail for the development of the policies.

Volume 2 sets out for each policy area:

- The Options which have been the subject of consultation
- Any new Options arising from the Community Involvement (this applies only to the site and setting section)
- A summary of the results of Community Involvement
- A summary of the Initial Sustainability Appraisal of the Options
- The Councils' response
- Any changes resulting from the Draft Final Sustainability Assessment report on the emerging Preferred Options
- How it performs against the Tests of Soundness as set out by Regulations
- Conclusions and identification of the Preferred Option

The Preferred Options, Volumes 1 and 2 take account of the following supporting documents:

- North West Cambridge Transport Study (Cambridgeshire County Council)
- North West Cambridge Green Belt and Landscape Study (David Brown and Associates)
- Junction Access Study into Huntingdon Road
- Site Footprint Assessment (Cambridge City Council/South Cambridgeshire District Council).

Consultation on Preferred Options

The Preferred Options are the subject of Pre-Submission public participation from 22nd October to 3rd December 2007. Representations are invited, either in support or objection to the draft policies set out in Volume 1. Volume 2 assists consultees by providing details of the process by which the Councils developed the draft AAP policies.

Next Steps

Following the consultation on Preferred Options, the AAP will go through the following stages to adoption as a Development Plan document:

- Draft AAP to be submitted to the Secretary of State (Regulation 28), 6 weeks allowed for objections to be made, June – July 2008
- Consultation on site allocation objections put forward by objectors (Regulation 32) for 6 weeks, July – October 2008
- Independent Examination into the soundness of the Plan by a Government Planning Inspector, December 2008
- Inspector's Report, binding on the Councils, May 2009
- Adoption, July 2009

NW Cambridge AAP - Preferred Options

Vision, Objectives & Development Principles

Draft AAP Policy NW1: Vision

Summary of Options consulted on:

One option for the Vision for the Area was consulted on:

Option 7.1: Provides a draft vision for the development.

Summary of results of Community Involvement:

Option 7.1:

7 objections	6 supports	4 comments
--------------	------------	------------

- Focus too much on the city;
- Plan too dominated by commercial uses;
- Development at expense of residents needs;
- New landscaped edge will not enhance setting of the City;
- Inappropriate to meet the City's wider housing needs here;
- Fails to cover wider sustainability and environmental issues;
- Should emphasise the role of the University in supporting further development of the Cambridge sub-region;
- Fails to ensure separation of Girton

New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:

Not applicable.

Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:

The option is presented in the form of a vision statement. The vision outlines what the councils hope to achieve by the implementation of the Area Action Plan. To achieve the vision the plan must successfully guide the implementation of a range of planning guidance in a sustainable manner. As the detail of the plan will not be known until later in the plan making process, beyond this Issues & Options stage, the assessment of this option returns unknown outcomes. However, the vision appears consistent with the SA economic objectives but less information on environment and social aspects are provided.

Response:

The vision is not intended to be all encompassing but rather to concentrate on key aspects of the development. The vision remains as proposed in the

Issues & Options Report but adds references to the role of the City and Sub-Region in higher education and research and to the development contributing to meeting needs before 2021 as requested by the University.

Pursue Option 7.1.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

- *Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:*

None proposed

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Option 7.1 has been taken forward in Preferred Option NW1 as amended by the addition of references proposed above.

Draft AAP Objectives

Summary of Options consulted on:		
A range of objectives were consulted on.		
Summary of results of Community Involvement:		
Option 8.1:		
15 objections	13 supports	10 comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Acreage & width of Green Belt should be preserved if not increased;• Boundary between the City & Girton should be significant;• Planning must be done in conjunction with the NIAB site;• Would undermine the function of the Green Belt;• Term sustainable development now widely regarded as too vague;• Refer to high modal share for walking & cycling;• Landscape setting should consider the wider setting not just Cambridge;• Wildlife corridor must be retained along the Washpit Brook & Girton Gap;• Transport infrastructure must relieve congestion not exacerbate it;• Development should only take place after comprehensive protected & notable species surveys have been carried out		
New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:		
Not applicable.		
Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:		
<p>The worst performing objectives are 5 and 6 (To create a new community which respects and links with adjoining communities and to create a satisfactory mix of uses). As expected the AAP objectives which concentrate on the need for a new development perform badly against the environmentally focused SA objectives. Tensions between some economic development objectives and environmental objectives are inevitable and reconciliation of the two pillars of sustainable development will be required. Other AAP objectives perform well or do not impact upon the SA objectives. Furthermore AAP objectives perform well against the economically focussed SA objectives. Finally, the performance of AAP objectives which address transport infrastructure is largely uncertain and will require more information from the options in order to progress the SA further. Overall the appraisal of the AAP objectives highlights that - some trade off of environmental objectives will be required in order to deliver the AAP. In particular on resource use, habitat, landscape and townscape character, open space and greenhouse gases. Mitigation measures will be required to reduce these potentially negative</p>		

impacts.
<p>Response:</p> <p>The revised objectives refine and supplement those set out in Option 8.1. Their detailed wording has sometimes been changed to reflect that they will now become objectives for a draft plan or preferred option rather than in relation to an options consultation document. Their purpose is to provide a means of testing whether the Vision (NW1) is being achieved.</p> <p>Part a), better reflects the reason why development is being brought forward in this location. Parts b), c), e), f), and l), supplement those set out in option 8.1 and have been included in response to representations made at the Issues & Options stage. The references in part h) to achieving a modal split of no more than 40% of trips by car reflects representations made at the Issues & Options stage (not in relation to option 8.1 but in respect of the travel section), and to the outcome of transport modelling for North West Cambridge. In relation to part i), a new Green Belt boundary is proposed that does not fundamentally undermine the purposes of the Green Belt.</p>
<p>Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:</p> <p>- <i>Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:</i></p> <p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Tests of Soundness:</p> <p>Procedural:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement* <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal <p>Conformity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (v) regard to the Community Strategies** <p>Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances <p>*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI</p>

and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Option 8.1 has been taken forward in the AAP Draft Objectives as amended as set out in the response above.

Draft AAP Policy NW2: Development Principles

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>Two options relating to development principles were consulted on:</p> <p>Option 16.1: Archaeological interests to be taken into account. Option 17.1: Development to achieve an overall increase in biodiversity.</p>				
<p>Summary of results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Option 16.1:</p> <table border="1"><tr><td>2 supports</td></tr></table> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No key issues arose in consultation for this option <p>Option 17.1:</p> <table border="1"><tr><td>2 objections</td><td>9 supports</td><td>3 comments</td></tr></table> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Avenue of Chestnut Trees bordering the 19 Acre Field must be preserved;• There is no specific safeguard of the SSSI at Travellers Rest Pit;• All loss of habitats must be kept to a minimum.	2 supports	2 objections	9 supports	3 comments
2 supports				
2 objections	9 supports	3 comments		
<p>New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>				
<p>Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:</p> <p>Option 16.1 This measure is overall deemed to have positive environmental benefits relative to the absence of such measures. The extent or significance of such positive impact would be dependent on how the findings of such an investigation are used and how such information would inform any development plans and preferred option mitigation measures.</p> <p>Option 17.1 This strategy would overall have positive benefits on biodiversity, conservation of habitats and people's access to wildlife, relative to no such strategy being in place. However, the significance and extent of such positive impacts is unknown since preferred options are unknown and the extent to which such a strategy could mitigate against any adverse impacts of these is uncertain at this stage.</p>				
<p>Response: Policy NW2 provides essential policy guidance on a number of important</p>				

issues that are not otherwise addressed in the AAP.

Parts a) to e) of policy NW2 provide positive guidance on how North West Cambridge should be planned and developed. They reflect the vision and objectives for the development, national policy guidance, the location of the site and its importance to the landscape setting of Cambridge. Various studies, (most recently the Inner Green Belt Boundary Study (2002), and the North West Cambridge, AAP Green Belt landscape Study (2006), including those informing the Structure Plan confirm that the area between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road is important to the setting of Cambridge and specifically to its Green Belt setting.

Parts f) to j) of policy NW2 incorporate the essential elements of options 16.1 and 17.1, without incorporating excessive detail and so leave flexibility for future masterplanning. They provide more detailed guidance on the outcomes expected of development at NW Cambridge. References to biodiversity, historic landscape and geological features are consistent with national guidance and also reflect the importance of the existing SSSI, existing biodiversity interests and retained elements of the historic landscape. Part h) requires the development to be accessible to all and to provide good access to public transport. Part g) requires a high quality landscape framework both externally and internally to the development, whilst parts i) and j) seek to ensure that crime is minimised and that planning for waste and recycling is considered from the beginning and not as a later add-on.

Parts k) to s) and part 4) of policy NW2 are intended to incorporate essential protections to matters of importance both to the locality and the wider area. They reflect the highly visible location, which forms the edge of the historic city of Cambridge, its location close to the busy M11, which is a source of noise, vibration and air pollution, and the residential character of adjoining development in Cambridge and in Girton. Land downstream of the development is at risk of flooding as shown in the South Cambridgeshire SFRA. A number of trees on the site are protected by Tree Preservation Orders such as the double line of chestnut trees bordering the 19-Acre Field. Other trees of significance should also be protected both as an aid to internal landscape design quality and to reflect their part of the historic landscape.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

- Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation

The main area for change is in strengthening some of the principles already in place, and adding slight amendments to other Development Principles:

1. Long-term protection of the Green Belt should be included;
2. The biodiversity of the site needs to be appraised ASAP;
3. Principle 3 or 4 should be amended to include light and pollution;
4. Principle 2(j) should be amended to "Provide integrated refuse and recycling facilities and reduce the amount of waste produced through

- good design”;
5. Principle 2(f) should be amended to say “Enhance and protect the biodiversity...”; and
 6. Principle 3(n) should be amended to say “On biodiversity, protected species, archaeological ...”

- Councils’ Response:

1. Disagree. This is covered by national planning guidance. Policy unchanged;
2. Noted. No change to policy required;
3. Disagree. This is already covered by NW2 part 3 (k, l & n) and paragraph 2.8, although NW2 part 4 has been strengthened to include a specific reference to lighting;
4. Agree. Policy altered;
5. Agree. Policy altered although recommended wording not used; and
6. Disagree. Planning permission will not be granted where the proposed development or associated mitigation measures would have an unacceptable adverse impact on biodiversity etc. Biodiversity is an all-embracing term therefore any adverse impact on protected species would be considered as the policy stands. Policy unchanged.

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

A combination of options 16.1 and 17.1 have been taken forward in Preferred

Option NW2, which adds further policy guidance concerning matters of importance, which are not addressed elsewhere in the AAP as set out in the response above.

Draft AAP Policy NW3: Implementing the Area Action Plan

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>It was considered that there were no options for the subject of consultation at the Issues & Options stage.</p>
<p>Summary of results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Response:</p> <p>The approach proposed in policy NW3 accords with best practice and national guidance. Masterplanning is required to ensure the development of a high quality and sustainable community for the long-term that will complement Cambridge and provide for the growth of the University. Masterplanning is a requirement of Structure Plan policy P9/2c.</p>
<p>Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:</p> <p>- <i>Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:</i></p> <p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Tests of Soundness:</p> <p>Procedural:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal <p>Conformity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (v) regard to the Community Strategies** <p>Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent

- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances,
 are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Policy NW3 should be taken forward as the proposed option as it accords with best practice and national guidance.

SITE AND SETTING

Draft AAP Policy NW4: Site and Setting

Summary of Options consulted on:

5 site footprint options were consulted on:

- 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 & 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 landscape 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.

Summary of results of Community Involvement:

Option 10.1:

9 objections	6 supports	5 comments
--------------	------------	------------

Cambridge University supported this option, as it would meet its development needs/aspirations in full. Many of the objections to this option, including from Girton and Histon & Impington Parish Councils 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 ability of parts of the site to function due to their proximity to the M11.

Option 10.2:

11 objections	1 support	6 comments
---------------	-----------	------------

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.

Option 10.3:

11 objections	4 supports	5 comments
---------------	------------	------------

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.

Option 10.4:

12 objections	1 support	6 comments
---------------	-----------	------------

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.

Option 10.5:

11 objections	6 supports	6 comments
---------------	------------	------------

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.

New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:

None of the site options consulted upon performed 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.

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 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 University put forward an additional option submitted as part of the University's response to the Issues & 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.

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.

Through this process, the University 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.

At the meeting of the Joint Member Reference Group on 29 June 2007, a further Option, subsequently referred to as Option E, emerged and was recommended by the Group to the two Councils as a deliverable outcome. The outer boundary of Option E is similar to Options A and B. However, it varies from those options in its treatment of the strategic gap; this is retained at 200m immediately south of Huntingdon Road but then extends into a larger central open space in a similar fashion to 10.1. Just south of this central green space it then narrows to 100m as it runs towards Madingley Road.

Site Options A to E were subject to detailed site assessments using the same assessment criteria as site options 10.1 to 10.5.

Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:

Options 10.1 to 10.5:

The relative sustainability of the options is dependent on the balance between the degree of land take and provision of employment opportunities. Although options 10.1 and 10.2 meet the development aspirations of the University, the impact on the character, setting and landscape of Cambridge and Girton is more extensive. Option 10.5 performs well against landscape, ecological and historical interest impacts. Providing the affordable housing requirement is fulfilled in option 10.5 the main area of underperformance is the lack of employment opportunities due to reduced provision of research facilities.

Design specifications for option 10.1 could reduce light pollution impact and for options 10.1 to 10.4 could reduce the prominence of buildings on the top of the ridge. Mitigation measures could reduce the resource impact of options 10.1 and 10.2, e.g. use of recycled aggregates, water efficiency measures and energy efficiency.

Cumulative, synergistic and indirect impacts: The cumulative environmental impact of options 10.1 and 10.2 will have greater significance on the immediate local environment in terms of biodiversity, loss of open space and character, setting and landscape. The significant cumulative impact for Option 10.1 lies with the character, setting and landscape, due to: the proximity of the option to the M11; the loss of the sweep of land which is important to the setting of Cambridge and the adverse impact on the character and setting of Girton. The significant cumulative impact for option 10.2 lies with biodiversity and natural heritage impacts due to the amount of land take and the loss of greenbelt fields in the south of the site. Mitigation measures such as building design will decrease the impact of option 10.2 on the landscape, particularly buildings on the higher areas of the site such as the ridge. Option 10.5 will have a cumulative economic impact through the potential loss of employment opportunities both within the proposed research facilities and the services that the larger land take options could accommodate more widely.

Options A to E:

All five options will have negative impacts from loss of open space and green belt land. Options C and D result in greater land take than Options A, B and E. Options A, B and E increase the threat to cultural heritage due to the south west part of the site being in close proximity to sensitive historical features.

All five options are likely to impact on views particularly of Girton. Options C and D obstruct views of the site along the whole side of the development due to the site traversing the 20m contour. Options A, B and E traverse the 20m contour to the south west of the site. Consideration of heights and mass of buildings and landscaping and impact on perception of green belt gap will all be important considerations in order to minimise cultural impacts of all of the options.

Options C and E, and to a lesser extent Option B, perform better than Options A and D, with regards to prevention of the merging of Girton and the new development as a larger area is left as part of the strategic gap. This could also have benefits for protection of the SSSI. In addition, the confinement of options A, B and E to be largely above the 20m contour should marginally reduce the loss of green belt land to the west of the development, in comparison to Options C and D.

All five options are likely to have negative effects on water stress and energy use. The impacts could be mitigated through inclusion of water and energy use efficiency measures into the development.

All five options perform well against economic and social objectives as the options meet the aspirations of the University, provide affordable housing and a local centre. However, the implications of the development on employment creation and transport, including private car use, will depend on the details of the designs for each option. Impacts on health and social inclusion will also depend on the detailed design of each option.

Response:

The Councils undertook a detailed and systematic assessment of the sites that were subject to consultation in the Issues & Options document in September 2006, taking into account the strategic context for the identification of this location in the Structure Plan for predominantly University-related uses and the requirements of a review of the Green Belt in locations on the edge of Cambridge. This process is fully documented in the supporting document to the AAP, "Site Footprint Assessments".

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. Given this, the two key criteria (in no particular order) can be considered to be:

- Satisfying the needs of the University
- Maintaining the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt.

A set of site assessment criteria was prepared, drawn from the Issues & Options report Vision and Objectives for NW Cambridge, to ensure that the full range of considerations was taken into account in the assessments that are necessary to lead to a quality and sustainable development. These were subject to focused consultation with key stakeholders including the County Council, Cambridge University, and local Parish Councils and residents groups. The detailed assessments of the 5 options consulted on, 10.1 to 10.5, identified that all those 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.

The site footprint assessments have therefore tested the 2 key criteria alongside a variety of other criteria. 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 the need to ensure that a sustainable form of development can be achieved, historic landscape impacts and connectivity within the development. However, these do not have the same weight in terms of strategic policy.

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 the joint officer team, comprising planners, urban designers and landscape officers of both Councils, was able to recommend one of them as the preferred site. The particular issues were that Option 10.1 as preferred by the University as best meeting its development needs/aspirations, has a greater impact on the Green Belt setting of Cambridge because it brings development further down the slope and in relatively close proximity to the M11. Conversely, Option 10.3, which was suggested by the Green Belt Landscape Study as the largest site option that retains a “workable” Green Belt setting to Cambridge, provides significantly less land than sought by the University.

Whilst none of the site options would be large enough to fully meet the University’s needs, which for housing have been demonstrated to be significantly more than they seek in this location, and there is therefore no specific land area that should be sought for the site footprint, there is a strategic objective to provide land for the needs of the University and therefore to provide as large a site as is appropriate in this sensitive location on the edge of Cambridge consistent with maintaining the Green Belt setting of the City.

Therefore, a number of further site footprint options were identified during the assessment process as set out in the earlier section, Options A to D, and these were also tested against the same site assessment criteria and subjected to Initial Sustainability Appraisal in the same way as the options consulted on.

Sites A and B are hybrid options developed by officers which sought to retain development at the top of the slope in the most sensitive northern and middle parts of the outer boundary, but to allow more development on lower lying land to the north of the Park & Ride site. They also maintain the full gap of 200m on the Huntingdon Road frontage but include a reduced strategic gap further south of 100m and 200m respectively to maximise the development footprint but also to help provide better community cohesion than the University’s original preferred site which had a large central open space.

Sites C & D were put forward by the University at the consultation stage and during the assessment of options respectively. They pull back development slightly from Washpit Brook but not as far as the 20m contour. In these options the University moved away from such a large open space and narrowed the central open space as demonstrated by Options C and D.

There were also discussions with the University’s officers during the assessment process and to assist that process, additional work has been prepared by consultants for Cambridge University and shared with the Councils on ecological issues, air quality and noise, and some views modelling of site options.

In particular, the views modelling helps to provide an impression of the potential difference in impact on the Green Belt setting of Cambridge of the different site footprints. The views modelling must be treated with a certain

amount of caution, but it helps to provide a consistent comparison of the relative impacts from key middle distant from the west and local views from the M11 and public footpaths. It shows each footprint with a wall of development on the boundary 4 storeys high. Clearly this is not how development would actually appear and there would be some breaks in building line and variation in built form. However, that is true of all site options and this approach provides a consistent approach for broad comparative purposes.

The University considers that there is a minor perceived difference between options and does not consider that the views from the M11 are an important issue because they consider they are fleeting views from fast moving vehicles. This setting was identified by the recent Cambridge Local Plan Inspector's Report as an important factor and that "the M11 should have an open space buffer because at present the M11 runs largely through countryside west of Cambridge" (Inspector's Report paragraph 2.7).

The joint officer team concluded that the recommended site footprint should be retained broadly at the top of the slope that runs down from a plateau towards the M11, because development that extends down the slope would have an unacceptable harmful impact on the immediate Green Belt setting of Cambridge.

The officer team has investigated options to secure the maximum site footprint, in order to go as far as possible towards meeting the University's stated needs/aspirations. The team recommended site Option A to the North West Cambridge Joint Member Reference Group (JMRG) meeting on 29 June 2007.

The site footprint includes a lower lying area of land to the north of the Madingley Road Park & Ride and closer to the M11, where development can be more effectively screened and where it will have less impact on Green Belt setting, even though this area has some features of historic landscape interest. It also goes closer to potentially important wildlife habitats but only where the ecological advice is that these interests can be successfully mitigated. The footprint in Option A also narrowed down the strategic gap south of Huntingdon Road running through the development to maximise the footprint whilst retaining this important structural feature to help ensure a more integrated and sustainable new community.

At the JMRG meeting, City Members raised concerns that there should be a large scale open space within the site in the strategic gap running through the development to reflect the character of Cambridge, more akin to the large open space proposed in the University's 10.1. This would be larger than that required by the Councils' open space standards and would be of a strategic scale serving a wider area of this part of the city. It would benefit by being shielded by development from the M11 and so would provide a space of high amenity value.

A further site option was subsequently developed with Lead Members of the

two Councils that is based on Option A but with a larger central open area – Option E.

The site footprint of Option E is 69ha, compared with the University's original preferred site of 77ha, and the alternative it suggested for discussion through the process of 75ha (Option D). However, the University commented in its representations to the Issues & Options report that site 10.2 that had a footprint of 68ha "has a sufficient developable area to meet the University's needs in terms of housing, academic and commercial research floorspace". It is therefore of an order that could accommodate the University's stated needs/aspirations. It should also be remembered that none of the site options, including 10.1 can fully meet the University's stated needs/aspirations for housing for its own staff and therefore there is no specific target figure for the site footprint.

The University has expressed concerns that the shape of the site in Option E would not be capable of delivering an appropriate form of development, particularly at the NW part of the site where it is relatively narrow in order to retain development around the 20m contour. However, urban design officers of both Councils have confirmed their view that the recommended site can be developed satisfactorily and demonstrated this through an illustrative masterplan (in the "Site Footprint Assessments" document).

The joint officer team took full account of the strategic requirement to ensure that the site footprint is maximised to help meet the needs/aspirations of the University into the future. However, the team considered that this must be balanced against the long term protection of the Green Belt, as required by the Structure Plan, a key purpose of which is to maintain and enhance the quality of the setting of Cambridge.

Site footprint Option E is considerably more extensive than would be the case if it were not for the priority being given by the Structure Plan and by both Councils to the needs of the University, in the light of the importance of the University to Cambridge. Indeed, there would be no land released from the Green Belt for development in this location, through either as already the case through the Cambridge Local Plan or as proposed in the Area Action Plan.

The meeting of Cambridge City Council's Environment Scrutiny Committee on 10 July 2007 resolved, and the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth then approved, the following:

"That the City Council is not sympathetic to the report's analysis of the landscape setting nor to the imperative of preserving the setting of the city in the manner recommended in the report. Furthermore, the City Council does not accept that such considerations override the needs of the University or the urban design requirements set out in the criteria. In particular, the City Council is keen to ensure that achieving green space internal to the development, and shielded from the visual and auditory impact of the M11 Motorway, should be a primary objective. Nevertheless, the City Council acknowledges the strength of the South

Cambridgeshire District Council feeling on the landscape setting issue and that, while the City Council is in favour of Option 10.1, it recognises that the only way to proceed is reluctantly to endorse the site footprint and Green Belt boundary as set out in paragraphs 3.2.2 –3.2.5 [*of the officer report*] and shown in the map of Option E, subject to taking legal advice about the planning law relating to joint working after which the final decision as between favouring Option 10.1 or Option E will be taken by the Executive Councillor following consultation with the Chair and the Spokesperson of the Scrutiny Committee.”

Regarding the issue of joint working, the legal advice received by the City Council was that at independent examination it would not in practice be possible for the City Council to promote one option as sound and meanwhile to try to canvas another alternative option. The City Council’s Executive Councillor subsequently decided that Option E should be taken forward.

South Cambridgeshire District Council held a Special meeting of Council on 17 July 2007 where the recommendation of Option E was agreed for the reasons set out in the joint officer report.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

- *Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:*

Policy should be reworded to read:

“to ensure separation is maintained between Cambridge and Girton village and to provide a central open space for biodiversity, landscape, recreation and amenity, whilst ensuring a cohesive and sustainable form of development.

- *Councils’ Response:*

Agree. Policy altered.

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent

- (vi) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances,
 are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

The site footprint was the most difficult aspect of the consideration of representations made on the Issues & Options consultation document. The challenge facing the Councils was to decide the most appropriate site footprint which balances the strategic priority for the release of land from the Green Belt to meet the needs/aspirations of the University into the long term, in a sustainable urban extension to Cambridge, with the need to maintain an appropriate Green Belt setting to the historic city.

There is a need under the new plan making system for a clear and defensible evidence base. The supporting documents to the Preferred Options Draft AAP provide a detailed evidence base.

The Councils have a different view on the interpretation of the Green Belt setting of Cambridge and the weight to be given to the University's needs/aspirations and the need for a large central open space as a focus for the development. However, in the interests of moving forward the preparation of a joint Area Action Plan to enable development to come forward as swiftly as possible where the University has or can demonstrate a need, and notwithstanding the strong views expressed by both Councils in relation to land both in and outside their respective administrative areas, they have agreed a preferred site footprint to take forward for public participation.

There will be an opportunity for interested parties that may have concerns that the footprint is too small, too large or the wrong shape, to take the opportunity to make representations at the Preferred Options consultation that provide evidence to support any concerns about the preferred site footprint. Any such concerns should be progressed through making objections to the policy for the preferred site in the draft Area Action Plan, and as part of that objection to promote as an alternative any of the sites previously considered by the Councils or to put forward any other alternative site for consideration when the Councils are deciding the AAP for submission.

Any interested party that remains unhappy about the submitted plan will then have the opportunity to have any objections to the AAP heard at a Public Examination in front of an independent Inspector who will decide the final form of the AAP.

Option E has been taken forward in preferred option NW4, as outlined above.

HOUSING

Draft AAP Policy NW5: Housing Supply

Summary of Options consulted on:

1 housing density option was consulted upon

- Option 11.2 – Higher housing densities will be located away from existing housing and close to the main public transport routes and services and facilities. Lower densities and other College, University or research related buildings with extensive green settings will be located adjacent to existing housing.

Summary of results of Community Involvement:

Option 11.2:

9 objections	3 supports	2 comments
--------------	------------	------------

- Focus should be on reduced impacts on the countryside and overall setting of the City not just areas adjacent to developments;
- Should be located adjacent not close to public transport routes;
- High density housing is not conducive to a healthy life;
- Concern about loss of private open space & the extent to which public open space can provide a viable alternative;
- A good number of lower density houses would add to the overall quality of the area;
- This option is contrary to established Green Belt purposes;
- College and University or related research buildings should not be located adjacent to existing housing;
- Option does not allow potential residents to use a more readily accessible means of transport in terms of their being close to main public transport routes;
- It will be important to provide sufficient informal open space close to areas of high housing density.

New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:

Not applicable.

Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:

The construction of higher density buildings away from existing buildings will be beneficial for integration with existing buildings and result in a less visually cluttered and displeasing landscape than there may otherwise have been. However placing these buildings in proximity to areas with biodiversity interest may also have negative effects. To avoid these effects the requirement of

development to undergo ecological assessment and daylight assessment should be considered for inclusion within the DPD.

Response:

Government policy is for the achievement of higher residential densities in the most accessible locations, particularly close to services and facilities or with good public transport access to them. The Structure Plan requires at least 40 dph in such locations but significantly higher densities in planned new communities. As a new urban extension to Cambridge where a focus on sustainable travel modes is a priority, and particularly having regard to the high proportion of dwellings proposed for University staff and students (some of whom will have the opportunity to travel sustainably to work in nearby University and related developments both on the site and in West Cambridge to the south of Madingley Road) the proposed average net density of 50 dph is appropriate and reasonable in policy terms. Whilst there may be sensitive areas within the site where lower than the average would be appropriate, there will also be opportunities for higher densities on the public transport corridors and in and close to the local centre. The final net density of development in particular parts of the site will be determined through the masterplanning process, and this will include consideration of the most appropriate form of development where it adjoins existing residential properties. The scale and form of development, together with the siting of roads, footpaths and areas of open space are all important aspects to be considered in relating the new development to existing houses, and is not simply about crude overall densities. It would not be an efficient use of the site if development densities were necessarily to reflect adjoining developments, particularly with respect of the large detached properties in large gardens fronting Huntingdon Road. For example large detached residential properties may have very similar characteristics in terms of visual amenity to a terrace of town houses or an apartment building, which may have a higher density in terms of number of units within a single built footprint. Whilst the preferred option was agreed, the proposed AAP policy clarifies this point and replaces lower densities close to existing housing with development of an appropriate scale and form where it adjoins existing housing.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

- *Sustainability Appraisal Response:*

None proposed.

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- ✓ (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- ✓ (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- ✓ (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- ✓ (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances,
are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and
- ✓ (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- ✓ (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Option 11.2 has been taken forward in preferred option NW5, the proposed average net density of 50 dph is appropriate and reasonable in policy terms. The proposed AAP policy replaces lower densities close to existing housing with development of an appropriate scale and form where it adjoins appropriate housing to recognise that this is the relevant consideration in terms of protecting residential amenity of existing properties.

Draft AAP Policy NW6: Affordable Housing

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>1 affordable housing option was consulted upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Option 11.1 – The target will be to secure 50% affordable housing.			
<p>Summary of results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Option 11.1</p> <table border="1"><tr><td>4 objections</td><td>1 support</td><td>3 comments</td></tr></table> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Term affordable housing misleading – replace with Key Worker;• Provision needs to take account of viability;• Requirement for affordable housing should be indicative and open to negotiation.	4 objections	1 support	3 comments
4 objections	1 support	3 comments	
<p>New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>			
<p>Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:</p> <p>The option is generally considered sustainable, having negligible environmental and economic effects. Affordable housing should also be of a high quality standard, the proposed mitigation should be significant to ensure that quality is not sacrificed for affordability and as a result producing environmental problems. The text around the option indicates need for key worker housing for people working for the university. The option therefore will not result in socially rented accommodation being provided, which excludes some members of the population from the development.</p>			
<p>Response:</p> <p>Affordable housing is the appropriate overall term to use, which by definition includes housing for key workers. The draft AAP should however make clear that on this site, the type of affordable housing sought will specifically be that to meet the needs of Cambridge University and College key workers. The 50% target is derived from the viability evidence prepared on behalf of Cambridge University and considered at the Cambridge Local Plan Public Inquiry in 2005 and which resulted in a change to the affordable housing requirement from the previous proposed target of 70%. It therefore has an evidence base and has recently been considered by an independent Inspector. There is therefore no justification for changing from the specific requirement and creating uncertainty. Option 11.1 is not a plan policy but rather an option and the actual AAP policy will be written to conform to the guidance given in PPS3 Housing for affordable housing, which specifically requires account to be taken of various factors including viability. This is also</p>			

consistent with the approach taken recently in the Inspectors' Reports for the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies and Northstowe Area Action Plan DPDs.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

- *Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:*

None proposed.

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Option 11.1 has been taken forward in preferred option NW6, it is consistent with the approach currently set out in the Cambridge Local Plan for the part of this site in Cambridge City, and the viability evidence considered by the independent Inspector as part of the Local Plan Inquiry. The draft AAP policy will clarify that affordable housing must be for University and College key workers and that development viability will be a relevant consideration.

Draft AAP Policy NW7: Balanced and Sustainable Communities

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>3 balanced and sustainable community options were consulted upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 11.3 – Components of housing (student, University Key Worker and market) mixed and integrated across the site. • Option 11.4 – Student accommodation as a separate University Quarter, whilst University Key Worker and market housing mixed and integrated across the site. • Option 11.5 – Student accommodation and University Key Worker housing as a separate University Quarter. 											
<p>Summary of Results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Option 11.3:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>3 objections</td> <td>1 support</td> <td>1 comment</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student accommodation should be located in a dispersed manner in the centre of the site and fringe facing the M11; • Development should be restricted to teaching accommodation & housing for students and key workers as opposed to market housing; • Normal objectives for housing mix are not relevant here; • Appropriate distribution of housing mix should be determined as a response to identified needs at the time of development <p>Option 11.4:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>2 objections</td> <td>3 supports</td> <td>2 comments</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should be restricted to teaching accommodation & housing for students and key workers as opposed to market housing; • This might undermine the marketability of market housing; • Normal objectives for housing mix are not relevant here; • Appropriate distribution of housing mix should be determined as a response to identified needs at the time of development <p>Option 11.5:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>2 objections</td> <td>1 support</td> <td>1 comment</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should be restricted to teaching accommodation & housing for students and key workers as opposed to market housing; • Normal objectives for housing mix are not relevant here; • Appropriate distribution of housing mix should be determined as a response to identified needs at the time of development 			3 objections	1 support	1 comment	2 objections	3 supports	2 comments	2 objections	1 support	1 comment
3 objections	1 support	1 comment									
2 objections	3 supports	2 comments									
2 objections	1 support	1 comment									

New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:

Not applicable.

Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:

Option 11.4 performs best and strikes a balance between enabling the student population to live in a distinct area, whilst not completely separating the University population from the market housing. Whether the student population is undergraduate or postgraduate and the design and planning of the housing will determine the extent of the sustainability issues outlined above. (NB. See errata to Initial Sustainability Appraisal)

Response:

The creation of sustainable, inclusive, mixed communities is one of the Government's key strategic housing policy objectives as set out in PPS3 Housing at paragraphs 9, 20, and 37, and in its policy statement 'Delivering Affordable Housing' of November 2006 which states that the Government believes everyone should have the opportunity of a decent home, which they can afford, within a sustainable mixed community. Amongst the benefits of pursuing such an approach are that it will avoid the creation of areas of monocultural housing with its implications for social cohesion and exclusion and enable the provision of the key worker housing to be delivered with greater certainty because of its having to at least come forward with the open market housing rather than at some later date.

Whilst student housing is better provided primarily in a separate University quarter because it has different characteristics and needs, the University and College Key Worker Housing should be mixed and integrated with the market housing across the site consistent with Government policy.

Pursue option 11.4.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

- *Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation*

Background para 4.9 should be amended to clarify the University's position on 'car free', and in particular their policy for this site.

- *Councils' Response*

Disagree as this is adequately covered in paragraph 6.21. Policy unchanged.

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme

(ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*

(iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

(iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy

(v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

(vi) Policies are coherent and consistent

(vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances,
 are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered

(viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring

(ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Option 11.4 has been taken forward in preferred option NW7, it provides for student accommodation as a separate University Quarter to reflect its different characteristics and needs, and requires University Key Worker and market housing mixed and integrated across the site consistent with Government policy and to secure a mixed and balanced community.

Employment and University Uses

Draft AAP Policy NW8 Employment Uses

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>2 employment uses options were consulted upon:</p> <p>Option 12.1 - Employment development at North West Cambridge will be limited to teaching and research institutions of the University.</p> <p>Option 12.2 - Employment development at North West Cambridge will include a mix of commercial research as well as teaching and research institution of the University.</p>						
<p>Summary of results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Option 12.1:</p> <table border="1"><tr><td>1 objection</td><td>2 supports</td><td>1 comment</td></tr></table> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The Structure Plan identifies the site as a Strategic Employment Location. <p>Option 12.2:</p> <table border="1"><tr><td>4 objections</td><td>5 supports</td><td></td></tr></table> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Inclusion of commercial uses would generate additional traffic and undermine the viability of mixed use developments elsewhere;Numerous alternative sites exist for commercial research and development.	1 objection	2 supports	1 comment	4 objections	5 supports	
1 objection	2 supports	1 comment				
4 objections	5 supports					
<p>New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>						
<p>Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:</p> <p>Option 12.2 performs better in economic terms relative to option 12.1. It should be considered, however, that in balancing the use of Greenfield land with development, that the most efficient use of the land is chosen and a decision must be made whether this includes further development of the flagship sector. Option 12.1 will not increase demand for additional housing to the extent of option 12.2. Note that housing is a key issue in the area and the priority of the development.</p>						
<p>Response:</p> <p>The principle of limited further employment growth which includes a mix of commercial research in addition to University teaching and research buildings</p>						

would be acceptable. The linking of academic University buildings and commercial research buildings has the benefit of encouraging working relationships between academic research and the commercial sector, benefiting the Higher education cluster and Cambridge's economy.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

- *Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:*

None proposed.

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Option 12.2 has been taken forward in preferred option NW8 as it encourages better working relationships between the University of Cambridge and commercial research, benefiting the higher education cluster.

Draft AAP Policy NW9 Employment Uses in the Local Centre

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>It was considered that there were no options for the subject of consultation at the Issues & Options stage.</p>
<p>Summary of results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable</p>
<p>New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable</p>
<p>Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:</p> <p>Not applicable</p>
<p>Response:</p> <p>While the main employment uses on the site will be for D1 educational uses and research that is associated with the University, it will also be appropriate to have small scale employment uses as a part of the local centre. This small-scale employment will help provide job opportunities for local residents, as well as increasing the vitality and viability of the local centre, by increasing pedestrian activity throughout the day and the number of people that will use local shops.</p> <p>The floorspace of 300m² has been chosen as below this limit the Councils would not normally seek to impose occupancy conditions on new employment development in line with the policy of selective management of the economy. Therefore if new employment developments at North West Cambridge within the local centre do not exceed this limit, they will not compromise the policy of discriminating in favour of uses that need to be within Cambridge.</p>
<p>Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:</p> <p>- <i>Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation</i></p> <p>Local employees accessing their place of work by sustainable means of transport is of strategic importance.</p> <p>- <i>Councils' Response:</i></p> <p>Noted. Policy unchanged.</p>

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances,
 are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Policy NW9 has been taken forward as the preferred option as small scale employment development will be appropriate in the local centre.

Draft AAP Policy NW10 Mix of Uses

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>It was considered that there were no options for the subject of consultation at the Issues & Options stage.</p>
<p>Summary of results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Response:</p> <p>It was felt appropriate to limit the amount of commercial and sui generis research institutes that would be developed at North West Cambridge given the considerable commitments to these uses around Cambridge at this time and the availability and take up of land in the University's ownership.</p> <p>Policy 9/7 of the Cambridge City Local Plan 2006 provides a split for the employment uses at North West Cambridge that will be developed within the City boundary. This split is for up to 14ha to be developed for higher education and up to 6ha for University related research institutes and commercial research uses, i.e. a split of 70% higher education uses and 30% research uses. As this split has already been determined through the inquiry into the Cambridge City Local Plan and in the absence of any further evidence from the University it was felt that the most appropriate way of determining the division for the whole site was to extend this seventy-thirty split to the full 100,000m².</p> <p>The policy is written such that there is no requirement to make this split obvious on the ground. Indeed the embedding of research institutes within the wider University uses is to be welcomed as this can encourage cross-fertilisation of ideas and better working relationships between different firms and the University benefiting the higher education cluster in Cambridge.</p>
<p>Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:</p> <p>- <i>Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:</i></p> <p>None proposed.</p>

Tests of Soundness:**Procedural:**

- ✓ (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- ✓ (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- ✓ (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- ✓ (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- ✓ (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- ✓ (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- ✓ (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances,
are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered
- ✓ (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- ✓ (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Policy NW1- has been taken forward as the preferred option as it carries forward the split for commercial and academic uses agreed in the Cambridge City Local Plan, while still allowing flexibility as to where these uses are located.

Travel

Draft AAP Policy NW11: Sustainable Travel

Summary of Options consulted on:

It was considered that there were no options for the subject of consultation at the Issues & Options stage.

Summary of results of Community Involvement:

Although no related options were presented in the Issues & Options Report, the following issues were raised during the consultation process:

- The Council has a duty to support the provision of sustainable transport as a priority over the production of new road schemes
- Option 13.5 is not a sustainable approach to development

New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:

Not applicable.

Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:

Not applicable.

Response:

Providing for sustainable travel is an essential component of the AAP. This can be achieved by forms of development which minimise the need to travel and so are inherently sustainable. Mixed-use development is particularly important for allowing the daily needs of occupants to be met within walking or cycling distance.

Where travel is necessary, however, development will be planned to make this as sustainable as possible, particularly by maximising use of sustainable transport modes through the provision of safe and convenient routes and higher densities to encourage people to move about by foot, cycle and bus;

Transport modelling for North West Cambridge has shown that an 8 percent reduction in the mode share for journey by car (reducing the mode share from 45 percent to 37 percent) is achievable, if the right conditions are created as part of the development.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

- *Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation*

The Policy as it stands sets a high level of modal split. This should, dependant on implementation be set at a higher level and this should be considered this is with particular reference to the 37% modal split highlighted

in the supporting text.

Car free should apply to the market housing and University buildings in addition to the 'essentially car free' University accommodation. This is recommended as the most sustainable option.

- Councils' Response

The modal split in the Area Action Plan is to allow for consistency with the Cambridge East Area Action Plan. Policy unchanged.

Noted, however a car free development in the out of centre location is not possible. Policy unchanged.

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Policy NW11 has been taken forward as the preferred option as it requires development and transport systems to be planned in order to reduce the need to travel and maximise the use of sustainable transport modes to encourage people to move about by foot, cycle and bus, to achieve a modal split of no more than 40% of trips by car. This will include the provision of car clubs, employee travel plans, residential travel planning, and other similar measures.

Draft AAP Policy NW12: Highway Infrastructure

Summary of Options consulted on:

2 highway infrastructure options consulted upon:

- Option 13.5 – New road links to and from the north (M11/A14) to Madingley Road will be provided. Such links would help to minimise traffic impacts from development by allowing more traffic to use Madingley Road as an alternative to Huntingdon Road
- Option 13.6 – That such new road links should not be provided as part of the development.

Summary of results of Community Involvement:

Option 13.5:

8 objections	8 support	1 comment
--------------	-----------	-----------

- This would further exacerbate traffic problems;
- This is not a sustainable approach to development;
- There has never been any technical evidence to support this scheme;
- Draft Transport Strategy shows the potential benefits of this scheme are negligible when compared to provision of an orbital link;
- The need for such a scheme has not been demonstrated;
- There are no plans to provide such slip roads;
- The Council has a duty to support the provision of sustainable transport as a priority over the production of new road schemes

Option 13.6:

1 objection	5 support	1 comment
-------------	-----------	-----------

- This would not enhance travel links from the South Cambridge area and Cambourne in particular

New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:

Not applicable.

Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:

The environmental impact of option 13.5 is significant. Option 13.5 may increase accessibility to the area, but it also encourages car use and thereby undermines the promotion of public transport. Note that option 13.6 may result in increased congestion in local area. The cumulative environmental and social impacts of option 13.5 will have an adverse impact on local residents due to loss of open space, noise and air pollution.

Response:

North facing slip roads at the M11/A1303 interchange have been considered because they would give an alternative route into Cambridge (via Madingley Road) for southbound traffic from the A14 and M11. However, there is insufficient evidence to justify that such slip roads, and they have not been supported by public consultation. As the NW Cambridge Transport Study also shows negligible benefits, the recommended approach is that the option of north facing slip roads should not be included as a preferred option.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:*- Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation*

Traffic assessments may be necessary as part of the development proposal must include consideration of whether the scheme could induce new traffic movements.

- Councils' Response

Noted, this will be covered in the transport assessment. Policy unchanged.

Tests of Soundness:**Procedural:**

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Option 13.6 has been taken forward in preferred option NW12, including a

requirement that development to be subject to sufficient highway capacity being available to serve all stages of development, including on the adjacent strategic road network. Development will contribute to measures to mitigate any significant adverse traffic impacts on the M11, A14 and the surrounding highway network, if this is shown to be necessary by transport assessments.

Draft AAP Policy NW13: Vehicular Access

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>It was considered that there were no options for the subject of consultation at the Issues & Options stage.</p>
<p>Summary of results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Response:</p> <p>In order to limit the impact upon the key radial corridors of Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road and to exclude the possibility of an access for general traffic from Storeys Way, there should be a limited number of vehicular accesses to the development area. A maximum of two accesses from Huntingdon Road and one from Madingley Road are thus proposed for general traffic.</p>
<p>Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:</p> <p>- <i>Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation</i></p> <p>It will be at the detail level that it will be possible to gauge the true level and type of impact on landscape character, and furthermore to ascertain the impacts of light, noise and air pollution. Therefore any application should consider Landscape Impacts as part of its scope</p> <p>- <i>Councils' Response</i></p> <p>Noted, policy NW2 covers such general principles. Policy unchanged.</p>
<p>Tests of Soundness:</p> <p>Procedural:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal <p>Conformity:</p>

- ✓ (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- ✓ (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- ✓ (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- ✓ (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and
- ✓ (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- ✓ (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Policy NW13 has been taken forward as the preferred option as it requires vehicular access to the development area to be from Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road. The number of vehicular access points to the development area will be minimised, especially from Huntingdon Road, and there will be no access for private motor vehicles to and from Storey's Way.

Draft AAP Policy NW14: Madingley Road to Huntingdon Road Link

Summary of Options consulted on:

4 orbital route options were consulted on:

- Option 13.1 – A new all purpose route will be developed linking Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road. The route will lie within a green corridor within the University's development.
- Option 13.2 – A new all purpose route will be developed linking Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road. This road will be designed within and as part of the developments with regard to slower speeds and safe crossings for pedestrians.
- Option 13.3 – A new orbital route limited to cyclists and public transport will be developed linking Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road.
- Option 13.4 – A new orbital route limited to cyclists and public transport will be developed linking Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road. This road will be designed within and as part of the developments with regard to slower speeds and safe crossings for pedestrians

Summary of results of Community Involvement:

Option 13.1:

8 objections	1 support	1 comment
--------------	-----------	-----------

- This would encourage people to travel by car & is not supported;
- There should be no increase in general road capacity;
- Should be restricted to cycling & public transport;
- Would spoil the green corridor;
- Contrary to the approach being advocated on the NIAB site;
- Route needs to be of urban form if it is to function properly;
- Will have an uncertain impact on the transport network in the NW quadrant

Option 13.2:

3 objections	7 support	2 comment
--------------	-----------	-----------

- There should be no increase in general road capacity;
- Will have an uncertain impact on the transport network in the NW quadrant

Option 13.3:

4 objections	3 support	2 comment
--------------	-----------	-----------

- Failure to provide road capacity does not encourage use of other modes of

<p>transport by those for whom it is impractical;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slower speeds & safe crossings are required for pedestrians & cyclists; • Cycling should be given high priority with road crossings; • Draft Transport Strategy shows there is not high demand for orbital movements and new roads should be designed to serve the development while discouraging their use as an orbital route; • Draft Strategy also highlights the need for direct walking, cycling and public transport links; • Draft Transport Strategy concludes orbital link should cater for all modes of transport, although will need to mitigate the desire for rat-running; • Preferred option must be based on an assessment of the evidence & input from key stakeholders <p>Option 13.4:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>3 objections</td> <td>10 support</td> <td>0 comment</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to provide road capacity does not encourage use of other modes of transport by those for whom it is impractical; • This denies the benefits to other drivers of reducing congestion in the City; • Draft Transport Strategy concludes orbital link should cater for all modes of transport, although will need to mitigate the desire for rat-running 			3 objections	10 support	0 comment
3 objections	10 support	0 comment			
<p>New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>					
<p>Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:</p> <p>Option 13.4 performs best across all objectives. Options 13.2 and 13.3 balance the use of undeveloped green corridor space and the promotion of public transport. 13.1 is the least sustainable option Options 13.1 and 13.3 will have cumulative environmental and social impacts, these will be due to loss of open space, noise and air pollution. The most significant cumulative impact will be on local residents living in proximity to the orbital route.</p>					
<p>Response:</p> <p>, A new road is proposed as part of the development of North West Cambridge. This route is intended to primarily provide access for the proposed development. Nevertheless, its development will only be possible if its impacts on the transport network and on amenity are acceptable. The design will provide for cycling and public transport, in order to encourage movements by more sustainable modes. Any new road will need to be designed not to impact on the purposes and amenity of the strategic gap within the development area.</p> <p>4 options (13.1 to 13.4) for the orbital route were included in consultation Although Option 13.4 received the largest number of supporting responses,</p>					

the preferred option emerging from the North West Cambridge Transport Study was Option 13.2, which also had a majority of supporting responses. The recommended approach is thus to take forward Option 13.2, but in such a way that priority is given to walking, cycling and public transport and to a design based on low vehicle speeds.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

- *Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:*

None proposed.

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Option 13.2 has been taken forward in preferred option NW14 including a policy which proposes a new all purpose route linking Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road. This road will be designed as part of the development and its design will be based on low vehicle speeds. It will give priority to provision for walking, cycling and public transport, including safe and convenient crossings for pedestrians and cyclists, in order to encourage travel by more sustainable modes.

Draft AAP Policy NW15: Highway Provision

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>It was considered that there were no options for the subject of consultation at the Issues & Options stage.</p>
<p>Summary of results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Although no related options were presented in the Issues & Options Report, the following issues were raised during the consultation process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There should be no increase in general road capacity• Failure to provide road capacity does not encourage use of other modes of transport by those for whom it is impractical
<p>New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Response:</p> <p>The overall approach to transport is to provide for the necessary vehicular trips associated with the development whilst managing the need to travel by car and promoting the use of other sustainable modes of travel. There is thus a preference for solutions to travel demand which do not require the provision of new strategic road capacity. However, development needs to be delivered in such a way that it minimises any additional burden on other users of the strategic road network. Thus, if transport assessments indicate adverse impacts from development on the strategic road network (despite the use of all possible demand management measures) then development will need to contribute to appropriate mitigation measures on the strategic road network which are necessary to cater safely and efficiently for anticipated traffic levels. Such measures will need to be in place prior to first occupation of each phase of development.</p>
<p>Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:</p> <p>- <i>Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:</i></p> <p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Tests of Soundness:</p> <p>Procedural:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme

- ✓ (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- ✓ (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- ✓ (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- ✓ (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- ✓ (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- ✓ (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and
- ✓ (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- ✓ (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Policy NW15 has been taken forward as the preferred option as it requires highway provision to be funded by development, as appropriate, and key links to be in place prior to first occupation of each phase of development.

Draft AAP Policy NW16: Public Transport Provision

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>4 public transport options were consulted upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 13.1 – A new all purpose route will be developed linking Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road. The route will lie within a green corridor within the University’s development. • Option 13.2 – A new all purpose route will be developed linking Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road. This road will be designed within and as part of the developments with regard to slower speeds and safe crossings for pedestrians. • Option 13.3 – A new orbital route limited to cyclists and public transport will be developed linking Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road. • Option 13.4 – A new orbital route limited to cyclists and public transport will be developed linking Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road. This road will be designed within and as part of the developments with regard to slower speeds and safe crossings for pedestrians 											
<p>Summary of results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Option 13.1:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>8 objections</td> <td>1 support</td> <td>1 comment</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would encourage people to travel by car & is not supported; • There should be no increase in general road capacity; • Should be restricted to cycling & public transport; • Would spoil the green corridor; • Contrary to the approach being advocated on the NIAB site; • Route needs to be of urban form if it is to function properly; • Will have an uncertain impact on the transport network in the NW quadrant <p>Option 13.2:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>3 objections</td> <td>7 support</td> <td>2 comment</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be no increase in general road capacity; • Will have an uncertain impact on the transport network in the NW quadrant <p>Option 13.3:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>4 objections</td> <td>3 support</td> <td>2 comment</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to provide road capacity does not encourage use of other modes of transport by those for whom it is impractical; 			8 objections	1 support	1 comment	3 objections	7 support	2 comment	4 objections	3 support	2 comment
8 objections	1 support	1 comment									
3 objections	7 support	2 comment									
4 objections	3 support	2 comment									

- Slower speeds & safe crossings are required for pedestrians & cyclists;
- Cycling should be given high priority with road crossings;
- Draft Transport Strategy shows there is not high demand for orbital movements and new roads should be designed to serve the development while discouraging their use as an orbital route;
- Draft Strategy also highlights the need for direct walking, cycling and public transport links;
- Draft Transport Strategy concludes orbital link should cater for all modes of transport, although will need to mitigate the desire for rat-running;
- Preferred option must be based on an assessment of the evidence & input from key stakeholders

Option 13.4:

3 objections	10 support	0 comment
--------------	------------	-----------

- Failure to provide road capacity does not encourage use of other modes of transport by those for whom it is impractical;
- This denies the benefits to other drivers of reducing congestion in the City;
- Draft Transport Strategy concludes orbital link should cater for all modes of transport, although will need to mitigate the desire for rat-running

New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:

Not applicable.

Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:

Option 13.4 performs best across all objectives. Options 13.2 and 13.3 balance the use of undeveloped green corridor space and the promotion of public transport. 13.1 is the least sustainable option. Options 13.1 and 13.3 will have cumulative environmental and social impacts, these will be due to loss of open space, noise and air pollution. The most significant cumulative impact will be on local residents living in proximity to the orbital route.

Response:

Providing high quality public transport is essential to achieving sustainable development in North West Cambridge and the proposed modal shift. Development will therefore be expected to encourage bus use as much as possible for trips to and from external destinations and for work journeys to the site. The development area has the advantage of being close to the existing bus route network, but needs to be well linked to them.

The proposed orbital route through the development area, running between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road, provides the option for buses to avoid the city centre and gives more direct connections to other areas of the City. It will provide links with development north of Huntingdon Road and with the University's West Cambridge site to the south.

4 options (13.1 to 13.4) for the orbital route were included in consultation. Although Option 13.4 (an orbital route limited to cyclists & public transport) received the largest number of supporting responses, the preferred option emerging from the North West Cambridge Transport Study was Option 13.2, which also had a majority of supporting responses. The recommended approach is thus to take forward Option 13.2.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

- *Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:*

None proposed.

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Option 13.2 has been taken forward in preferred option NW16 including a policy which requires High Quality Public Transport provision to be provided to support development, including:

- a) Providing segregated bus priority routes through the development, along internal orbital and radial routes;
- b) Linkage of bus routes within the development to the wider bus network, including enhanced bus services along Huntingdon Road and the proposed orbital route;

- c) Provision of bus stops, shelters and real time passenger information, with the majority of development being within 400m easy walking distance of a bus stop; and
- d) Support for bus usage via residential travel plans and employee travel plans, funded by development.

Draft AAP Policy NW17: Cycling Provision

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>1 cycling provision option was consulted upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Option 13.7 New and improved cycle links will be provided as part of the development			
<p>Summary of results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Option 13.7:</p> <table border="1"><tr><td>3 objections</td><td>8 support</td><td>2 comment</td></tr></table> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Should include reference to linking cycle routes to all road links to ensure sustainable development;Policy should state where the links are to (should explicitly state to Cambridge and all other large developments)All cycle routes should be designated cycle paths (not shared-use) and designed to the highest Sustrans/DfT standards;Needs to include reference to provision of secure and convenient residential cycle parking	3 objections	8 support	2 comment
3 objections	8 support	2 comment	
<p>New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>			
<p>Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:</p> <p>The inclusion of cycle links within the development area is considered to have sustainability advantages and this option is viewed as having economic and social benefits as well as environmental. Mitigation has been proposed in the form of undertakings within the plan to provide secure bicycle parking and to provide measures to design out crime from cycle routes. Indirect positive benefits on biodiversity have been noted. Reducing the potential emissions that the site may produce will have a reduced effect on biodiversity through better air quality, and will help protect the integrity of designated sites within the region.</p>			
<p>Response:</p> <p>The development needs to include excellent cycling routes and facilities to encourage short distance trips to be made by cycling and so reduce the dependence on private cars. Cycle facilities within the development also need to be linked to the wider cycle network.</p> <p>Radial provision is needed to give cyclists spinal routes through the new development which link with existing routes, including to and from the City</p>			

centre. This will give alternatives to existing cycle route along Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road (although existing routes may also be improved).

Orbital cycle routes are also needed, to connect with radial provision and with links north eastwards to Histon Road and beyond, as well as southwards to the Coton path, and University buildings. Safe and convenient cycle crossing facilities at Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road will be an essential part of the orbital provision. This will also give the potential to provide a more convenient cycle route to key destinations, including the proposed new rail station at Chesterton Sidings.

Pursue option 13.7

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

- *Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:*

None proposed.

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Option 13.7 has been taken forward in preferred option NW17 including a policy which requires new and improved cycle links to be provided as part of the development, including:

- Giving priority to cycling links between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road and to the City centre;
- Giving priority to cycling within the development, including connections to key destinations, including the local centre, bus stops, the primary school and employment; and
- Linking the development with the surrounding walking and cycling network and orbital routes including links to nearby villages and open countryside.

Draft AAP Policy NW18: Walking Provision

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>It was considered that there were no options for the subject of consultation at the Issues & Options stage.</p>
<p>Summary of results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Although no related options were presented in the Issues & Options Report, the following issues were raised during the consultation process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Slower speeds & safe crossings are required for pedestrians & cyclists;• The draft transport strategy highlights the need for direct walking, cycling and public transport links
<p>New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Response:</p> <p>The development needs to include excellent walking routes to encourage short distance trips to be made by walking and so reduce the dependence on private cars. The majority of walking trips generated by the development will be internal to the development site, but opportunities also exist for walking trips to be made to key external destinations, including schools and colleges in the vicinity of the site.</p> <p>Walking routes should be provided within the development sites to provide maximum permeability to destinations within the development, particularly local centres. The routes should connect to existing walking routes on Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road, via as many connections as possible. Where feasible these links should be in the form of separate footpath links and should include safe and convenient routes to bus stops</p>
<p>Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:</p> <p>- <i>Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:</i></p> <p>None proposed.</p>
<p>Tests of Soundness:</p> <p>Procedural:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme

(ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*

(iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

(iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy

(v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

(vi) Policies are coherent and consistent

(vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances,
 are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and

(viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring

(ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Policy NW18 has been taken forward as the preferred option as it requires development to be required to provide attractive, direct and safe walking routes as part of the development, including:

- Giving priority to walking links between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road and to the City centre;
- Giving priority to walking routes within the development connecting to key destinations, including the local centre, bus stops, the primary school and employment; and
- Linking the development with the surrounding walking network, including links to an improved rights of way network and to nearby villages and open countryside.

Draft AAP Policy NW19: Parking Standards

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>It was considered that there were no options for the subject of consultation at the Issues & Options stage.</p>
<p>Summary of results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Although no related options were presented in the Issues & Options Report, the following issues were raised during the consultation process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Needs to include reference to provision of secure and convenient residential cycle parking
<p>New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Response:</p> <p>The amount of residential and employee car parking will have a significant effect upon levels of car use and needs to be minimised in order to make the car a less preferred option. In particular, student residential parking will be very low and subject to proctorial control. In order to reduce car parking demands and to make cycling a more attractive option, the amount of convenient cycle parking provided as part of development should be maximised.</p> <p>The amount of car parking needs to be related to public transport accessibility and residential densities. Car parking should not be allowed to dominate design and measures such as car clubs should be explored to minimise the need for individual car ownership and the associated parking demands.</p>
<p>Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:</p> <p>- <i>Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:</i></p> <p>The policy should be expanded to promote car free development for <u>all</u> of the land uses designated on the site. This is recommended as the most sustainable option.</p> <p>- <i>Councils' Response:</i></p> <p>Noted, however a car free development in the out of centre location is not possible. Policy unchanged.</p>

Tests of Soundness:**Procedural:**

- ✓ (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- ✓ (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- ✓ (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- ✓ (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- ✓ (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- ✓ (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- ✓ (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and
- ✓ (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- ✓ (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Policy NW19 has been taken forward as the preferred option as it requires car and cycle parking to be provided in accordance with specified standards. In applying these standards, the overall aim will be to minimise the amount of car parking and to maximise the amount of cycle parking in order to encourage the use of more sustainable modes.

Community Services and Facilities

Draft AAP Policy NW20: Provision of Community Services and Facilities, Arts and Culture.

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>It was considered that there were no options for the subject of consultation at the Issues & Options stage.</p>
<p>Summary of results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Response:</p> <p>In accordance with national planning policy in PPS1 which seeks to create sustainable communities, the development of North West Cambridge will require an appropriate level of services and facilities to be provided within the development to serve the needs of the community, including those who will come to live, work and study within its area. It is important that these services and facilities are provided at an early stage in the development to ensure that the new community has the opportunity to be sustainable by using local services rather than travelling to use those provided outside its area.</p> <p>The appropriate type and level of services and facilities will need to be determined in advance of the granting of any planning permission through detailed assessments prepared in collaboration with key stakeholders, which will include an assessment of needs, leading to strategies identifying the requirements and the phasing of their delivery which will be incorporated into planning obligation. As the development will take place over a long period of time and it is important that adequate provision is made at all stages.</p>
<p>Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:</p> <p>- <i>Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:</i></p> <p>Part 1 of the policy has no mention of ensuring high quality services and facilities. Suggest rewording thus: “The development will provide an appropriate high quality level and type of</p>

services and facilities in suitable locations ...”

Part 2 of the Policy should be reworded to make clearer what it is hoping to achieve. Suggest the addition of an e.g.:

“Where appropriate, those services and facilities delivered by the community or voluntary sector (e.g. faith facilities) will be provided through...”

- *Councils' Response:*

Agree in principle. Policy altered although recommended wording not used.

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Policy NW20 has been taken forward as the preferred option in order to implement the vision (NW1), which requires a local centre to act as a focus for the development and also provide facilities and services for nearby communities.

Draft AAP Policy NW21: A Local Centre

Summary of Options consulted on:

Two locations for the local centre options were consulted on:

Option 14.1 – A local centre will be established, close to the heart of the new development.

Option 14.2 – A local centre will be established close to the heart of the new development, with some community services and facilities to be located close to Huntingdon Road.

Summary of results of Community Involvement:

Option 14.1:

3 objections	2 supports	1 comment
--------------	------------	-----------

- Difficult to form a view about the function & makeup of local centre without information on the ultimate size and mix of land uses;
- Provision is required for new residents of both sites in the area and also for existing residents in areas neighbouring both sites;
- Could increase the need to travel for the wider community.

Option 14.2:

2 objections	6 supports	3 comments
--------------	------------	------------

- Must be planned in conjunction with NIAB site;
- Locating facilities on Huntingdon Road would make them more difficult to access from the West Cambridge site;
- Masterplanning for the NIAB site does not provide for establishing community facilities on the northern side of Huntingdon Road;
- Difficult to form a view about the function & makeup of local centre without information on the ultimate size and mix of land uses;
- Could have implications for the viability of both the local centre & outlying facilities.

New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:

Not applicable.

Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:

Option 14.2 generally performs better across all relevant objectives, there are particular benefits across social and economic objectives. With regards environmental objectives, there is potential benefit of option 14.1 associated

with the loss of undeveloped land. This benefit of option 14.1 (objective 1.1) will depend on whether the land that would have been allocated to a local centre is left undeveloped or whether it would be used for other development.

Response:

In accordance with national planning policy in PPS1 which seeks to create sustainable communities, a local centre will act as the focus for the new community and help to establish its special character and identity. By co-locating as many services and facilities, there can be a more efficient use of scarce land and buildings through shared buildings and facilities which can lead to better customer service and considerable savings especially for operational efficiency. The provision of such services and facilities in a local centre will also enable small-scale employment to be located within and/or alongside the local centre to reinforce its function.

By linking the local centre to the network of pedestrian and cycle routes as well as public transport routes, the development can become an exemplar of sustainable living. A single centre will also enable a journey for one purpose to serve another, thus reducing the overall number and length of journeys and providing opportunities for social interaction.

The location of the local centre at the heart of the development will assist in bringing together the two parts of the development either side of the strategic gap and thus encouraging the creation of a cohesive community. The local centre can also provide for some of the needs of those who live or work in neighbouring communities, particularly the sector of North West Cambridge which will be developed to the north of Huntingdon Road and the University's West Cambridge Site, south of Madingley Road.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

- *Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:*

There were no negative impacts identified by the assessment. One recommendation is that, although the Policy promotes public transport access, it will be important to ensure that this enables access to the centre for all elements of the community. This should be mitigated through NW2 (1 (b)).

- Councils' Response

Noted. Policy unchanged.

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme

(ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*

(iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

(iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy

(v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

(vi) Policies are coherent and consistent

(vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances,

are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered

(viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring

(ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Option 14.1 has been taken forward in preferred option NW21 in order to act as the focus for the new community and help to establish its special character and identity.

Draft AAP Policy NW22: Public Art

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>It was considered that there were no options for the subject of consultation at the Issues & Options stage.</p>
<p>Summary of results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Response:</p> <p>The provision of public art will assist in creating the distinctive character of North West Cambridge. The provision of quality visual arts and crafts as part of new developments can bring social, cultural, environmental, educational and economic benefits, both to the new development and to the community at large. It is considered particularly important that public art is integrated into the overall design of North West Cambridge and functional elements e.g. lighting, street furniture, floor designs and signage as well as landmark works such as sculpture.</p> <p>Given the scale of development at North West Cambridge it is considered important to set out the level of public art provision sought. In addition, a strategy for public art is required, with the appointment of a lead artist (s) at an early stage in the planning and design of development.</p>
<p>Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:</p> <p>- <i>Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:</i></p> <p>Most detailed mitigation for this policy should be implemented through the Masterplan. Recommend that the policy or policy background include integration of public engagement requirements.</p> <p>- <i>Councils' Response:</i></p> <p>Agree. Supporting text altered.</p>

Tests of Soundness:**Procedural:**

- ✓ (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- ✓ (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- ✓ (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- ✓ (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- ✓ (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- ✓ (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- ✓ (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered
- ✓ (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- ✓ (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Policy NW22 has been taken forward as the preferred option as the provision of public art will assist in creating the distinctive character of North West Cambridge.

Recreation

Draft AAP Policy NW23: Open Space and Recreation Provision

Summary of Options consulted on:		
Two options in relation to open space and recreation facilities were consulted on:		
Option 15.1 – Open space and recreation facilities should be provided on site.		
Option 15.2 – Some open space and recreation facilities could be provided by commuted payments.		
Summary of results of Community Involvement:		
Option 15.1:		
1 objection	10 supports	1 comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The need for such provision should be applied on a site-by-site basis and planning obligations should adhere to the tests of Circular 5/05;• Could have an impact on the viability of the development.		
Option 15.2:		
3 objections	2 supports	2 comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Any provision of recreational and strategic open space should comply with the Green Infrastructure Strategy;• There is deficiency of such provision in this part of Cambridge and the proposed higher density of housing necessitates adequate and full open space and other recreational provision;• The need for such provision should be applied on a site-by-site basis and planning obligations should adhere to the tests of Circular 5/05.		
New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:		
Not applicable.		
Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:		
Overall, environmental and social benefits to the local environment and community are greater with option 15.1. It should be borne in mind that the strategic location of the open space could enhance the greenbelt area and mitigate against impacts of the development on the townscape, thus retaining some distinctive gap between Cambridge and Girton.		

Response:

In accordance with national planning policy in PPG17 (Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation) it is important to ensure that those living, working and visiting North West Cambridge have easy access to high quality open spaces and recreation facilities which can lead to healthy lifestyles and a high quality of life and entertainment. Its provision will also enhance the setting of the City and add to its special character, amenity and biodiversity.

Furthermore, provision should be made for Strategic Open Space, which is the sub-regional network of green spaces and linkages. This could include improved access from North West Cambridge into the wider countryside and other areas of Strategic Open Space, such as the Coton Countryside Reserve. These linkages will be important to those living and working in North West Cambridge to ensure access to the wider countryside and also to provide connectivity for reasons of biodiversity.

Where appropriate such provision should be made on site or otherwise through commuted payments. In most cases on site provision is preferred as the facility will be close to the development. However, for some facilities this will not be possible and in such cases a commuted sum will be required.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:*- Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:*

1. The supporting text para 8.1 should be amended to, “many open space uses are not mutually exclusive”.
2. The policy background text should be amended to promote a strategic approach to locating all open and green space encouraging the use of pedestrian and cycle routes

- Councils' Response:

1. Agree. Policy altered.
2. Noted.

Tests of Soundness:**Procedural:**

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- ✓ (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances,
- ✓ are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered
- ✓ (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- ✓ (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

A combination of options 15.1 and 15.2 has been taken forward in preferred option NW23, which requires the provision of open space and recreation facilities.

Natural Resources

Draft AAP Policy NW24: Climate Change and Sustainable Design & Construction

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>It was considered that there were no options for the subject of consultation at the Issues & Options stage, as Government guidance supporting the setting of specific levels of sustainable design in local development documents was not published until December 2006.</p>
<p>Summary of results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Although no related options were presented in the Issues & Options Report, the following issues were raised during the consultation process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reference should be made to up-to-date innovative standards for sustainable homes and buildings;• Should also address the need for improved energy efficiency as well as renewable energy provision as both are important in relation to climate change mitigation;• The AAP should require all buildings to be low energy and achieve Ecohomes 'very good' or 'excellent' ratings;• The need to minimise use of resources and ensure buildings are adapted got climate change are not included – there is a need to be specific about these elements.
<p>New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Response:</p> <p>The Stern Review (2006) identified that climate change will have profound and rising costs for global and national prosperity, people's health and the natural environment. Even with effective policies for reducing emissions in place, the world will still experience significant climate change over the coming decades from emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases already released. To this end, the Government's recent consultation paper "Planning Policy Statement: Planning and Climate Change Supplement to PPS1" (Dec 2006), sets out how spatial planning, in providing for the new homes, jobs and infrastructure needed by communities, should help shape places with lower carbon emissions and resilient to the climate change now accepted as inevitable. At paragraph 1.13 the document states that where there are demonstrable and locally specific opportunities for requiring higher levels of building performance it is proposed these should be set out in</p>

advance in a DPD. This could include where there is a significant local opportunity for major development to be delivered at higher levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes. The Code for Sustainable Homes complements the Governments aims for all new development to be zero carbon by 2016, with a 25% improvement in energy/carbon performance by 2010 (Building a Greener Future: Towards Zero Carbon Development, 2006).

In addition, Regional Planning Policy in the form of Policy SS1 of the Secretary of States Proposed Changes to the draft East of England Plan (2006) encourage local development documents to assist in the achievement of obligations on carbon emissions and adopt a precautionary approach to climate change by avoiding or minimising potential contributions to adverse change and incorporate measures which adapt as far as possible to unavoidable change.

It is felt the favourable nature and significant scale of development proposed at North West Cambridge, provides a unique opportunity to set specific code levels (code level 4) for residential buildings, with a view to increase this to code level 5 for anything approved after 2012. This is in part due to the fact that this is a greenfield site, with few if any of the constraints of a brownfield site. It is also in single ownership by a body that will have a long term interest in the site and can therefore benefit from the long term savings some of these measures will generate. Achieving these code levels will also allow for better adaptation to climate change, including minimum standards for water efficiency and better management of surface water run-off thus reducing the risk of flooding.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

- Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:

1. The policy should be rephrased to ensure the highest possible standards are aspired to, unless it can be proven that they are not reasonable for technological, economical or environmental reasons;
2. There should be a clear distinction between the CSH and BREEAM standards. CSH applies to residential development, taking over from EcoHomes whereas BREEAM will apply to all other developments. This split needs to be distinct and clear;
3. To avoid confusion between climate change mitigation (reduction in CO₂) and adaptation (flood defences) the last sentence of para 9.1. should be amended to read: "North West Cambridge will need to play its part in helping to reach this goal, balancing the overall increased emissions due to the scale of the development, with the opportunities that new development offers for reducing carbon emissions, through such measures as sustainable design and the provision of decentralised and renewable energy sources.";
4. The supporting text makes an important link between adapting to future increased temperatures, but at the same time reducing emissions, therefore also acting to mitigate climate change. However, it is thought that 'air conditioning' or 'active cooling systems' could be substituted

- for 'active heating and cooling systems', in order to add to clarity; and
5. This Policy refers to sustainable design, but could also be used to promote sustainable construction. Amend Part B to read "...sustainable design and construction in line with..."

- Councils' Response:

1. Agree. Policy altered;
2. Agree. Policy altered;
3. Agree. Supporting text altered;
4. Disagree as the supporting text refers only to climate change and both heating and cooling systems contribute to this. Supporting text unchanged;
5. Agree. Policy altered.

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Policy NW24 has been taken forward as the preferred option, which requires development to be designed to adapt to the predicted effects of climate change, achieving high levels of sustainable design in line with the Code for Sustainable Homes, which is consistent with Government policy.

Draft AAP Policy NW25: Renewable Energy

Summary of Options consulted on:

Four options relating to the provision of renewable energy were consulted on:

Option 18.1: Provision of at least 10% of the developments predicted energy requirements on-site, from renewable energy sources;

Option 18.2: Provision of at least 20% of the developments predicted energy requirements on-site, from renewable energy sources;

Option 18.3: In addition to renewable energy, a requirement for combined heat and power to meet the energy needs of a considerable proportion of the development; and

Option 18.4: If combined heat and power is not suitable, then a district heating scheme to meet the heating needs of a considerable proportion of the development.

Summary of results of Community Involvement:

Option 18.1:

4 objections	1 support	1 comment
--------------	-----------	-----------

- The policy is too weak;
- The suggestion that housing developments could provide 10% or indeed 20% renewable energy is strongly questioned;
- Renewable energy issues should not stifle regeneration and development

Option 18.2:

4 objections	4 supports	1 comment
--------------	------------	-----------

- Current policies require 10% and it is considered unreasonable to require a much higher target for this development;
- Will local planning authorities support the provision of large wind turbines on this site;
- The suggestion that housing developments could provide 10% or indeed 20% renewable energy is strongly questioned;
- Renewable energy issues should not stifle regeneration and development

Option 18.3:

2 objections	5 supports
--------------	------------

- The environmental advantages and financial viability of CHP are to a large extent dependent on the size and timing of demand and

residential development might provide a reliable base load for CHP.

Option 18.4:

1 objection	4 supports	2 comments
-------------	------------	------------

- The plan should not specify a policy requirement in advance of a feasibility study and testing;
- Need to make it clearer that the 20% renewable energy obligation applies with a district heating scheme if it is found that a combined heat and power scheme is not suitable.

New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:

Not applicable.

Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:

The Sustainability Appraisal found that option 18.3 performed best on relevant sustainability objectives due to reduced greenhouse gas emissions, increased resource recovery, greater energy sourcing from renewables and enhanced competitiveness. The relative sustainability of option 18.4 in terms of increased resource recovery and greater energy sourcing from renewables will be dependent on the type of energy harnessed for the district heating scheme and the extent to which it would provide energy to the development.

Response:

PPS22 states that local planning authorities may include policies in local development documents that require a percentage of the energy to be used in new residential, commercial or industrial developments to come from on-site renewable energy developments. The draft PPS on Planning and Climate Change expects a high level of ambition in this regard, stating that LPA's should ensure that a significant proportion of the energy supply of substantial new development is gained on-site and renewably and/or from decentralised, renewable or low-carbon energy supply. In addition, the draft PPS also expects all new developments to consider and take into account the potential of decentralised energy supply systems based on renewable and low-carbon energy sources such as CHP.

In terms of Regional Strategy, the Secretary of States Proposed Changes to the East of England Plan state that Local Authorities should, through DPDs, set ambitious but viable proportions of energy supply in substantial new developments to come from on-site and/or decentralised renewable or low carbon energy sources, and that in the interim **as a minimum** 10% of the energy consumed in new developments should come from such sources. The supporting text for the East of England Plan goes on to state the planning policies should move development in the region towards the Government's ambition of zero-carbon development countrywide by 2016.

Given the mixed-use and relatively high density nature of the development at

North West Cambridge, along with the requirements of policy NW24 relating to the Code for Sustainable Homes, it is felt that a target of 20% on-site renewables will be viable for this development along with either CHP or a district heating scheme (a combination of options 18.2, 18.3 and 18.4). The University, with its experience in building services management is likely to be very well placed to manage the system. The policy does contain a caveat stating that this requirement will be relaxed if it can be clearly demonstrated that to require full compliance would not be viable. Flexibility also exists within the requirement for CHP, although if this is found to be unviable, the requirement for a district heating scheme will then be sought.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

- Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:

1. The compatibility with the requirements for the levels of CSH needs to be checked. Also, as with the previous policy, a clear distinction between residential and other uses, and their respective requirements needs to be made;
2. Part 1 of the Policy recognises that some developments will not be able to feasibly meet the 20% on-site renewables requirement. In order to ensure that all development results in carbon reduction benefits it is suggested that Part 1 of the Policy be extended to state that: Where a development can demonstrate that generating on-site renewables is not viable, then there is a requirement to demonstrate how a similar reduction in carbon emissions will be achieved through energy conservation (in addition to energy conservation required through any other Policy);
3. There needs to be a clearer hierarchy in Part two of the policy, as CHP can be fuelled by biofuels, just as a DHS. A possible hierarchy could be:
 - CHP fuelled by biomass;
 - CHP fuelled by gas;
 - District heating fuelled by biomass;
 - District heating fuelled by gas
4. It is also recommended that priority be made for energy demand reduction first, then renewable technology second, as reduction of energy demand is higher up the energy hierarchy and will result in lower overall GHG emissions.

- Councils' response

1. Disagree as this sets a minimum standard for the development as a whole. Policy unchanged;
2. Disagree as energy conservation is already required under policy NW24 and will still be a requirements if policy NW25 cannot be met. Policy unchanged;
3. Agree. Supporting text, rather than policy, altered although recommended wording not used;
4. Disagree as both go hand in hand. Policy unchanged.

Tests of Soundness:**Procedural:**

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances,
 are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

A combination of options 18.2, 18.3 and 18.4 have been taken forward in preferred option NW25, which provides for the provision of at least 20% renewable energy along with a requirement for either combined heat and power or a district heating scheme. This approach is consistent with both national and regional policy and will contribute to the development of a sustainable new urban extension on the edge of Cambridge.

Draft AAP Policy NW26: Surface Water Drainage

Summary of Options consulted on:	
One option relating to surface water drainage was consulted on: Option 20.1: Storm Water Drainage to be designed as far as possible in line with Sustainable Drainage Systems with drainage, recreation, biodiversity and amenity value.	
Summary of results of Community Involvement:	
5 objections	5 supports
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Drainage plans should seek to actively decrease rainwater input to the Washpit;• Should include a statement that SUDs should not affect the SSSI and wet areas;• Does not consider the wider catchment area (catchment wide study needed); and• SUDs challenged as a suitable solution	
New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:	
Not applicable.	
Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:	
These measures should perform better in terms of reducing vulnerability to flooding than if there were no measures. The significance of positive impacts on limiting water consumption will be dependent on drainage system specifications and how these can be integrated with option 20.6 (water conservation) and other development options. Water is a key sustainability issue within the region and these measures could provide mitigation measures against indirect impacts of development options.	
Response:	
National planning policy in the form of PPS25 (Development and Flood Risk) aims to ensure that flood risk is taken into account at all stages in the planning process in order to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding, and to direct flooding away from areas at highest risk. Reduction of flood risk to and from new developments through location, layout and design, incorporating sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) is advocated and as such the use of SUDs to reduce flood risk is consistent with national planning policy. The practice guide companion to PPS25 provides further advice, stating that local planning authorities should ensure that policies encourage sustainable drainage practices in their local development documents. Priority should be given to the use of infiltration drainage techniques as opposed to discharging surface water to watercourses, and where this is not possible discharging site run-off to watercourses is perceived to be preferable to the	

use of sewers.

The effectiveness of SUDs is largely dependent on choosing the most appropriate ones for a site and designing, constructing and maintaining them effectively. There are a wide range of different SUDs techniques or components available and while it is acknowledged that not all SUDs may be applicable to this site, for example soakage SUDs, other SUDs techniques may be suitable, for example rainwater harvesting, filter strips and swales, filter drains and porous pavements and basins and ponds. In line with the requirements of PPS25, the specific types of SUDs to be employed at North West Cambridge will need to be demonstrated at the planning application stage. A Strategic Water and Drainage Strategy will be required to support a planning application, including a strategic scale flood risk assessment for the site and any impact on the wider catchment and detailing the types of SUDs proposed and options for future adoption and maintenance arrangements. This strategy will be assessed by the Environment Agency.

The use of SUDs to achieve wider benefits for biodiversity and local amenity is also consistent with government policy as set out in PPS25 and PPS9 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation). Where possible SUDs will be encouraged that will enhance biodiversity by creating additional habitats, for example through the use of basins and ponds.

As flood risk downstream of the development is already an issue for neighbouring communities such as the Parishes of Histon and Impington and Girton, reducing flood risk from this development is essential. By creating impermeable areas on what is currently a greenfield site, surface water flows leaving this area will increase significantly and potentially exacerbate flooding problems downstream. SuDS can provide a long term, sustainable solution to this, as well as delivering biodiversity, microclimate and amenity benefits.

Therefore option 20.1 will be pursued in the draft AAP subject to amendments to ensure that SUDs will also address surface runoff in the event of ordinary rainfall events as well as storm events as well as making allowances for the forecast effects of climate change.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

- Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:

1. Part 2 of the Policy should be reworded to increase clarity. It could be stated that: "The SuDS will seek to hold water on the site, ensuring that it is released to surrounding watercourses at an equal, or slower, rate than is the case prior to development"; and
2. In order to increase clarity, Part 4 of the Policy could be reworded to state that: "Any surface water drainage scheme will need to be capable of reducing the down stream flood risk as well as normal rainfall events under future climate change scenarios".

- Councils' Response:

1. Agree. Policy altered;
2. Agree. Policy altered although recommended wording not used.

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances,
 are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Option 20.1 has been taken forward in preferred option NW26 to encourage the use of a Sustainable Drainage System for the site to deal with surface water drainage and to ensure that all flood mitigation measures make allowance for the forecast effects of climate change, an approach consistent with Government policy.

Draft AAP Policy NW27: Foul Drainage and Sewage Disposal

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>It was considered that there were no options for the subject of consultation at the Issues & Options stage.</p>
<p>Summary of results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Although no related options were presented in the Issues & Options Report, the following issues were raised during the consultation process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The issue of foul water drainage is not addressed in the overall drainage scheme for the AAP. The implications of additional discharges from receiving Sewage Treatment Works are likely to have to be assessed as part of the Flood Risk Assessment for the Site.
<p>New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Response:</p> <p>The issue of foul drainage and sewage disposal is an important element that must be addressed by a policy in the draft AAP. In accordance with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (WFD), the treatment of wastewater must not cause the deterioration of the water environment thereby compromising WFD objectives. Government Guidance in the form of PPS25 states that all forms of flooding, including flooding from sewers, and their impact on the natural and built environment are material planning considerations.</p> <p>Policy WAT2 (Water Resource Development) of the Secretary of States proposed changes to the East of England Plan states that local development documents should plan to site new development so as to maximise the potential of existing water/waste treatment infrastructure thus minimising the need for new/improved infrastructure. Adverse impact on sites of European or International importance for nature conservation must be avoided. The supporting text for this policy states that additional capacity for wastewater treatment will need to be included in Water Company Investment Plans.</p> <p>The foul water produced at North West Cambridge will be directed to Cambridge Sewage Treatment Works at Milton to take advantage of consolidating existing facilities. Anglian Water are currently undertaking an appraisal of sewerage provision for the whole catchment and the outcome of that appraisal will inform the approach to be followed for foul water arising from North West Cambridge.</p>

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

- Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:

It could be beneficial to refer to integrated approaches to the treatment of wastewater that include grey water recycling as part of sustainable design and construction (promoted by policy NW24).

- Councils' Response:

Noted. This policy already forms part of an integrated water strategy for North West Cambridge. Policy unchanged.

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Policy NW27 has been taken forward as the preferred option as it addresses the issue of treated and untreated wastewater and links the start and phased development of the site to the availability of wastewater treatment capacity and the capacity of receiving watercourses in accordance with Government policy and European legislation.

Draft AAP Policy NW28: Management and Maintenance of Surface Water Drainage Systems

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>Four options relating to management and maintenance of watercourses were consulted on:</p> <p>Option 20.2: All water bodies and watercourses to be maintained and managed by a specific trust which would be publicly accountable and funded in perpetuity by taking ownership of commercial property;</p> <p>Option 20.3: All water bodies and watercourses to be maintained and managed by the two Councils;</p> <p>Option 20.4: All water bodies and watercourses would be maintained and managed by Anglian Water; and</p> <p>Option 20.5: All water bodies and watercourses would be maintained and managed by Cambridge University</p>							
<p>Summary of results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Option 20.2:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>3 objections</td> <td>5 supports</td> <td>1 comment</td> </tr> </table> <p>Option 20.4:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>3 objections</td> </tr> </table> <p>Option 20.5:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>3 objections</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is too early to prescribe the means by which water bodies and watercourses would be managed. 			3 objections	5 supports	1 comment	3 objections	3 objections
3 objections	5 supports	1 comment					
3 objections							
3 objections							
<p>New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>							
<p>Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:</p> <p>Overall, option 20.2 performs best. It is thought that a designated trust would have more time and resources to maintain the waterways. In addition, the focus of the trust on a specific task will be of benefit to overall management of waterways.</p>							
<p>Response:</p> <p>Planning Policy Statement 25 sets out that those proposing development are</p>							

responsible for ensuring that any flood risk management measures are sufficiently funded to ensure that the site can be developed and occupied safely throughout its proposed lifetime. As part of the site specific flood risk assessment required to accompany a planning application, consideration must be given to flood risk management measures and how the site will be protected from flooding, including the potential impacts of climate change over the lifetime of the development.

A National SUDS Working Group (NSWG), established to address the perceived issues impeding the widespread use of SUDS in England and Wales, has developed an interim code of practice to help overcome the specific problems of SUDs adoption (Interim Code of Practice for SUDs, NWSG, 2004). Complemented by the CIRIA publication "C625 Model Agreements of SUDs", the code provides a set of model arrangements to facilitate uptake of SUDs by providing a mechanism for maintenance, based on current legislation and the current planning system. The model agreements developed achieve this through the planning process, either as a planning obligation or as a condition attached to planning permission.

While it is too early to prescribe the exact means by which management and maintenance will occur, it is vital that the draft AAP makes it clear that management and maintenance will be guaranteed in perpetuity of development. Option 20.2, preferred by the Sustainability Appraisal, allows sufficient flexibility in referring to a specific trust that will be publicly accountable while not setting out how this Trust will be composed. As such the preferred policy option to be taken forward in the draft AAP will be based on option 20.2.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:

1. Part 2 of the Policy could be reworded to add to clarity. This could read: "No development shall commence until the written agreement of the local planning authorities has been secured stating that organisations with sufficient powers, funding, resources, expertise and integrated management are legally committed to maintain and manage all surface water systems on the North West Cambridge site in perpetuity;
2. Reference should be made to the type of monitoring, such as ecological/biological/hydrological conditions into the future to ensure that good conditions are being maintained.

- Councils' Response:

1. Agree. Policy altered;
2. Disagree as this will be covered by the written agreement. Policy unchanged

Tests of Soundness:**Procedural:**

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Option 20.2 has been taken forward in preferred option NW28, which states that no development shall commence until organisations with sufficient powers, funding, resources, expertise and integrated management are legally committed to maintain and manage all surface water systems on the site. This approach is consistent with Government policy.

Draft AAP Policy NW29: Water Conservation

Summary of Options consulted on:

One option relating to water conservation was consulted on:

Option 20.6: Aims to reduce water consumption generally seeking a balance in the management of water recycling so that there is no adverse impact on the water environment and biodiversity.

Summary of results of Community Involvement:

Option 20.6:

2 objections	5 supports
--------------	------------

- Policy is not strong enough (mandatory grey water recycling and rainwater capture);
- Include targets for the reduction of water use;
- Need to ensure no adverse effects on the water environment and biodiversity;
- The AAP should specify a requirement to reduce per capita water consumption by at least 25%.

New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:

Not applicable.

Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:

These potential measures perform well in terms of limiting water consumption to levels supportable by natural processes and storage systems. How well these measures perform is dependent on how these are implemented and the level to which they can mitigate any indirect adverse impacts of development options on water use. Since definitive methods cannot be stipulated prior to preferred options, at this stage the significance of such positive impacts are uncertain. However, it is asserted that these impacts will be positive to no such measures being put in place. In addition, water is a key sustainable issue within the region and these measures could provide mitigation measures against indirect impacts of development options.

Response:

Paragraph 5 of PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development) states that planning should facilitate and promote sustainable and inclusive patterns of development by, amongst other things, ensuring high quality development through good and inclusive design and the efficient use of resources. As noted in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Issues & Options Report, water resources are a key sustainability issue in the East of England, an area that has the lowest rainfall in the country and officially described as being semi-

arid. A high proportion of the available water resource is already being exploited and as such, even allowing for the impact of climate change, careful management of water will be crucial if the economic potential of the Cambridge Sub-Region is to continue to be realised. The Environment Agency's Water Resources Strategy for the East of England seeks a 'twin track' approach to meet the increasing demand for water in the region, whereby water efficiency and increased supply must go hand in hand. While the responsibility for planning and managing water supply, including the submission of water resource plans, rests with water supply companies, planning can help achieve water conservation targets by adopting policies and supporting measures that help to reduce per capita water consumption.

Policy WAT1 of the Secretary of States Proposed Changes to the East of England Plan seeks to ensure that the development provided for in the Spatial Strategy is matched with improvements in water efficiency, which will be delivered through a progressive, year on year, reduction in per capita consumption rates. The target in EERA's monitoring framework should achieve savings in water use compared with 2006 levels equivalent to at least 25% in new development. The East of England Plan envisages that this target will be pursued through a co-ordinated programme of measures including changes to Building Regulations, the Code for Sustainable Homes, fiscal measures, incentive schemes and other regional measures.

The preferred approach for NW Cambridge is linked to the requirements of preferred policy option NW24, which sets out a requirement for all homes at North West Cambridge to achieve code level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, rising to code level 5 for anything approved after 2012 in line with guidance contained in the proposed planning policy statement on Planning and Climate Change. As well as introducing minimum standards for energy efficiency, the code also introduces minimum standards for water efficiency. At code level 4 the water consumption rate stands at 105 litres per person per day, which represents a 30% reduction in water compared to the 2005/2006 industry standard of 151 litres per head per day for water only companies (source: OFWAT Report, Security of supply, leakage and water efficiency 2005-06). Anything approved after 2012 will be required to meet code level 5, at which the water consumption rate stands at 80 litres per person per day, representing a 47% reduction in water consumption compared to the 2005/06 industry standard.

In line with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive, care must be taken to ensure that water reuse and recycling does not have an adverse impact on the water environment. In accordance with the requirements of PPS9 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation) a balance must also be struck to ensure no adverse impact on biodiversity or sites of international importance.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

- *Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:*

1. This Policy should be internally coherent with Policy NW24 and the Code for Sustainable Homes in terms of standards and timescale;
2. The supporting text refers to water conservation measures reducing 'the overall demand for water'. This is not strictly true as the development will in fact increase overall demand for water in what is already a water stressed region. The Policy should aim to reduce per capita demand for water;
3. Paragraph 2 of the supporting text refers to 'improving the efficiency of water supply'. This should be changed to 'water use'; and
4. The final sentence of paragraph 9.18 should read 'adverse affect on biodiversity, or the wider water environment, in accordance with the Water Framework Directive'.

- Councils' Response:

1. This is already the case as the percentages are based on the Code for Sustainable Homes (as compared to the 2005/06 industry standard). Policy unchanged;
2. Agree. Supporting text altered;
3. Agree. Supporting text altered;
4. Agree. Supporting text altered.

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Option 20.6 has been taken forward in preferred option NW29, which seeks at least a 30% reduction in water consumption, rising to at least 47% after 2012, while ensuring that there will be no adverse impact on the water environment or biodiversity. This approach is consistent with European Legislation as well as Government and Regional policy.

Delivery

Draft AAP Policy NW30: Construction Process

Summary of Options consulted on:

One option in relation to the construction process was consulted on:

Option 19.1 – The construction process will need careful management in order to avoid disruption to adjacent parts of the City and Girton. It would also not be appropriate to transport spoil over considerable distances and the general principle should be for construction spoil to be treated and utilised on site.

Summary of results of Community Involvement:

Option 19.1:

4 objections	6 supports
--------------	------------

- Should include a statement to protect the SSSI and wet areas;
- Long-term usage of areas needs to be considered (i.e. clay-rich sub-soils may not be suitable for sports and recreational facilities);
- Reference needs to be made to sustainable design & construction methods;
- Need to make the policy more robust & require developers to produce & implement a site waste management plan

New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:

Not applicable.

Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:

The mitigation measures perform well against environmental and social objectives, in terms of efficient use of resources and reduced noise and vibration pollution. This will have an indirect impact on human health since Noise and vibration pollution is known to contribute to stress and other adverse impacts particularly on mental health.

Response:

Careful management of the construction process is consistent with PPS1 which requires development to protect and enhance the natural environment, the quality and character of the countryside and existing communities. The development of North West Cambridge will take place over a number of years and the construction process will need careful management in order that disruption to adjacent parts of the City and Girton as well as parts of North

West Cambridge which have already been built is avoided. Avoidance of impact will be the objective, but where this is not possible, disruption will be kept to a minimum both in magnitude and duration.

In accordance with the principles of efficient use or reuse of existing resources set out in PPS1, any existing resources available on the site, such as materials from redundant buildings, can help reduce the amount of materials that have to be imported onto the site.

Furthermore, it would not be appropriate to transport construction spoil over considerable distances as this would be unsustainable and simply transfer the problem elsewhere. The general principle should be for construction spoil to be treated and utilised on-site. However, it would not be acceptable to alter the land forms locally by concentrating the spoil into one or more large mounds as this would introduce an alien character into this area.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

- *Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:*

The Policy should include a requirement for all construction traffic to use the most effect and sustainable access to the site.

- *Councils' Response:*

This is covered in the supporting text to the policy – paragraph 10.5.

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Option 19.1 has been taken forward in preferred option NW30 in order to achieve sustainable development as required by PPS1.

Draft AAP Policy NW 31: Strategic Landscaping

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>One option in relation to the strategic landscaping was consulted on:</p> <p>Option 22.3 – A landscape strategy will be needed to ensure that each part of the development area is landscaped, managed and protected where practical before much of the development is started and appropriate landscaping is completed upon completion of each phase of development.</p>		
<p>Summary of results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Option 22.3:</p> <table border="1"><tr><td>1 objection</td><td>5 supports</td></tr></table> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The need for such provision should be applied on a site-by-site basis and planning obligations should adhere to the tests of Circular 5/05	1 objection	5 supports
1 objection	5 supports	
<p>New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>		
<p>Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:</p> <p>These measures will potentially have a positive effect on mitigating impacts and maintaining the diversity and distinctiveness of the landscape and townscape character, relative to no such measure being in place. In addition the measures will help to create places, spaces and buildings that work well with the landscape. Landscape impacts could potentially be significant should there be development on the ridge, together with development impacts on the character and distinctiveness of Cambridge and Girton and landscaping issues around the site. The significance of the positive impacts of these measures are at this stage uncertain. This will be dependent on preferred options and how far these measures can mitigate against any adverse impacts.</p>		
<p>Response:</p> <p>Part of the strategy for minimising impacts of the development will involve the landscaping of the site as part of the overall development. Landscaping will involve earth moving and the general management of spoil which will be created from digging footings, land drains, surface water attenuation lakes etc. Woodlands, individual trees and hedgerows will also be planted.</p> <p>The delivery of an agreed landscape strategy will need to be implemented and managed to ensure that strategic landscaping is carried out prior to each phase of development and maintained closely throughout the construction</p>		

<p>period.</p> <p>Such strategic landscaping, delivered through an agreed landscape strategy will ensure the creation as a high quality development as required by the vision.</p>
<p>Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:</p> <p>- <i>Sustainability Appraisal Recommendation:</i></p> <p>The Policy should make explicit the requirement to link providing high quality habitat (including the planting of trees of local genetic stock) that is strategically located in order to reduce habitat fragmentation with improving the quality of open space and green space.</p> <p>- Councils' Response:</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>Tests of Soundness:</p> <p>Procedural:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement* <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal <p>Conformity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (v) regard to the Community Strategies** <p>Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances <p>*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.</p> <p>** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils</p>
<p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Option 22.3 has been taken forward in preferred option NW31 in order to ensure the creation as a high quality development as required by the vision.</p>

Draft AAP Policy NW32: Phasing & Need

Summary of Options consulted on:

Two options in relation to phasing of the development were consulted on:

Option 22.1 – The first phase of the development will take place close to the existing part of the built up area of Cambridge to the east and then move westwards as the needs of the University are proven.

Option 22.2 – the first phase of development will take place around the local centre moving outwards as the needs of the University are proven.

Summary of results of Community Involvement:

Option 22.1:

1 objection	3 supports
-------------	------------

- A strong local centre is needed from the outset

Option 22.2:

1 objection	4 supports
-------------	------------

- Unless option 10.1 is preferred it is not clear where the new local centre will be located or whether it would be viable to bring it forward as the focal point for the first phase of development

New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:

Not applicable.

Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:

Option 22.1 performs better on environmental objectives due to the potentially reduced area of land take if University needs are not demonstrated i.e. there may be less development of a local centre than option 22.2 if the needs of the University are realised at an early stage of housing development. However, the development of a local centre early on in development will ensure local residents have access to services and facilities throughout construction phases of residential development. It should be noted that the benefits of option 22.2 relative to 22.1 are short term in nature. However, the benefits of option 22.1 would be long term if they are realised.

Option 22.1 may result in cumulative impacts on the environment due to a greater use of undeveloped land. These impacts would include loss of open space and biodiversity. The cumulative impacts of 22.1 would lie with the local

economy and local provision of services and facilities, however, these would be short term in nature.

Response:

The Structure Plan and Cambridge Local Plan clearly state that this land should only be brought forward when the University can show a clear need for it to be released. The site is in proximity to the University's existing West Cambridge site, south of Madingley Road, which is the current focus for the growth of the University. Other sites in the City are allocated for University and student housing uses in the Cambridge Local Plan. Accordingly, a Needs Statement is required to support a planning application to satisfactorily demonstrate the need for development and that it cannot reasonably be met elsewhere. This would take into account factors such as viability, land availability, ownership, location, accessibility and suitability.

This land is also identified as a Strategic Employment Location in the Structure Plan and again is subject to the University proving the need for the development; the site therefore will enable the long-term growth of the University education and research cluster in Cambridge. There is, however, a generous supply of other land for some of these uses on the West Cambridge site and elsewhere in the City.

The phasing of the development should have regard to the creation of a sustainable community from the outset and as the development progresses. This is particularly important as the development will be implemented over a long period as the University's needs arise although the early establishment of a viable local centre should not be undermined.

Members had previously indicated a preference for option 22.1 with development starting in the east and moving westwards. However, it is considered that such phasing details are highly dependant on masterplanning and therefore this matter should be left to this stage to determine.

Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:

- *Sustainability Appraisal recommendations:*

Reference should be made to the strategic aim of phasing and to the nature of receptors exposed to impacts during the construction of the development (i.e. current and future residents).

- *Councils' Response:*

This is covered by the Policy NW30 and the supporting text – paragraph 10.4.

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme

✓ (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*

✓ (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

✓ (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy

✓ (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

✓ (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent

(vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances,

✓ are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered

✓ (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring

✓ (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Neither option (22.1 & 22.2) should be taken forward as the preferred option; instead this matter should be addressed through masterplanning as stated in preferred option NW32.

Draft AAP Policy NW33: Infrastructure Provision

<p>Summary of Options consulted on:</p> <p>One option in relation to infrastructure provision was consulted on:</p> <p>Option 22.4 – Provision will be sought for physical and community infrastructure to meet the needs of the new community to an agreed timetable.</p>			
<p>Summary of results of Community Involvement:</p> <p>Option 22.4:</p> <table border="1"><tr><td>2 objections</td><td>5 supports</td><td>1 comment</td></tr></table> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All key services, facilities & infrastructure should be provided ahead of time;• The need for such provision should be applied on a site-by-site basis and planning obligations should adhere to the tests of Circular 5/05	2 objections	5 supports	1 comment
2 objections	5 supports	1 comment	
<p>New Options Arising Following Community Involvement:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>			
<p>Summary of Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Options:</p> <p>This plan will ensure that quality, range and accessibility of services are provided. The significance of such positive impacts will be dependent on the decision-making process and the outputs of such a process.</p>			
<p>Response:</p> <p>The development of North West Cambridge will create additional demands for physical and social infrastructure, as well as having impacts on the environment. In such cases planning obligations will be required, in accordance with Government guidance (Circular 05/2005), to make any necessary improvements, provide new facilities, or secure compensatory provision for any loss or damage created. The nature and scale of contributions sought will be related to the size of the development and to the extent it places additional demands upon the area.</p> <p>The overall viability of the development will be taken into consideration in the decision on the level of planning obligations to be incorporated into the Section 106 Agreement at the planning application stage.</p>			
<p>Any Changes resulting from Draft Final Sustainability Report:</p> <p>- <i>Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations:</i></p> <p>To ensure the comprehensiveness of the list of types of infrastructure for</p>			

which contributions will be sought 'energy infrastructure' could be added to the list in para 10.13

- *Councils' Response:*

Agree. Policy altered.

Tests of Soundness:

Procedural:

- (i) In accordance with Local Development Scheme
- (ii) Compliance with Statement of Community Involvement*
- (iii) Subjected to Sustainability Appraisal

Conformity:

- (iv) with national planning policy and Regional Spatial Strategy
- (v) regard to the Community Strategies**

Coherence, consistency and effectiveness:

- (vi) Policies are coherent and consistent
- (vii) Policies are most appropriate in all circumstances, are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and relevant alternatives were considered
- (viii) Clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring
- (ix) Plan is flexible to deal with changing circumstances

*The document has been prepared in accordance with Cambridge City Council's adopted SCI and the minimum regulations set out in The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

** As a joint plan, it should have regard to the Community Strategies of both Councils

Conclusion:

Option 22.4 has been taken forward in preferred option NW33 in order to ensure a range of suitable infrastructure, services and facilities are provided to meet the needs of the new community.

Options Not Carried Through to the Draft Area Action Plan

There are a limited amount of issues where options from the Issues & Options consultation have resulted in no policies being included in the Area Action Plan:

- The preferred option is not to include a policy for north facing slip roads (Issues & Options 13.5 and 13.6). The NWC Transport Study, undertaken for the County Council, recommends a 'Preferred Highways Option' which does not include north facing slip roads at the A1303/M11 interchange;
- The secondary School for the quadrant is proposed by the County Council for the NIAB sector north of Huntingdon Road and there is therefore no policy in the Area Action Plan although there is a light type reference in the plan (Issues & Options 14.3 and 14.4);
- Consequently, there is no need to address the appropriate location of secondary school playing fields in the Area Action Plan (Issues & Options 14.5 and 14.6).

Currently Adopted Policies that will be Superseded by the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan

The following policies and proposals in the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) will be superseded when the Area Action Plan is adopted:

- Policy 9/7 – Land between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road;
- Proposal Site 9.07 – Madingley Road/Huntingdon Road; and
- Proposal Site 9.11 – 19 Acre Field and Land at Gravel Hill Farm

The Proposals Maps for the Cambridge Local Plan and South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Development Framework will be updated as required.